

THE
WESTMINSTER
REVIEW



JULY 1, 1860.

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

SHAKESPEARE.

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

NEW SERIES.

VOL. LXXIV

LONDON:
TRÜBNER & CO., 8 & 60, PATERNOSTER-RROW.

1860.

THE

WESTMINSTER

AND

FOREIGN QUARTERLY,

REVIEW.

JULY 1, 1860.

ART. I.—STRIKES: THEIR TENDENCIES AND REMEDIES.

1. *An Inquiry into the Law of "Strikes."* By Francis D. Longe. London: 1860.
2. *Report of the Committee upon Trades Societies, with papers read, and discussions held at the Third Annual Meeting of the Association, Bradford, 1859.*

THE late disputes in the building trade seem on the point of being renewed. The time therefore has arrived to take a calm review of the general tendency of these contests between the employers and the employed, for whilst these disputes continue, little is heard but useless recrimination. Accuracy of judgment, and moderation of sentiment, are for the time entirely sacrificed to bitter personalities. We were forcibly struck with this at the late Social Science Meeting at Bradford. There were many present whose names secure the attention of thousands. They came there professedly to promote the most important branch of all science. A more suitable opportunity there could not be to expound the true law of wages; but social science was too often neglected for vague popular generalities. Thus Lord Brougham is supposed to be such an authority on social science, that an exceptional course has been taken, and he has been appointed permanent president. In his very lengthy address, he ran over every current popular topic, but instead of applying social science to the strike question, he preferred, in the first place, to utter a few unmeaning generalities about demand and supply, and then to make an unfounded attack on the motives of the delegates. One evening the working classes of Bradford were invited to

[Vol. LXXIV. No. CXLV.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. XVIII. No. I. B

attend in St. George's Hall to hear social science; they however obtained little social science, but a great deal of patronizing advice, which we trust was as distasteful to those to whom it was addressed as to those who were compelled to listen. Strikes were not alluded to, except by Lord Shaftesbury, who said with considerable emphasis, "Ye men of Bradford, don't strike;" a precept which he expanded into seven or eight admonitory sentences. He surely cannot suppose the working men of England will desist from movements, to support which they have made so many heroic sacrifices, simply because they receive an affectionate request to do so; if wrong, they like others must by reason be convinced of their error. An attempt is rarely made to instruct the people, and they are often unwittingly misled. Thus the Right Hon. J. Napier, at the same meeting, told the working men of Bradford that if the legal Sabbath were destroyed, they would have to give seven days' labour for six days' wages. We wonder these words have not become the inspiration of the Paviers' Arms movement; for according to this doctrine it is by analogy quite manifest that when the working classes obtain power to decree two Sabbaths, they will receive six days' wages for five days' work.

The phenomena of strikes can be investigated in two different ways, which in consonance to current language may be best described as the practical and theoretical. We want facts not theories, is the popular cry of the present day. Thus a recent reviewer in an article on strikes,* assured his readers that he was not "going to preach political economy." This reminds us of an old gentleman we once met, who amused himself with astronomy. He constructed an orrery, in which the sun revolved round the earth, and the planetary motions were exhibited by ingenious cycles and epicycles. He said, I despise mathematics—I like to represent things as they really appear. Sometimes, certainly, when I explain astronomy to my friends, I meet with a few difficulties, but then I can always glide over these with a little moral declamation. In like manner the reviewer easily dispenses with political economy. Instead of ascertaining and expounding the laws which determine wages, he indulges in denunciations of trades' unions, which, he says, are as oppressive as any secret society on the Continent, and present unmistakeable evidence of the danger of extending the suffrage to the working classes.

In the sphere of physical science, during a long period the nicest observations were made, but there were no deductive principles by which to connect these observations one with another,

* *Edinburgh Review*, October, 1859.

to explain their true meaning, and to bring out their relative importance; and physical science never advanced beyond empiricism. Astronomy was in this state till the time of Newton. He enunciated three simple laws of motion, which became the foundation upon which the whole superstructure of physical astronomy has been raised. They not only enable us to predict a distant future, but they decipher important truths from observations which were made two thousand years ago, and which had remained simply unsuggestive facts. Mr. John Stuart Mill, in his "Logic of the Moral Sciences," has considered the mode of investigation which must be applied to moral science questions. He has discussed this subject, like every other which he has handled, with an accuracy of thought, a perspicacity of style, and with a philosophic breadth of mind, which those who know his works best declare have never been surpassed. He decides that social science requires the same mode of investigation as physical science. As, therefore, strikes are intended to effect the division of the produce of the country, which the labourer and the capitalist respectively share; we must resort to political economy, because this science explains the laws which regulate wages. This mode of investigation will enable us to explain what it is possible for the labourer either to gain or lose by strikes, and we shall finally proceed to consider the important tendency indicated by these collisions between employers and employed, towards social relations very different from those existing at the present time in the commercial world. It is a fundamental error to direct attention only to the effects of social phenomena, and not to investigate the causes from which these effects flow as natural results. The consideration of the visible effects of any social movement cannot afford sufficient data to decide whether its tendency is good or bad, and as long as the causes of a social movement remain unexplained, its tendency cannot be directed, and such a direction and not resistance is generally all that can be done either by the politician or by the philanthropist. The usual method is to describe the history of several strikes; to calculate the amount of wages lost by the labourers on strike; and also the subscriptions paid by other labourers; to enumerate the sufferings endured by the working classes; to search out a few isolated cases of violence; to point out the heedless language which is too often indulged in; to select those strikes which have failed to secure any rise of wages, and then say,—such evils sufficiently prove that strikes must be wrong, that they must injure the labourers, that therefore their tendency must be bad, and that consequently the authors of such disasters must be prompted by improper motives.

But surely it is more reasonable to inquire the causes which render strikes so frequent at the present time. The working men

of England are now constantly agitated by these disputes from one end of the country to the other, but this cannot be the result of inexplicable chance. Such combinations of labourers as are now continually organized were a few years since unknown, and it is as idle to say that the moral character of our labourers is lower now than formerly, as it is to assert that the employers are actuated by less kindly feelings towards those whom they employ.

One prominent feature of our present social condition is the rapidly advancing intelligence of the artisan population. Railways, cheap literature, cheap reading-rooms, and cheap newspapers, have all combined to produce a wondrous change. The working classes have been until within a few years the helpless victims of unjust laws and of oppressive taxation. Now they are regarded as a great power in the State, and are appealed to as such. What more natural than at the first awakening into this higher existence there should be a reaction, and that they should be eager to combine for any objects which they wish to secure. Thus the agricultural labourers are still in their former low state of intelligence; they are a class who would be benefited by a combination, and yet they have not the capacity of organization. When the subject of strikes is discussed, political economy is seldom employed for any other purpose than conveniently to dispose of the whole question in some such outbursts of outraged science as these:—"How contrary to political economy to seek ten hours' wages for nine hours' work. This cannot be; the immutable laws of demand and supply forbid it." How soon the world has become enamoured of scientific truth, for few are the years that have passed since protective duties, bounties on exports, and penalties on imports, were the favoured doctrines of the day. Whenever political economy is applied to any practical question, it is most important to remember that this science frequently only investigates and affirms tendencies. These tendencies are liable to be counteracted, and always require time for their complete operation. Thus as an illustration let us consider that important case of value deduced from the theory of rent. It is often stated that the price of agricultural produce must be such as will return the ordinary rate of profit to that worst land in cultivation which pays no rent, but it can only be asserted that the price of agricultural produce has a constant tendency to approach that limit when the ordinary rate of profit is returned to this worst land. Again, the profits of different trades are said to be reduced to a common rate by the competition of commerce; but the law should be enunciated thus,—The competition of commerce exerts a constant tendency to reduce the profits of different trades to the common rate. Let us carry these considerations to the law of

wages. The capital of a country is that portion of its past produce which has been saved to aid future production, and the wage fund of a country is the portion of this capital which is applied directly to remunerate labour. This wage fund is distributed amongst the whole labouring population, and therefore wages depend directly upon the amount of this fund, and inversely upon the number of the labouring population. If this wage fund is estimated in money, the above simple proportion determines the average money wages of the country. But the quantity of commodities which these money wages represent indicates the real remuneration of the labourer. The aggregate wages paid to the labourers are thus determined; wages, therefore, cannot be permanently raised without either increasing the wage fund or diminishing the number of the labourers. But there is another element as yet unnoticed,—what regulates the quantity of labour which must be given to obtain these wages, or in other words, the number of hours the labourer must work? The wage fund of a country is a component part of its capital,—capital is the result of saving. The rate of profit which capital obtains, is the reward of this saving; the greater the reward, the greater the inducement to save; therefore the amount saved and consequently the wage fund varies, *ceteris paribus*, with the rate of profit. The produce of labour is divided into two shares, one goes to the capitalist, and is the remuneration of his past saving; the other the labourer obtains as the remuneration for his labour, and is termed his wages. Supposing other circumstances remain the same, the amount which is produced varies with the quantity of labour which is applied; if therefore the labourer works nine hours a day instead of ten, less will be produced, and if he continues to receive the same wages, the profits of the capitalist must be diminished. Now let us suppose that our labouring population unanimously resolved to do one-sixth less work—in fact, to work five days in the week instead of six; if they entered into such a voluntary combination no one has any right to complain, but would they, or would they not, continue to receive the same wages? We will take the case most favourable to the labourers, and suppose that the resolution has been come to suddenly, without time for the capitalists to receive warning. The wage fund which exists would not, perhaps, be immediately diminished, and for a time it is quite possible that the labourers will receive the same wages. But at the end of the first year considerably less will have been produced, and since the same wages have been paid, the whole loss must have been borne by the capitalists' profits. The rate of profit will therefore be diminished, there will now therefore, as we have before observed, be less inducement to save, and less will be saved. The wage fund would be necessarily

diminished, and consequently it is quite impossible, in the absence of any counteracting circumstances, for the labourer to receive the same wages for less labour. As yet the general average rate of wages has alone been considered, but wages vary greatly in different employments. The law of the apportionment of the wage fund amongst the different sections of the labouring population is complicated, but there are general tendencies which can be simply stated.

1st. There is a tendency which acts with increasing force as civilization advances towards an ultimate equalization of wages. In the same way prices are constantly tending towards equalization. A few years since many commodities were twice the price in London that they were in Cornwall. Railways have now reduced the difference to be no more than the small cost of carriage.

2nd. There is a tendency the operation of which is more immediate, although ultimately it must be absorbed into the first,—wages of different employments must constantly tend to be such as will enable the ordinary rate of profit to be returned to the capital employed. Tendencies, therefore, are constantly acting to bring wages into a position which may be described as their natural rate, and as these tendencies act with increasing force, the more wages are disturbed from their natural rate, the position may be regarded as one of stable equilibrium. Similarly it is often stated that the planets revolve in ellipses; and by considering that they do so move, many important truths can be brought out, cleared from obscuring complications, but to the planets these ellipses are only positions of stable equilibrium. The paths of the planets are disturbed by an infinity of causes, and the explanation of many most important phenomena must be sought entirely amongst these disturbances. In precisely a similar manner the phenomena of strikes must be considered with reference to those causes which disturb wages from their natural rate before described as a position of stable equilibrium. If it is supposed that the laws of demand and supply operate instantaneously, if all the affairs of commercial life were also regulated instantaneously by competition, and if, in a word, it is not remembered that political economy treats of tendencies which require time to produce their influence, strikes may be denounced in one general sentence, and the sweeping conclusion be asserted which is so constantly reiterated, that strikes must inevitably cause loss to the labourers. But we shall discover that the subject assumes a very different aspect when considered in that light in which we wish to place it. The causes which disturb wages from their natural rate may be divided into two classes:—

1st. Some causes which not permanently produce a great

inequality in the rate of wages paid in different employments.

2nd. Temporary causes temporarily raise the rate of profit in a particular business above the ordinary rate.

At the present time, our agricultural labourers undoubtedly receive less wages than other labourers. Prominently amongst other disturbing causes from which this inequality results may be placed the law of settlement, and the low intelligence of the agricultural labourer. Would or would not an organized combination of the agricultural labourers exert any influence towards equalizing their wages with the wages of other employments? Let us see what actually takes place now when the agricultural labourer cannot combine. A fair example shall be taken. An agricultural labourer is earning ten shillings a week, he is a married man with a large family, he lives in a cottage in the village in which he was born, he is uneducated; for although he was at school, he left at ten to be a ploughboy, and now can neither read nor write. In a town, perhaps not twenty miles distant, this labourer might obtain eighteen shillings a week instead of ten, and yet he does not avail himself of the advantage. The reason is simple, his low intelligence effectually restrains him from moving. His ignorance magnifies the difficulties of his settling in another employment, and when he has once left his cottage he feels that he has lost his home, for the law of settlement, one of the most grievous burdens that ever oppressed a class, may drive him a helpless wanderer from village to village. We do not attribute the slightest blame to the farmer; cheap labour is offered to him, and he is by common sense bound to accept it, and not to seek about for more expensive labour. Let us now suppose the agricultural labourers could organize themselves into the same perfect combination that the Preston operatives did in 1851. The leaders of the combination might go to the farmers and say,—You refuse, but we are supported by such subscriptions that we can live for a twelvemonth without work; you must have labour somewhere or other; we wont work for you—you must therefore get labourers from other employments—but these labourers are receiving in those better paid employments higher wages than we are—you must therefore pay them at least as much as they were receiving before. It will therefore be greatly to your interest to raise our wages, because if not, you must pay at least as much to labourers less efficient because not accustomed to your work. In the first place, therefore, it appears that strikes exert a tendency to equalize the wages of different employments. The farmers could not ultimately suffer any loss, because they would be compensated either by a rise in the price of agricultural produce, or by a reduction of their rents. A general

rise in agricultural wages would in the first place cause a rise in the price of agricultural produce, but this would induce increased importation; less corn would have to be grown at home, the resources of the fertile land would not be so severely strained, and the farmer would therefore be ultimately compensated by a reduction of rent.

Let us now direct our attention to disturbances of the second class, and suppose that some temporary cause has temporarily raised the profits of a particular business above the ordinary rate.

We will take as an example a higher class of labourers—the builders' operatives. To avoid any possibility of mistake, let it be repeated that profits in one business cannot be permanently higher than in others. The building trade has been steady, builders have been receiving just such prices and paying just such wages, as will give to the capital employed the ordinary rate of profit. The trade suddenly improves and its profits rise above the ordinary rate. Let us, in the first place, consider what will take place if the operative is a single individual unable to combine with his fellow-workmen. He might go to his master and say,—Your trade is better, your profits are larger, and you can therefore afford to pay me higher wages. The master would very naturally reply,—I altogether refuse to raise your wages,—whether or not I can afford to increase your wages has nothing whatever to do with the question, all that I have to ask myself is,—Can I or can I not get your labour as cheap as I could before? I say I can, because I very well know that you have no means of supporting yourself without work. It is hopeless for you to expect higher wages in another employment; and, in fact, you must receive considerably less, because you would sacrifice all the advantages of your acquired skill, and be obliged to descend to the ranks of the unskilled workmen. Theory would lead us to expect such results, and our theory can be amply verified by observation; for how often has it happened that a particular business has, from some exceptional circumstances, for three or four years, been so good, that all engaged in it have realized a fortune; and yet the labourers have entirely failed to reap any corresponding advantage. Let us now consider whether any different results will follow if the labourer could enter into a perfect combination with his fellow-workmen. Instead of a single individual seeking increased wages from his master, a deputation, the representatives of combined thousands, might urge the following case to the masters:—We examine all the prices of your trade as carefully as you do for yourselves, and we are perfectly convinced that your business is so active, that you are now obtaining larger profits than you were before. We therefore know that you can afford to

raise our wages, and we demand higher wages or the same wages for less work. Remember, if you refuse our request, we are prepared with past savings, and we shall be supported by such subscriptions from other classes of labourers, that we shall be able to live many months without work. We have calculated exactly the sacrifices we shall be compelled to make; we consider that what we hope to gain renders it worth our while to make these sacrifices; our combination is supported without compulsion, and therefore we have an undoubted right to do all that we are now doing. What reply could the masters make to such a request? They could not repeatedly refuse higher wages, because, as we shall see, the refusal would expose them to loss. If they should close their shops, the great bulk of their capital not only remains unemployed, but they cease business at the very time when it is most profitable. If they should continue their business with labour obtained from other employments, they still have to raise their wages, because there is no reason to suppose that wages in other employments are lower; therefore workmen could not be induced to enter into new employments without receiving higher wages, and therefore the builders would have to pay higher wages to less efficient labourers. It would be almost impossible to over-estimate the enormous loss which would be caused to the masters by this employment of new hands. Consider for a moment the position of a Manchester manufacturer whose old hands have turned out, and whose place is filled up by some hundreds of builders' operatives. The marvellous dexterity of the factory operatives which has needed years of constant practice to acquire, would be replaced by all the blunders of labourers untrained to the work. If the strike did not extend throughout the whole trade, still the builders must raise their wages. Thus suppose the strike was confined to the district south of the Thames, these builders might then perhaps say to their workmen,—Strike, if you like, for we shall have no difficulty whatever in opening our shops with workmen from the north. But the builders in the north wont let their workmen go, the north will compete against the south for labour, and the capital in the trade ready to be paid to the labourers being the same, and the number of the labourers greatly diminished, those who are employed must obtain a very decided rise in their wages. It therefore appears evident that a perfectly organized strike must tend to give the labourers increased wages, whenever the employers' profits are by some temporary cause advanced above the ordinary rate. For we have seen that if the labourers did not combine, the masters need make no advance in wages, and would be able for a considerable time to secure to themselves the whole advantage of the improved trade. After a certain period the exceptionally high profits would tempt

other capitalists to compete in the same business, the wage fund of the trade would therefore be augmented, and the labourers of the trade would obtain increased wages, and these higher wages would continue to be paid until this advance of wages attracted labourers from other employments; exactly in the same way as high profits had brought new capitalists; and the profits, as well as the wages of a particular business, may for a considerable time continue above the ordinary rate. If competition completed its operation instantaneously, this could not be, and strikes could avail nothing to the labourer. But since this is not the case, capitalists, when the labourers cannot combine, obtain all the benefit of this delay in the operation of competition, and thus the power of combination effectually secures to the labourer a participation of the advantage. Such an opinion is much opposed to the general sentiments of the day, which are continually expressed in some such phrases as these,—The masters to endure this dictation at the hands of the workmen!—better to suffer any loss than to be thus tyrannized over! The utterance of violent indignation is generally pleasant, and for a time will serve as a compensation for much pecuniary sacrifice; but if the indignation involves pecuniary loss, the fact is sure very soon to be discovered, and the indignation will then quietly subside. The masters cannot resist a strike without inflicting on themselves a most serious loss. On the other hand, if an advance of wages is given to the labourer, the masters suffer a relative but not an actual loss, for they are still benefited by the improvement in their trade. But instead of securing the entire advantage to themselves, they now share the increased profits with their workmen, and thus the workman forces himself upon his master as a partner. This partnership will be presently noticed as indicating the most important social feature of strikes. We thus attribute to strikes these two tendencies:—

1st, Strikes, without increasing the general wage fund of the country, or, in other words, the aggregate wages which are paid, exert a tendency to equalize wages in different employments.

2nd, Strikes exert a tendency to raise the wages of a particular class of workmen when the profits of the particular trade are temporarily raised above the ordinary rate.

Some serious evils may be set off as a counterpoise to these advantages, but we believe that time will entirely correct these evils, and that the power of combination is destined greatly to promote social amelioration. One prominent evil of strikes is, that higher wages may be demanded, when no increased profits justify the demand. This was undoubtedly the case with the late strike in the building trade. Such a strike must be even more injurious to the men than to the masters. All the money which

is subscribed by other labourers to support the strike, is spent in vain, all the sufferings endured can bring no result, and the loss which is inflicted upon the masters only serves to aggravate the misfortunes of the labourers. The masters' capital must bear these losses, but the labourer has to look to this capital for the remuneration of his labour, and therefore when he resumes work, the funds from which he is paid are greatly diminished. But the disastrous consequences to the labourer of all such mistakes must soon prove an effectual security against their recurrence, for the labourers will recognise the great sacrifices they must make to support a strike, and they will ultimately be as careful as other classes not to make such sacrifices without due deliberation. Some of the acts by which these combinations are supported are indefensible; some of the rules of the 'Trades' Unions are injurious, and much of the language of agitation betokens ignorance. But we consider it unjust of the educated classes of this country to confine their attention solely to the bad features of the movement, to refuse to recognise the many noble virtues developed by these contests; and we moreover consider that the upper and middle classes are wanting in an important and sacred duty, when they attempt no effort to discover whether or not these contests indicate tendencies which are destined to promote the welfare of our country. The working classes are the victims of many errors, but these must be corrected, not by abuse, but by calm reasoning. Moreover, many of the accusations which are launched against these combinations are singularly inconsistent. Thus Whigs and Tories remark with equal satisfaction,—Does not the late strike prove that the suffrage cannot with safety be extended, for the builders' operatives have shown themselves ignorant of political economy; and would not a fearful danger be incurred if masses who do not understand the principles of economical science were to have votes. But we will ask if ninety-nine out of one hundred of those who now have votes are not as ignorant of political economy as any builders' operative. Where can we find evidence of the wide-spread knowledge of this science? Shall we search the Protectionist speeches of the great Conservative party? Our professed philanthropists despise political economy;* and it would certainly be not easy to prove that there are many either of our hereditary or elected legislators who are in any way acquainted with the principles of economical science. It is often asserted that the chief object of Trades' Unions is to reduce the wages of each employment to one uniform rate, to permit the skilled to earn no more than the unskilled, the

* Thus much of the philanthropy of Mr. Kingsley appears to be merely emotional and intuitive.

energetic no more than the indolent. This, to say the least, is an over-statement. The many delegates who spoke at Bradford emphatically denied that any such attempts are now made by their respective unions, and their assertions remained uncontradicted. From personal examination we know that the members of many Trades' Unions earn wages which vary very considerably.

To the general public, strikes serve as a convenient excuse to denounce the leaders of the movement as designing knaves, and to extend patronizing pity towards those who are deceived. It will not be difficult to show that the accusations are as unjustifiable as the pity is unnecessary. No definite charge is made, and therefore we have to deal with vague denunciations, such as designing agitators, who get up a strike in order that they may go about the country, and live upon the fat of the land, whilst those whom they delude starve. Personal accusations, supported by no facts, should always perhaps be treated with silent contempt. Lord Brougham, at Bradford, aspersed the character of the delegates, and his lordship received a rebuke as calm and just as it was severe; for Mr. Cowell; the leader of the Preston strike of 1854, made remarks to the following effect:—"I, in conjunction with ten others were the executive committee that had the entire management of that strike. The strike lasted thirty-six weeks, 17,000 men were on strike; we distributed 96,000*l.*; and although the greatest sufferings were endured, such confidence was placed in us, that not a murmur of complaint was heard. We accounted for every sixpence that we spent; our accounts were always open to the closest scrutiny; and the same confidence which the operatives placed in us then is continued now. What right, then, has Lord Brougham, or any other man, to say, on an occasion when he cannot be answered, that we are dishonest agitators?"

Another complaint against strikes is very commonly urged—Strikes must be wrong, because combinations require thousands to sacrifice their individual action, and resign themselves entirely to their leaders. But a sacrifice of individuality is a prime necessity of combination, and therefore the above complaint amounts to this—combinations of labourers are wrong, because the combinations formed are extremely well organized. We are quite willing to admit that any sacrifice of individuality is always to be deplored, and the question to be decided is, whether or not the loss of individuality involved in strikes is recompensed by any advantages secured by these combinations. We shall arrive at a definite decision on this point when it will be presently shown, that as soon as strikes extend to all sections of the labouring population, their occurrence will be less frequent, and as an ultimate consequence, will altogether cease. All acts of intimidation, and of personal violence, are not only to be discouraged,

but should be suppressed with the utmost severity of the law. Much folly always results from the excitement of agitation. But taking a calm review of the past, even those who most heartily disapprove of strikes may well feel proud of the great qualities these contests have developed, and may well look hopefully on the future of our country, when even our working classes exhibit such great devotion to a cause. The future historian will have to pen few brighter pages in our social annals than those which record that 17,000 men, almost reduced to starvation during a most severe winter, were yet so supported by a belief in the justice of their cause, that they attempted no act of violence, committed no breach of the peace, made no pitiful complaint, but struggled on with a calm patience. It is frequently assumed that strikes invariably fail in obtaining a rise of wages, and the subject is discussed with so little impartiality, the cases of failure being brought into such prominence, whilst those disputes which turn to the advantage of the labourer are kept so entirely in the background, that it is now generally believed that strikes cannot possibly secure any rise of wages. It is, therefore, only fair that a few such cases as the following should be mentioned :—

In the year 1836 the workmen of Messrs. Seward and Co., engineers, London, struck for the reduction of the number of working hours from ten-and-a-half hours to ten hours a day. The workmen of the other employers in the neighbourhood subscribed for the assistance of Messrs. Seward's men. "The battle was fought, and the result of it was, that the men were entirely successful."

In 1848 the operative builders struck for the cessation of work on Saturdays at four o'clock. They were successful.

In 1818 the operative builders struck for an advance of six-pence per day. They obtained their demand.

In 1859 the shipwrights of the Tyne and Wear struck for an advance of wages, and, as on many previous occasions, they succeeded.

In 1859 the building trades of Dublin struck for an advance of two shillings a week. After a brief struggle, the masters complied with the demands of the men.

In the same year, 1859, the Northampton boot and shoe makers struck successfully for an increase of wages.

An immediate gain, therefore, has often well repaid the labourer for the sacrifice he has made in joining a strike. But even had it been impossible to find such examples as we have above enumerated, our theory of the ultimate tendency of strikes would not have been disproved, for an inductive mode of investigation must entirely fail to show the ultimate tendency of strikes. Let the truth of the common assumption be granted, that all strikes

have turned against the labourers, an enumeration of particular instances will not, however, afford sufficient data to establish a general principle which should affirm that strikes can never bring any different results to the labourers. The fallacy may be best exemplified by an example. At the end of the Preston strike of 1854, the workmen resumed work at the same wages as they were before receiving; they had gained nothing; 96,000*l.* had been spent by other labourers to support them, and for thirty-six weeks 17,000 men received four shillings a week instead of twenty, and it has been calculated that this strike caused an immediate loss to the labouring population of at least 250,000*l.* The loss inflicted upon the masters is no set-off against this heavy item, for suppose the masters also suffered to the extent of 250,000*l.*, this only shows that their capital, and therefore the wage fund was diminished, and hence the loss of the masters would only add somewhat to the 250,000*l.*, the sum which the labourers spent to gain an advance of ten per cent. in their wages; an advance which they completely failed to obtain. No opponent of strikes can desire a stronger case, and such a description shall be considered to represent the type of every strike. From the development of such an example, the deduction would be almost invariably drawn that any future strike must involve a proportionate loss to the labourer, and it would, therefore, be considered needless to inquire whether it would be possible for any advantage to follow as an ultimate result. We believe, on the contrary, that the sacrifice, great as it was, will ultimately obtain an abundant recompence; for now that the angry feelings engendered by such a contest have passed away, valuable experience is left to instruct every intelligent mind. On the one hand, the masters may say,—Our workmen have shown that they possess an extraordinary power of combination, they are also prepared to make the greatest sacrifices; if, therefore, on any occasion a combination will place them in a position to demand from us a rise of wages, we shall not be able to withhold the advance; because the combination will inevitably be formed. This demand for higher wages can be pressed with success, whenever active business gives exceptionally high profits. A strike is a most serious evil to ourselves as well as to our men; will it not be greatly to our advantage at once to offer a rise of wages when we can afford to make the advance, rather than in the first place to refuse, and then at last have the advance forced from us by a strike? The Preston strike has taught the workmen a no less valuable lesson. They also may say—We can never hope to organize a strike more successfully than we did the one of 1854. We were supported by the most munificent subscriptions, and we carried on the struggle much longer than it was believed

to be possible. We gained nothing whatever; if therefore our masters are not in a position to give us an advance of wages, no strike can obtain it. We will never, therefore, again make such sacrifices unless we first assure ourselves that our masters are obtaining increased profits from which we can demand a rise of wages. Thus one of the very intelligent leaders of this Preston strike not long since, in a conversation we had with him, said, "For my part, I believe the Lancashire operatives will never strike again." We now observe with the greatest care the current prices of the trade, and we are therefore able to calculate exactly what our masters' profits are; when they increase, we demand a rise of wages; our masters recognise that we have the power of combination, and they at once quietly give us the advance, and everything now goes on smoothly and pleasantly." If such become the relations between employers and employed, it is manifest that the employed are voluntarily accepted by the employers as partners. We shall presently enlarge upon this as a most important social tendency.

When these collisions between employers and employed are traced to the increased intelligence of the labouring population, many philanthropists are deeply distressed. Here, they say, are the first sad fruits of an agency which we had hoped would ameliorate the lot of mankind. But there is no cause for despondency, for all that has taken place might have been foreseen. There are those who cherish the traditions of the past, and hope to revive between employers and employed the emotions of an affectionate dependence; but such sentiments belong to an age which has irrecoverably gone—it was an age when a lord could have his vassals and a chief could have his clan. Although an amiable sentimentality prompts a different conclusion, the interests of the employers and employed with our present social relations, must be considered as directly opposed, as are the interests of the buyer and seller. The employers and employed share the produce of labour between them, and it must be therefore the interest of each to secure as large a share as possible. If at any time a buyer should recognise that he can purchase on more favourable terms, of course he avails himself of the advantage; and when the labourers understand how it is possible for them to obtain an advance in their wages, they will put forth every effort to wrest this advantage for themselves from their employers. According to our theory, a strike will on certain occasions tend to raise wages. Intelligence not only gives the labourer the power to combine, but also explains the advantage a combination can secure. Frequent combinations, therefore, become an inevitable consequence of the increased intelligence of our labourers, and thus the whole commercial community is divided into two great

opposing interests. On the one hand, the employers strive to obtain labour as cheap as possible; on the other hand, the labourers eagerly resort to all the expedients by which wages can be advanced. We are ready to confess that this is a very unsatisfactory state of things to contemplate. Some regard it as a painful necessity; but it is idle either to blame or to regret, for a collision of these opposing interests is a natural and inevitable result of our present social relations. Those, therefore, who anticipate the future with hope should ask—Must these social relations remain unaltered?—and if not, what is the agency to effect the change? Many able writers have remarked that long-continued custom has made the English almost refuse to admit that there can be any other state of society than that in which the employed are simply hired labourers; a social condition not in itself desirable; for can there be anything more sorrowful to contemplate than that masses of intelligent beings, from early childhood to old age, should ceaselessly toil upon a work in which they have no interest; the attachment between themselves and those for whom they work being that which exists between a buyer and seller? Philanthropists recognise and regret the evil of such a state of things, but will not fairly grapple with it. Some identity of interests can alone secure an attachment between employers and employed. It will be at once seen that, if there is any truth in our theory, strikes must be an agency to create an identity of interests. We have already alluded to the fact that the perfect organization of the Preston Strike of 1854 has created a security against the recurrence of the strike in that district, and similarly many other employments, and many other classes of labourers may have yet to pass through the same troubled times; but when every class of labourers has shown itself capable of combining, the power of combination will, like so many other agencies, when universally recognised, exert its influence potentially, and everything will be given which a strike would secure, although a strike should never actually occur.

In fact, strikes would produce their influence in the same way as does competition in an advanced commercial country. Suppose some discovery cheapens the cost of production of a commodity, competition at once reduces the price of the commodity. Now, competition does not actually induce new producers to bring this commodity at a cheaper rate into the market, but the price is reduced, because it is known that if the price was maintained at its former point, the competition of capital would bring the commodity into the market at a cheaper rate. As long as attention is only directed to the exterior signs by which strikes are manifested, all seems discouraging. Nothing is apparent but heedless language, angry feelings, and dire distress. But when

the origin of strikes is sought and their tendency investigated, a brighter prospect opens, a period can be recognised with distinctness, when these temporary troubles shall have passed away, and when the employers and the employed will be bound with the sympathy of mutual interest. For combinations of labour in the first place compelled the masters to give their workmen a share of the extra profits derived from improved trade. As long as this participation of profits is secured by an actual resort to strikes, the workman is forced upon his master as a partner. But these contests cannot continue; they entail an enormous loss both upon the masters and men; and when at length it shall be recognised by all that the labourers have not only the will but the power to form combinations, the interests of the masters as well as the men will guarantee that the struggle against these combinations should cease, and the masters will then voluntarily give all that had before been forced from them, and between the employers and employed the relations will be those of a voluntary partnership. The pecuniary as well as the social advantages which will arise to each from such identity of interests cannot well be exaggerated. This opinion will be met with such expressions as these—The idea of such partnerships is preposterous; in practice they must fail.

Many instances shall be adduced to prove that such partnerships have already been tried with the most eminent success, and those who believe such partnerships to be impracticable, shall be challenged to produce any case in which they have been tried and failed; and if the truth of our theory still remains uncontradicted, we shall be entitled to say, that it points not only to happy but to practical results.

M. Leclaire, a house decorator of Paris, employed 200 workmen. He, like so many other employers of labour, found a constant source of trouble and annoyance in the general listlessness and carelessness of his workmen. They required watching, they did as little work as they could, and, in fact, showed by their whole conduct that they cared nothing for their master's interests. M. Leclaire was quite aware of the loss he thus suffered, but was more deeply concerned with the constant annoyance he had to endure. He tried every expedient which would suggest itself to one who was most kindly disposed to his workmen. He paid higher wages, and thus of course secured the most skilled labourers in the trade, but there was no real improvement; his workmen still acted as if they felt no concern in their master's interests. M. Leclaire therefore became convinced of the necessity of creating some identity of interest between his workmen and himself. He assembled his men; told them that they should receive the current wages paid in the trade, and that

at the end of the year he would treat them as if they were partners. He would calculate his profits, he would himself receive a fixed salary for his own labour of superintendence, and after having taken a proper sum for interest upon his capital, he would divide the remaining profits amongst his workmen and himself, each individual's share being allotted in proportion to the wages or salary received during the year.

Four francs per day were the highest wages paid to any of his workmen, and as no workman received for the 300 days he was employed less than 1500 francs, at the end of the first year each workman must have at least obtained 300 francs, or 12*l.*, as his annual share of the profits.

M. Leclaire himself says the plan was eminently successful. He had no further annoyance with his workmen, their habits and demeanour were greatly improved, and even when not at work, they showed increased respect for themselves as well as for their employers in all the other relations of life. M. Chevalier affirms that M. Leclaire was even in a pecuniary sense fully compensated by the increased zeal of his workmen for the share of profit he had renounced on their behalf. A similar co-partnership in a modified form exists among the Cornish miners, sailors employed in the whale fishery, and in some few other cases; and in every such instance in which it has been tried, it has produced a proportionate satisfactory result both social and economical. Indeed, almost every employer of labour in this country, although he would not verbally admit the fact, yet has often felt himself compelled to create such co-partnership between himself and some of those whom he employs. Merchants feel that the successful voyage often depends entirely upon the activity of the captain; they do not rely upon obtaining this activity by preaching to the captain his moral obligations, but take care to secure it by telling him he shall share the profits of the voyage. In fact, whenever the success of any commercial undertaking mainly depends upon one who may act as agent, clerk, or in any other capacity, the full energy and zeal of such an individual is guaranteed by giving him a share of the profits made, in addition to a fixed salary. Human nature is cast in the same mould, and if the employer thus finds it necessary to create a pecuniary attachment between himself and the most educated of those whom he employs, how can he expect that his less educated workmen should be able to maintain a high moral sense of their obligations towards him, when they are attached to him by no such pecuniary bond. M. Leclaire's complaints against his workmen are now constantly repeated by employers in every part of the country. Thus it is said our labourers are more haughty and independent than formerly, are more careless of their masters' interests, and willingly

pass from one employer to another to secure the slightest advantage. There seems to be a constant undercurrent of dissatisfaction at work, which occasionally gathers sufficient strength to convulse society with a strike; but all this in reality means no more than the assertion of a feeling innate in human nature, that the intelligent man dislikes to labour upon work in which he has no interest; once create such an interest, let strikes have completed their full influence to establish a co-partnership between the employers and the employed, and a mighty change will have been effected in the social condition of our labourers. Their dissatisfaction will cease, their energy will be exerted to the utmost, and instead of their advancing intelligence exhibiting itself in a haughty demeanour, and in violent agitation, it will be displayed in the promotion of every social virtue, and it will also give to the labourer a manly independence, which will alike increase his own self-respect as well as his respect for others, and will enable him to dispense with the tutelage of effeminate philanthropy. Although it would be difficult to calculate the beneficial change which would be thus wrought in the whole character of the labourer, the form of co-operation between capital and labour as yet described, should perhaps be only regarded as a necessary and salutary training to fit the labourer for higher developments of the principle of co-operation.

We have particularly endeavoured to explain with distinctness and accuracy the laws which regulate the remuneration of labour. In our country during any one year, the labourers, as a class, spend all that they receive. It is therefore absolutely impossible for production to proceed so as to supply the wants of an increasing population, unless some portion of the produce of the country has been by other classes saved, and set apart to form an addition to capital. Therefore the whole produce of the country has to be divided into two shares, one rewards the capitalist for his forbearance to consume; the other compensates the labourer for his physical exertion. The amount of these respective shares is regulated by laws which cannot be arbitrarily set aside. The influence which a combination of the labourers can exert on wages is, ultimately to make the capitalist and labourers divide, as partners, the profits arising from improved trade. The labourers have always suffered with their masters from the depression of business. We have thus pointed out the utmost advantage it is possible for the labourers to obtain, as long as they remain a class which does not save, for thus they themselves, by not accumulating, render capitalists who do not labour with their hands absolutely necessary. But cannot a better state of things than this be anticipated; cannot that day be looked forward to, when the labourer shall by prudence have raised his lot, and shall

then have the inclination as well as the means to save? Directly the labourers become a saving class, they will be capitalists; the capitalist and the labourer will be combined in one man, and the glorious results of such a union may well indeed raise bright expectations. This form of co-operation, in which the labourer is himself the capitalist, would probably in our country be attacked as the socialism of the Continent, and any one who speaks a word in its favour, may perhaps be reproached as a red republican. But if an advocate of co-operation is compelled to maintain the general political opinions of the party who in France supported this union of labour and capital; if this is to be the case, a follower of Bacon's philosophy may have to defend the sycophancy of its immortal author. Many unsound economical doctrines were advanced by the socialists of France, but the eminent success of their co-operative shops has not been appreciated by this country. The prosperous career of many of these concerns has been detailed in a pamphlet by M. Feugueray, in some articles in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, and also in a recent work on "Political Economy" by M. Villiaume.

Our labourers as a body are not yet sufficiently advanced to co-operate, but when they are prepared to work out this improvement for themselves, two instances of co-operation at Leeds and Rochdale will exemplify the extraordinary results which may be anticipated. We have endeavoured to show that the social tendencies which are now being developed will create a co-partnership between the capitalist and the labourers. Such a social position will inevitably lead the labourer to these higher forms of co-operation, in which the labourer and capitalist are combined as one individual.

In 1844 the working classes of Leeds believed that they were compelled, in consequence of a combination of millers, to pay a high price for adulterated flour. They therefore determined to supply themselves with pure flour at the lowest market price; 3000*l.* was raised by shares of twenty-one shillings each, no person being permitted to hold more than one share. As no suitable mill could be rented, one was purchased for 5000*l.*, part of the purchase money remaining on mortgage. It was resolved to purchase the very best English wheat; to sell no flour but that of the first quality; and after a careful calculation it was resolved, that so many half-pence per stone should be charged for flour as shillings per quarter were paid for wheat. Thus, if wheat was forty shillings per quarter, flour would be one shilling and eightpence per stone. In Leeds, flour had always been sold one penny or twopence per stone above the price thus determined. But all the millers have now by competition been compelled to reduce the price to that charged at the Co-operative Mill. The

members of the society and the public purchase upon the same terms, but each member receives a tin ticket to record the amount of each of his purchases, and at the end of the year the profits are thus divided:—Five per cent. is paid as a uniform dividend upon the shares, and the remaining profits are divided amongst the members in proportion to the amount of their respective purchases, this amount being registered by the tin tickets.

In 1850, the capital was 3925*l.*; business done, 26,100*l.*; and profits, 506*l.* The society continually and rapidly progressed in prosperity. In 1857, taking an average of the preceding five years, the business done was 55,980*l.*, the capital 7689*l.*, and the profits 1788*l.* This indicates a profit of 25 per cent. The management of the concern appears to be admirable. No credit whatever is given, the retailers of the flour are remunerated by a commission of 1*s.* 9*d.* per bag, and they are not allowed to give orders for less than 10*l.* at a time; this arrangement diminishes the cost of cartage from the mill. The economy and excellence of the management are proved by the fact, that the cost of retailing is reduced 50 per cent., and the expense of grinding is 40 per cent. less than had been before charged in Leeds.

At Rochdale, a co-operative store is conducted on the same principles and with equal success. It commenced in 1844 with a capital of 28*l.* At first only grocery was sold, now butcher's meat and clothes are also retailed, and within the last few years a flour mill, similar to the one at Leeds, has been established. In 1856, the number of members was 1600, the amount of funds 12,920*l.*, the business done was 63,197*l.*, and the profit made 3921*l.* In this society a member can hold any amount of shares less than 100*l.* The society also has the functions of a bank of deposit, for members can add or withdraw capital at their pleasure, profits are divided on the same principles as at Leeds, with the exception that 2½ per cent. of the profits are put aside for the mutual improvement of the members; an excellent reading-room and a library is thus supported. All adulteration is most carefully avoided. The officers are elected by the members for a definite period. A box is kept in which any member can lodge a written complaint, which is investigated at a quarterly meeting; but complaints are seldom made, for the management is as excellent as at Leeds. Thus the working expenses are not 2½ per cent. upon the returns; this is much less than half the average working expenses of similar businesses. The Pioneers' Co-operative store at Rochdale and the Leeds Co-operative flour mill have, together, done transactions to the extent of more than 1,000,000*l.*, and they have not had to set off 10*l.* for bad debts. As an offshoot of the Pioneers' store, a Co-operative cotton mill was established in 1855 at Rochdale. The Pioneers' Society has

5000*l.* invested as capital in the undertaking. In 1856, ninety-six looms were at work, and the profits upon the capital were 13½ per cent. The labourers are paid the wages current in the district, and 5 per cent. is paid as interest on capital. The remaining profits are equally divided between capital and labour; each labourer's share is in proportion to the aggregate wages he has received. The best skill, and the highest efforts of that skill, are secured, and thus the concern, though in its infancy, is able to compete successfully in a business where commercial enterprise has been most particularly developed.

A letter lately received from Mr. Samuel Ashworth, the manager, will show the progress of this remarkable undertaking:—

“ We commenced working ninety-six looms in 1857, and in 1858 we took another room in a mill, and filled it with twelve engines, six mules, and other portions of machinery to follow; and that soon became too small, and new members kept coming in, until 1859, the meeting came to the conclusion (seeing that they could not take a mill) to build one, and in March or April, 1859, they commenced to build a new mill about 180 feet long, 60 feet wide, and a chimney about 180 feet high, which is now complete except the roof; and we are putting in two engines of sixty horse-power each; the mill when complete is supposed to cost above 40,000*l.*; and during the last two months new members have come in so fast, that we have been compelled to close our books for the admission of any more new members at present.”*

The signal success of these co-operative efforts is no doubt due to exceptional good management, and they are not quoted to prove that the same principle of co-operation could now be extended throughout the country with equally satisfactory results. We will admit that the labouring class has not yet acquired those habits of prudence which would induce the accumulation of the necessary funds; that they are not yet sufficiently advanced to appreciate the advantages of co-operation, and also to find managers so worthy of confidence. This is much more, we think, than ought to be admitted, but our object has been to exemplify the extraordinary results of co-operation whenever it can be applied. In co-operation it is shown that labour and capital both work with the utmost efficiency and with the utmost economy. Therefore co-operation increases the wealth of a nation in the fullest sense of the term, since both labour and capital are rendered more productive; and no other agency can to the same extent promote the social advancement of the people. In a variety of ways co-operation tends to augment their wealth,

* Numerous other co-operative societies exist in different parts of England, the majority of which are working with similar remarkable success.

the advantage of saving is made strikingly apparent, and prudence is thus induced ; for eligible investments are the primary source and cause of all accumulation. The labourer thus becoming a capitalist, has no longer to pay other persons a heavy charge for supporting him while he is labouring, and therefore the entire fruits of the labourer's exertion become his own, and he thus becomes prompted to apply to his work the whole energy both of his body and mind. Co-operation, although it requires the labourers to show forbearance, yet calls in the faculties of all to promote the welfare of the concern. But more important than all, co-operation gives to the labourer's career the blessings of hope. Orators from platforms may deceive the working men of England, by telling them that they have it in their power to become a Stephenson or Watt. But no such platitudes can alter the fact that thousands in our country are born to no other lot than, without hope, from early childhood until age has exhausted strength, ceaselessly to toil with no other result than at last to beg a pittance from an enormous tax raised from this over-taxed country. We mention this with no desire to blame, for with our present social relations, wages depend on the ratio between capital and population ; and population is regulated by prudence. Our social condition demands change, and we have sought to show how a change may at least be promoted. Intelligence induces combinations, combination tends to create a partnership between employers and employed, and this will lead to those higher forms of co-operation which will alike realize all that has been sought either by the economist or the philanthropist.

Mr. Laing in his prize essay sums up the remedies for national distress. He regards co-operation as the most effectual agent of improvement, but seems to imagine it could not be introduced without such a revolution as would threaten our splendid aristocracy, and destroy our venerated constitution. We have pointed out tendencies which we believe will act irresistibly to introduce co-operation, and yet not one circumstance has been mentioned which can make either our aristocracy tremble or our constitution fear. Without the aid of legislation, which would probably prove as injurious as it is certainly needless, all will be effected by the peaceful workings of advancing intelligence. The pledge has been redeemed that all personal recrimination should be avoided, and a practical verification has perhaps been given to the words,

“ There is a soul of goodness in things evil,
Would men observingly distil it out.”

ART. II.—THE MILL ON THE FLOSS.

The Mill on the Floss. By GEORGE ELIOT, author of *Scenes of Clerical Life* and *Adam Bede*. London and Edinburgh, Blackwood and Sons. 1860.

WHEN we reviewed "Adam Bede,"* we were the first to express a conviction that the author was a woman; we did so on critical grounds alone, and we have now the satisfaction of knowing that our judgment was not at fault; indeed, the opposite opinion seems to us only possible for those who divide the human race into men, women, and parsons, and attribute "Adam Bede" to a masculine but clerical author. Clergymen are debarred from the expression at least of many passions that laymen are allowed to exhibit without the same amount of blame; these are chiefly the rougher and coarser feelings of our nature and their outward signs; the consequence is, that the proceedings of the clergy are less direct, and, because less direct, more refined, and ultimately partake more of the character of female management than of the perhaps somewhat coarse energy of masculine methods; the single fact that parsons and women can neither strike nor be stricken, exercises upon both an influence that tends to produce a similarity in their views of life and methods of observation.

We have little doubt that some such reflections as these influenced the author of "Adam Bede" in selecting the title of her first work, SCENES OF CLERICAL LIFE, and whatever may have been George Eliot's motive in shrinking from personally gathering her abundant laurels, whether constitutional fastidiousness, over-refined taste, or real indifference, she could not possibly have decided upon a more efficient disguise than that of the clerical character.

In her first works the topics are not such as to afford decisive tests on the question of the author's sex; but in "Adam Bede," where the heroine, or one of them, Hetty, is brought into equivocal positions, the sex of the author shows itself in an unequivocal manner. No man having imagined such a lovely creature as Hetty, such a sweet compound of primroses and new milk, could have at last so cruelly abandoned her to a desecrated and disregarded death; much less could he have allowed Donnithorne to escape with such slight blame. It is true that the immediate

* See No. for April, 1859.

external consequences of his fault are visited heavily on his head ; but though unquestionably the more sinning of the two, he is nowhere pursued with that half-contemptuous treatment to which poor Hetty is constantly subjected by the author.

We know of nothing so significant of the extreme difficulty of escaping from the moral atmosphere in which we have been brought up as the failure of George Eliot in the attempt to assume the masculine character : few, very few, men have her learning, humour, delicate observation and original genius ; but all these high qualities do not, even when supported by the most strenuous effort, enable her to take up a position external to herself. The influence of opinions imbibed in early childhood will make itself manifest, and even the most enlightened judgment which has brought all things before its tribunal, will betray by the tone of voice in which it delivers its determinations the secret leaning of feelings, independent of, and never overcome by, that sovereign faculty. The greatest of all obstacles to the early belief in the female authorship of these books was found in the depth and breadth of the information they revealed, and in the remarkable reserve with which that knowledge was displayed : we are constantly called upon to reflect by some turn of expression that implies familiarity with the most recondite learning or with the last results of scientific investigation. It was thought that no woman could wear such rare jewels of the mind with so little apparent consciousness. That tone of the highest intellectual intercourse it was imagined was found among men alone.

"Adam Bede" may be said to be a protest against the overpowering influence of beauty, and a pleading in favour of the modest virtues of obscure life, threatened by the imagination and by longings after a lovelier and better world than that we must all consent to inhabit. This is a peculiarly feminine view. Whose peace, whose self-complacency is most threatened by the insolencies and attacks of beauty, if not woman's ? In this contempt for beauty, the woman takes up arms, in George Eliot, against her external enemy ; and in her polemic against imaginative longings after an ideal life, she in the same way sets her face against those enemies which too often inhabit the citadel of a woman's heart and rise up as insurgent traitors.

George Eliot seems to us distinguished in the most marked manner from Currer Bell, with whom she has often been compared. The comparison is instructive only by contrast ; two women of great original genius could hardly be more dissimilar. Compared with George Eliot, Currer Bell is an uneducated rustic, who pours forth her feelings, her discontent, her disappointment, and almost her despair, without premeditation, without thought

of art, without reflection, and relies only on the unity of impression for the artistic effect of the whole. Her fancy roams in lonely and savage solitudes, such as Salvator Rosa would have painted, and she peoples her scenery with men as savage, whose good qualities are only recognisable by the imagination. George Eliot, on the contrary, has returned from these excursions wiser by the sense of their delusiveness, and resigned, like Goethe, to find in treatment and beauty of detail that satisfaction which the loftiest conceptions can only yield for a season.

Compare the descriptions of nature in the works of these two remarkable women: how pure, objective, and external, are the pictures found in George Eliot; how penetrated by the medium of the author's feelings in Currer Bell. In her we see through a haze, glorious, indeed, and beautiful, but which dispenses with minuteness of detail like the loaded atmosphere of a picture by Danby; while George Eliot's landscapes are as clear as Tenier's, they have a bright colourless atmosphere, a full and serene life: they are dotted with homesteads, are full peopled by unpretending men, and give us back the beauty of our daily life under placid skies.

We do not think that "The Mill on the Floss" will increase the author's popularity, but it fully sustains her reputation. "Adam Bede" was far from structural perfection; but "The Mill on the Floss" is still more defective in this particular. Its development is languid and straggling beyond expression; it affects us like the spring in which it appeared with a weary lounging and suspense that is too forcibly contrasted with the rapid movement of the conclusion of the story; the slow, placid, and somewhat turbid stream too suddenly changes to a rushing waterfall; the canal ends in a cascade: this destroys the harmonious impression that every work of art ought to leave upon our minds. It is in vain to reply that this is a true transcript of nature, that the gradual accumulation of moral motive often ends in a sudden breaking through barriers which appeared to be too firmly fixed to be moved. This defence might perhaps be set up if Maggie had been more decidedly the central figure of the early portion of the tale; but, being lost in the early crowd, she is too suddenly and exclusively brought forward in the latter scenes; she engrosses too much attention compared with the effect she produces in her youth. The moral unity of the book is disturbed by a too brilliant and purely local light.

Passion will no doubt thus burst through the routine of daily life, and break to pieces the rules on which that life reposes; but as a work of art, it is not enough to be merely true to nature, an external probability and an internal harmony must be arrived at; and although we are sufficiently well acquainted with Maggie's

nature to realize the full force of the temptation to which she is exposed, we are not prepared for the qualified consent with which she yields to it. The greatest fault, however, is not that her conduct is insufficiently grounded in her character,—for few will deny the careful preparation of the reader's mind for some such catastrophe,—so much as in the inordinate disproportion between the parts she plays at different periods of the story. It is not—far from it—that she is too insignificant to be made the supporter of that great struggle, but that the struggle itself is out of harmony, not with her, but with two-thirds of the tale itself. It is a very striking fact that the author compromises her heroine, but does not commit her to the breach of any of those positive social rules for which it is still evident she has but a small esteem. A man writing such a story would have made Maggie transgressing but loveable, would not have taken such care to be yet on the right side of rules declaimed against. We cannot help loving Maggie; indeed, she is almost the only loveable person in the tale; but there is something in the development of her mind that affects us painfully. As a child, her affectionate disposition was a constant torment to herself from the want of sympathy in those about her; after her father's misfortunes, when no joy could enter that sad and anxious household, she is thrust back upon herself, and tries, in the absence of all nutriment for that hunger after happiness so natural to the young, to find a substitute in mystical religion, and to take refuge from a world that answers to none of her longing desires in a systematized self-denial which shall at least appease her imagination. This effort is too great for her, and indeed was calculated rather to increase than allay that self-observation to which it at first offered itself as an antidote. In this frame of mind she meets her brother's schoolfellow, Philip Wakem, who has loved her since she stayed for a short time with her brother at school. Though passionately attached to her, he is rendered in the highest degree diffident by his deformity. He is humpbacked, and shrinks from the avowal of his love; he is, too, the son of her father's enemy, or at least of one her father holds as such. Philip at last declares himself, in one of the meetings they have in an old hollow called the Red Deeps; she lonely and sad, with no companion, no sympathizing friend, cannot fail to think it lovely to be loved, and allows herself to become engaged, though she knows that both her father and his would scorn the idea of a union between them. Their meetings become known, and her brother goes with her to her next interview with Philip, insults him in the grossest manner, and puts an end to the connexion. Her father dies; and some time after Maggie goes to visit a rich cousin at St. Oggs, who is about to be married to a certain Stephen Guest, a wealthy partner

in the firm in whose employ her brother is rapidly rising into consideration and influence. From their first interview Maggie and Guest are attracted by each other, and in spite of every effort to be true to her cousin, Guest's influence over her gains ground daily, until Philip Wakem again appears upon the scene and renews his claims on Maggie's heart: she comes to an understanding with Guest, and points out the impossibility of her any longer listening to his suggestions, though she allows him to see with how great an effort she does so. Her cousin, who has kindly arranged a rowing-party to give Philip Wakem an opportunity of meeting her, complicates her plot by another stratagem, that they may enjoy the trip alone; the stratagem fails. Wakem sends Guest to say he cannot come; and Guest finding Maggie alone, prevails on her to take one last row with him. She yields with a mixture of longing and reluctance to this last request of her rejected lover. They embark; the well-known scenes along the river-side pass by Maggie lost in a confused reverie; at last she wakes up to find that Guest has rowed her out to sea; that the tide will not allow of their return. Guest pleads his cause with the eloquence of passionate despair, and Maggie, helpless and confused, allows him to hail a ship bound for a northern port; they pass the night on deck, and the next day are set on shore. Maggie then determines that her passion must be sacrificed to her duty to her cousin. She escapes from Guest, returns to the Mill, is discarded by her brother as disgraced, and put under the ban of all the outraged respectabilities of St. Oggs, who would have forgiven the elopement if followed by a marriage, but who are scandalized by a self-denial they can neither understand nor believe. This history is very natural, but very sad. Why did she love Guest? we say. What was there about the man to attract her when there was so much to forbid her thinking of him?

George Eliot will no doubt say, why does any one love another? what reason can the lover give for his passion that will not seem absurd to him who asks for one? The influence exercised by the sexes over each other is quite incalculable, is determined by no rules, is what the Germans call *demonisch*, and beyond the sphere of reason. This is true enough in life, beneath whose surface we can penetrate to so small a depth, but in books we look for some indication of the affinities of choice; in this consists the distinction between art and nature, and on this point we think that George Eliot has sacrificed too much to her beloved realism. That realism, which is so triumphantly in place in all the prosaic relations of the Tullivers and Dodsons, seems here inadequate; we revolt at Maggie's weakness, and take up arms against the author in spite of a truth we cannot controvert.

Maggie is the representative, after all, of the poetical tempera-

ment, and stands out throughout the book a protest against the obscure and cmmet-like lives of all who belong to her. When boors are to be painted, we rejoice in Jan Steen, and recognise humanity though in most unlovely forms; the narrow-minded Gleggs, Pullets, and Tullivers, we accept with all their coarseness, but the shortcomings of those who long for and aspire after a better and higher life afflict us: we shrink from the failures of those we love, with a feeling too closely allied to pain to admit of our drawing any satisfaction from the truthfulness with which they are delineated.

As with Donnithorne so here with Stephen Guest, the hero escapes with but a qualified reprobation; his dishonourable abduction of Maggie is treated as the quite natural result of his passion for her; in George Eliot's eyes he is evidently not disgraced by conduct that would cause any honourable man to turn his back on him, conduct that cannot have left him a moment's peace of mind to enjoy that colourless marriage to which the author at last consigns him. The treatment of Stephen Guest is the result of that fascination which men exercise over women even when most intoxicated by them, and affords a cardinal test and patent demonstration, if it were still needed, of George Eliot's sex. On this topic however, enough has perhaps been said. The separate beauties of the "Mill on the Floss" are numberless. You seem to be wandering down a long gallery filled with the masterpieces of Dutch cabinet paintings; it is true there is Rubens and his fires looming in the distance, but at present we have only to concern ourselves with the quiet beauty of the scenes before us. You can hardly stop before a single frame without finding food for the day's thought and feeling, and yet the pictures are so numerous that their minute beauties escape: the colour and tone are so uniform that we are a little weary; but how natural, how tender, how delicate are the subjects of these sweet domestic scenes, how faithful these half-boorish family quarrels. In all English literature there is nothing, in our opinion, so true and so affecting as the love of old Tulliver for his "little wench," his "Magsie," the only one in the family who could sympathize with that father in whose veins flowed the blood of an ancestor capable of ruining himself for a genial extravagance, blood so hostile to the prosaic, prudent Dodsons, who never did a foolish thing and hardly ever a wise one. The manner in which Maggie grows up, leaning on that somewhat lonely father, the mutual and yet inarticulate understanding which exists between them, is one of the finest conceptions anywhere to be met with, and as finely delineated as it is delicately conceived.

The beauty of the early pictures of mill life, the children among the pigeons, the chickens and the calves, have all the

natural truth of Landseer's works without their somewhat affected prettiness. The quarrels between the children, their misunderstandings, and Maggie's ambition—the great ambition of girls—to be the associate of her brother's amusements, show a closeness of observation, a wonderful power of seizing on the most representative topics, and are given with a true homeliness of expression that will make many a mother's heart leap. These scenes are lovely, why should they end in all that ruin? We cannot reconcile ourselves to it; but the author is here our providence, and we must submit. When we first alight among these pastoral localities, we feel that there is a hostile influence in the air; we are soon oppressed by the overshadowing influence of indebtedness, and at last cower under the drenching storm of the lost lawsuit. It is impossible to deny the art with which everything is introduced, supported, and developed up to the time of Tulliver's death. We cannot help forming a theory, which is perhaps an indiscretion. It seems to us that up to this period in the tale, the author has drawn her materials from events and men that have passed under her immediate observation; there is a reality and local colour that we imagine to be otherwise unattainable. At Tulliver's death the groundwork of fact disappears, and the problem of Maggie's nature alone occupies the author's attention. This has to be worked out in fictitious circumstances; at least, there is not that breath of truth and reality about the events of her stay with her cousin which we seem to inhale with the tale of Maggie's youth, as though the apple-blossoms and cowslips round the mill were in perpetual bloom.

What can be compared to the profoundly-studied and perfectly-executed picture of the whole group of Tullivers and Dodsons; indeed, the Dodsons are typical characters, full of the deepest significance to those who wisely read their history. These Christian pagans, narrow, contracted, ignorant, full of prejudice, and ready to anger, are yet governed by a code of traditionary morality, with a completeness that does not admit of their questioning anything that has been customary in their family, which has for generations been respectable, after their notions of respectability. They are a picture in little of nine-tenths of the world we live in: that overwhelming self-esteem which is so ridiculous when compared with the qualities on which they pride themselves, yet lies at the root of all the good qualities they possess. Self-esteem has not in vain been called by the "wisest of mankind" the next thing to religion; indeed, with the Dodsons it completely usurps its place. As an effectual motive power it no doubt does so now in many quarters that would repel the accusation as the highest insult; but it is too often the real vital force which since the period of religious revivals has only been

clothed by a set of religious expressions, without in any degree losing its predominating influence in the ultimate formation of character.

It is a profound touch of Nature and an instance of the insight of true genius which makes Mrs. Glegg, who had always declared that Maggie would come to no good, yet offer her a home when all the world had turned their backs upon her, on the ground that those who spoke ill of the Dodson blood had better be well advised before they brought their remarks to her door.

George Eliot, like Maggie, hungers and thirsts after a higher life, and cannot reconcile herself to these pitiful limitations. In her book, which, could she have confined herself to what she has seen and known, would have been homogeneous and *sui generis* in its unsurpassed and, we think, inimitable reproduction of Nature, she relinquishes the lofty calm of critical insight for a region of questions to which no complete answer can be given. All aspiration is subjective and consequently delusive; we seek in others what we desire to be ourselves, without sufficiently considering how far we have advanced and what chance we have of finding in others those qualities we so much desire, without reflecting that our imaginations will surely mislead us—that a day of sad awakening must arise when we shall have to mourn over the ruin of our dreams.

It is true those realist canons which have governed George Eliot in her early volumes are not forsaken in the last, but how sad the result. What can we think? Must so many Maggies die before the Dodson rules are a little enlarged? We are afraid that there is no consolation to be found, if this indeed is "the fate of loveliness on earth."

The rare and singularly original humour which took the world by surprise in Mrs. Poyser and Bartle Massey, shines with a lustre perhaps not so startling, but quite as pure in the "Mill on the Floss." In "Adam Bede" we made discovery of a new region, the like of which was not to be found without going back to the conflicts at the "Mermaid," or to the exchanges of wit between him who was not only witty himself but the cause of wit in others; in the "Mill on the Floss" the excitement of discovery is gone; the country is as rich, but we explore it with a quieter and more critical glance. Tulliver and the whole family of Dodsons afford a rare harvest of that quiet and deep mirth which is one of the highest enjoyments. The miller is not only humorous in his speech, his very mental constitution is made up of those contrasts in which true humour consists.

What can be finer than this reflective rustic's regret that he cannot speak daggers without coming under the lash of the law; that his defective education will not allow of his insulting his

enemies in safe generalities, but forces him to call a rascal a rascal, and then submit to the consequences. We have spoken of what we consider the defective moral grouping of the "Mill on the Floss;" it has also, in our opinion, defects in its external structure in the sequence of its events; the *denouement* is altogether melodramatic; indeed, there is a tendency to and taste for startling events in George Eliot, which seems to crop out of the rich culture of her mind, like the primitive rocks of an earlier world. The flood in the mill, and the rescue of Hetty in "Adam Bede," are instances of what we mean; they are vestiges of a Titanic time, before the reign of the peaceful gods commenced; devices condescended to as external escapes from moral difficulties, always to be deprecated, and we hope soon to be thrown aside by one so well able to dispense with every artifice as George Eliot.

We cannot like Tom Tulliver; as a boy he is natural, and his character is brought out with exquisite skill; he is as much a Dodson as a Tulliver can be, and has all the virtues of the Dodsons, on a somewhat higher level of character; his manly endeavours to succour his father, the crowning triumph of that day, when chiefly from his savings all the creditors are paid, is the true glory of a Dodson; but after his father's death he retrogrades, he becomes preternaturally hard (it is true his vanity is wounded, and vanity is the most ruthless of our passions, for passion it often becomes); and he is unnaturally blind to his sister's love. His mercantile adventures with Bob Jukin will make many a City man smile, and wish they had so judicious a pedlar to regulate their investments. A money question is a trying one with George Eliot; the rate of profit of the most thriving young speculator; the morality, we mean business morality, of burning a bill of exchange from sentimental motives, and the general possibility of a man's saving out of thirty shillings a week, when he has a wife and child to support who have been brought up in comparative affluence, are all points in which her insight, because the area of experience, fails her. Bob is in our opinion the least successful of all the characters in the book. He approaches too near the farcical in his amusing interview with that female dragon Mrs. Glegg, and he is far from being the first who has entertained a dog-like love for a woman out of his reach.

Philip Wakem is a carefully drawn figure, but seems to us to lack vitality, though nothing can be finer than his recovery from the blow he sank under at Maggie's disappearance, his letter to her, or his conversation with his father when he declares his love. We have not thought it necessary to give an analysis of the plot; it is too well known by all who are likely to take up this Review; neither have we thought it desirable to give a collection of the quaint humorisms that abound in the two first

volumes, or to make a catena of the profound and far-reaching remarks which abound throughout the book ; this would neither be fair to the author nor agreeable to our readers. These beauties are for the most part so organic, that to withdraw them from their context would be to dislocate them from that vital nexus which gives them their highest charm. We have confined ourselves to a few words of welcome, and fewer still of warning, to one whose works will henceforth be looked forward to with an ardour of expectation that has had no equal for many years.



ART. III.—RAWLINSON'S BAMPトン LECTURES FOR 1859.

The Historical Evidence of the Truth of the Scripture Records, stated anew, with special reference to the Doubts and Discoveries of Modern Times, &c. &c. By George Rawlinson, M.A., late Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College. London: 1859.

IF we attempt to analyse from a theoretical point of view the contents of our current Christianity, we find them fall most easily into four divisions, which are but partially interdependent. First come the principles of a pious morality, as exemplified in the life of the Founder, in virtue of which whoever practises them may claim the Christian name. Secondly, we find a body of theological statements, whether reasonable or mysterious, which may be held in various senses, but in some sense are requisite to the orthodoxy of the Church. In the third place a claim is preferred to a supernatural communication, so attested by external miracles that the function of reason is to approve its credentials, rather than criticise its contents. In this sense Revelation is the opposite of Rationalism. Less closely connected with the above, but often erroneously represented as their foundation, is a belief in the infallibility of every portion of the Bible ; this last being enforced by religious sects, and current among less educated portions of the community, rather than cordially approved by men of learning.

We do not here dwell upon a more refined sense of the term revelation, which brings it within the range of spiritual experiences, and assimilates it to the deep realities of love and sorrow, or passion, by which unsuspected depths in our moral being are naturally disclosed. Our foot tramples not that sacred ground, which has evidences of its own. Mr. Rawlinson's sense of Reve-
[Vol. LXXIV. No. CXLV.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. XVIII. No. I. D

lation is an external communication, miraculously attested, and itself an historical miracle. He uses the word miracle in the unproved sense of a contravention of the order of nature. To what he deems the historical evidences of such a divine communication, he devotes eight lectures, preached at Oxford, with an appendage of learned notes. It must have seemed to the advocates of a traditional theology high time for such a defence to appear. Mr. Mansel, the Bampton lecturer of the preceding year, had in criticising the laws of thought, detracted so largely from the value of reasoning and moral sentiment, that the old advocates of the faith on moral premises appeared to have the ground cut from under their feet; and religion, forbidden to fasten on man's intuition or affections, required a large addition of buttresses for her external support. Mr. Rawlinson, as a good man-at-arms, boldly bestrides his fallen colleague, and brings history to fill the gap, which a logic, savouring more of Hobbes than of Butler, had laid open. The new lecturer's near relationship to our great Assyrian discoverer, and his own distinction on some portions of the field of classical learning, had raised high expectations of his performance. If his argument should fall short of its object it can be from no lack of appliances, or of scholastic zeal, but from difficulties inherent in the case. We shall best enable thoughtful readers to form an estimate of his results, by a rapid analysis of his work, with criticisms of its weaker points interspersed, and by then raising the question, what has been proved?

The lecturer starts with the dangerous assumption that the Old Testament is a part of Christianity. He claims an historical rather than a speculative origin for his creed, and enlarges on the revolution brought about in our views of antiquity by the researches of critical historians. He would not exclude the Biblical records from subjection to similar tests, but predicts for them a triumphant passage through the ordeal. He laments, while he extenuates, the neological tendencies of Niebuhr,* but boasts, while he overstates, the great critic's acquiescence in Christian belief. He lays down canons for historical inquiry, which acknowledge but imperfectly the value of an author's proximity in time and place to the subject-matter of the record; and then, with emphasis rather zealous than philosophical, adds a protest against pre-judgments upon the antecedent incredibility of miracles. He not only conceives imperfectly of the vast presumption which science raises, and which with disciplined minds is ever strongest, against

* Niebuhr in his history rejected the Mosaic genealogies, and in his correspondence expressed some concurrence in the doubts raised by the Wolfenbittel fragments. But the turn of mind which made him sympathize timidly with freedom, and so the work of despotism, led him to wish that his son might be educated in a habit of undoubting credulity.

any interruption of divine law, but he seems unconscious how that presumption has been strengthened by the induction of numerous instances in which the evidence for miracles has appeared cogent at a distance, but grows faint upon approach, ever receding before research, like the Fortunate Isles with the progress of maritime discovery. Hence we are led to apprehend in our lecturer a careful compiler of authorities, rather than a philosopher or philologist full-armed. His first lecture, as a whole, contains little beyond a statement of the subject, delivered with some confidence of assertion.

In the second lecture are argued the genuineness and authenticity of the Pentateuch. Undismayed by the enormous difficulty that no testimony to the five books, as a whole, approaches within a thousand years (or even amongst the Jews within seven centuries) to the probable age of Moses, Mr. Rawlinson strangely contents himself with citing authors of the Macedonian, and even of the Roman empire. The antiquarian hearsay of Hecateus, the sneers of Juvenal and Tacitus, and even the allusion of the writer called Longinus, the last probably secretary to a Jewess, and all of them echoing late Jewish tradition, are exhibited as trustworthy testimonies for literary authorship fourteen centuries before Christ. A writer with such facility of belief may well think that Mr. Gladstone has proved the unity of Homer, and Latona to be the Virgin Mary; or, what is no less probable, that he is about to pay the national debt. It would have been safer to leave the question one of faith, than to make such a display of evidence. To the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch true criticism finds not an atom of external testimony, and but slight vouchers for its authenticity. The two authors who most illustrate it are Berosus, the historian of Babylon, and the Egyptian Manetho. The first gives an account of a deluge, which shows a tradition resembling the Mosaic to have been the common property of the Semitic races, but leaves undetermined our preference for either form of the legend, and suggests a latitudinarian interpretation for both. Manetho, the Egyptian, furnishes allusions to the Exodus; but instead of making the event miraculous, he represents it as the result of an armed conspiracy, and of an internecine war, in which the Israelites were aided by their Arab kindred. All this may be either a perversion of the Mosaic account, or its historical basis; but it is hardly a confirmation.

It would be a curious rather than important result, if the incidental notice of Chedorlaomer* in Genesis should be confirmed

* Our concession of Rawlinsonian decipherments, ascending earlier than a thousand years before Christ, is hypothetical, and for the sake of argument only. Time must decide on the necessary amount of deduction. But the existence of Chedorlaomer is as probable as that of Agamemnon.

by an alleged discovery of Sir H. Rawlinson's. We should await its development more confidently, if the discoverer did not assure us that the Canaanite tribes, with such names as *Adonizedec* and *Kiriath-Arba*, were a race distinct from the Semitic; but we hesitate to follow through the Babel of cuneiform a guide who misleads us in simple Hebrew. Nor would M. Bunsen permit an Ethiopia to be discovered in Asia, without asking whether its linguistic indications are not rather *Proto-Semitic*, or merely Turanian, elements? and such a question Rawlinson *frères* seem little likely to elucidate. When one of them recommends as authentic the testimony of a pillar in Africa which we first hear of under Justinian, the trifling interval of two thousand years from Joshua may fall within the canon of contemporaneity; but he should have explained how the inscription came to be Phœnician, which his brother has discovered the Canaanites would not understand.

Passing from Gentile to Biblical evidence, we find the stereotyped assertion of divines, that the books of Joshua and Judges suppose the Pentateuch as their antecedent. But it is not explained, how Joshua could have engraved the five books on a pillar* on Mount Ebal; or why traces of Levitical worship are so scanty throughout the period of the Judges; still less, why Samuel could rebuke the people for desiring a king, if the law of regal election had been divinely laid down in Deuteronomy, and such a book were familiar to his hearers. It is left in equal obscurity, how David could have priests of the tribe of Judah, and how Solomon himself could sacrifice, if the Levitical system had the fulness which appears in the story of Uzziah. For eight hundred years, from the days of Joshua to those of Ezra, we learn from the book of Nehemiah,† that the feast of tabernacles was unknown in Israel; yet our lecturer would have us believe that a book enjoining the celebration of the feast was through all those centuries familiar as household words amongst the people. Such wider difficulties as these he hardly grapples with; the more obvious ones, that names of places first imposed by the Israelites are as it were anticipated in the Pentateuch, and that the possession of the land by the Canaanite is mentioned as a thing which in the author's time had passed away, are conveniently accounted for by the gratuitous hypothesis of interpolations. Does the University of Oxford believe in an interpolated "Word of God?" Rather, do the laws of historical investigation allow us to assume that a literature is older by some centuries than the names, the nations, the customs, and the institutions, which it delineates as familiar? It is difficult to read the second lecture without

* Joshua viii. 32.

† Nehemiah viii. 17.

amazement at the contrast between the weakness of the arguments and the confidence with which they are alleged. Even geology, with its periods, whose vastness transcends imagination, is strangely said to confirm the Mosaic records, because human remains are not found in the earlier strata. As if such circumstance proved a creation in a week, or a chronology of six thousand years! Even where science is express against Mr. Rawlinson, he not the less quotes it. Rationalists in general hold that Sodom and Gomorrha were destroyed by volcanic agencies; but Revelation bids us consider these as fire rained from heaven supernaturally. Mr. Rawlinson points to the subsidence of the valley of the Jordan, which is a clear sign of volcanic action, and tells us that to pious minds the miracle is confirmed. As regards mere manners and customs, he is more successful. It is possible that Von Bohlen and Donaldson may have been too hasty in denying the use of bricks to the Egypt of the Pharaohs. And if any infidel has supposed that there is no such country as Egypt or Palestine, no such river as the Nile, and no Mount Sinai in the world, he may so far unlearn his scepticism by reading Mr. Rawlinson. But that the series of wonderful events described in those countries took place in the miraculous form with which they are invested, or that a spark of external evidence from ancient historical records confirms either the character of supernatural revelation, or the genuineness and authenticity so confidently ascribed to the Pentateuch, is a proposition of an entirely different kind; and to the establishment of these latter propositions our Bampton lecturer has contributed not a particle of proof. We may concede everything in the least probable throughout his volume, without advancing a step in the direction in which he is anxious to lead us. If the manners of the Pentateuch are true to nature, so are those of the Arabian Nights. If its disputed ethnology should turn out correct, so may that of Dr. Latham and M. Müller. If relics abound in illustration of it, the scenes of the Waverley Novels are similarly illustrated in our modern Highlands.

The third lecture embraces the portion of Hebrew literature supposed to extend over the period between Joshua and Solomon. Our utter uncertainty as to the authors or compilers of most of the books is properly acknowledged. The description of them as anonymous documents preserved in the archives of the State, would be more adequate, if larger allowance had been made for the unfettered influence of priests or prophets in remoulding, as well as arranging at pleasure, and in embodying from time to time such popular traditions as bore the stamp of piety. That the books of Joshua and Judges were compiled from older documents is clear from their contents; but the assumption that the compiler of the first may have been contemporary with the events, stands in glaring contradiction

to the mention of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel, and to the Davidical name of Jerusalem, as well as to the citations from the book of Jashar, which can hardly have been earlier than David. In failing to notice such things, the Bampton lecturer betrays a lamentable want of familiarity with the contents of the literature which he defends. Nor should we infer him to be a good Hebraist from his not seeing the poetical character of the citations which relate the passage of the Jordan; or from his arguing the subordinate question whether Chusanrithathaim was an Assyrian satrap, without notice of the presumption derivable from the form of the name, which implies duality of province. Still more suggestive as to the value of our guide's judgment is the reiterated stress he lays on such testimony as that of Eupolemus and Nicholas of Damascus, both authors of Jewish affinities, and the latter as low as the Augustan era. Such arguments imply weakness in the advocate, or are fatal to his cause. Instead of historical corroboration, we are next offered the testimony of the book of Psalms; but such citation rather confirms the theory which the lecturer wished to disprove, that the miracles of the later prose books may have arisen from misapprehension of the sublime figures of earlier poetry. There is nothing to show that Joshua, Judges, and Samuel, are so old as some of the Psalms. Certainly they are not so old as the book of Jashar.

A gleam of reason seems to have crossed the lecturer's mind as he wavered over the possibility that the words, "Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon," may have been a poetical apostrophe; but if the suggestion had suited him, he might have fortified it by higher authority than that of Keil.

The only critical point which deserves notice in the third lecture arises in connexion with Tyre and Sidon. The representative of Phœnicia in the Pentateuch is Sidon, the older city; but in Samuel, Tyre, the younger one. Hence a faint argument for the greater antiquity of the Pentateuch. But its weight will appear slight, if we consider how easily archaic names, like that of the Gergesenes in the New Testament, may float down the stream of tradition, while there is no such possibility of later names, like that of Hebron, in Genesis, having been anticipated in a book of genuine antiquity. Walter Scott calls Edinburgh Dunedin, and the British name Deira is preserved in Gray, when he versifies an ancient fragment. Homer, with whom the Sidonians represent Phœnicia, is later than David's reign; why, then, need the Pentateuch be older? That Tyre had kings called Hiram; that the Egyptian Shishak captured Jerusalem; that Solomon's oppressive luxury was as renowned in Eastern tradition as that of Louis XIV. in France, and that the disruption under his son was gratifying to the priesthood, and possibly instigated

by them, are probabilities which we are not concerned to dispute. We are not aware that the building of the temple has ever been doubted. But we find not a shadow of confirmation of the directly theocratic ideas which are ordinarily associated with these events. If it be sceptical to trace in them a sacerdotal policy rather than a Divine intervention, and to think the priestly chronicler's eulogy of an oppressive reign a proof of moral shortcoming rather than of inspiration, Mr. Rawlinson contributes nothing to the removal of such scepticism.

The manifest proofs in the record of the superstitious pretensions of the Diviner growing into the prophetic office of Judge, of a great sacerdotal development under Samuel, arrested under Saul, and becoming bolder as the regal prerogative was weakened under Rehoboam, remain with all their significant resemblance to kindred phenomena in India and in the Middle Ages of Europe, and are not so much shaken by the lecturer's assertions, as confirmed by his want of countervailing testimony. He leaves us a literature, of which the historical portions contribute nothing to his cause, and of which the miraculous elements, whether vaguely traditional or sacerdotal, gain nothing from his advocacy. The resemblances which he points out between Solomon's Temple and kindred structures in Phœnicia or Assyria, are eminently rationalistic illustrations.

The fourth lecture comprehends the period from the reign of Rehoboam to the Babylonian exile. Greater light was here to be expected, both because the period is comparatively modern, and because it falls within the range of the most credible portion of the Assyrian discoveries. It soon transpires that the lecturer's illustrations even here apply chiefly to events which few care to dispute. That Israel and Judah were distinct kingdoms, and that they contracted relations of war or alliance with Egypt, Ethiopia, Tyre, and Damascus, is probable rather than wonderful. That they fell, like other petty kingdoms, within the sweep of Assyrian conquest, is as natural as for Ephesus and Delphi to have become subject to Rome. A rough confirmation by Assyrian inscriptions of the general features of the conquest would hardly prove such inscriptions to be supernaturally inspired; and has equally little bearing upon the inspiration of the Bible. It is far more significant that the alleged destruction of Sennacherib's army by a stupendous miracle finds no such confirmation in all Sir H. Rawlinson's discoveries. When we compare this silence with the Egyptian account in Herodotus, we are inclined fully to admit the credibility of an army having been lost in the desert; but a wide door is opened for a natural interpretation of this and of other such events; and we can understand Professor Newman's remark that, "whether it were panic or pestilence, the hot wind

of the desert, or the quicksands of the Serbonian bog, the Egyptians ascribed glory to the god of Memphis, and Hezekiah to the God of Zion." The critic's judgment on such questions is neither aided nor impeded by any fresh matter in the Bampton Lectures. The points of agreement between Biblical and general history are only multiplied in matters trivial or irrelevant; no religious obscurity is cleared up; no miraculous difficulty is solved; no rationalistic doubt vanishes. The chief merit of the fourth lecture is its frank acknowledgment that the books of Kings and Chronicles, as we have them; are compiled from miscellaneous documents; its failure is, that it throws no light upon the date of such compilation, explains none of the discrepancies between the books, and evades altogether the question, how far a comparison of the prophets with contemporary events permits us any longer to regard their prophecies as predictive? The author might have learned much in this department from Professor Newman's *Hebrew Monarchy*; but a too accurate treatment of the subject would have been fatal to his position as an advocate.

In the fifth lecture we at length reach the solitary contribution in this volume towards the better establishment of the credibility of the miraculous character of the Old Testament. Amongst the numerous difficulties which have compelled even orthodox critics to regard the book of Daniel as a retrospect in the time of Epiphanes, rather than as a prediction in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, was the name of the last king of Babylon, which the book represented as Belshazzar, but which all authentic history declares to have been Nabonadius, or Labynetus. It is a suspiciously fortunate solution, that the two Rawlinsons have discovered, and have deciphered, an inscription at Mugheir, which provides them with a son of Nabonadius, called Bil-shar-uzur, and associated with his father as king. We suspend our own judgment upon the timely apparition of this young prince, until the likelihood of the site, the decipherment of the name, and the adequacy of a youth of sixteen to all Belshazzar's responsibilities, in respect to his kingdom and seraglio, shall have been properly discussed. If the result should exceed our anticipations, it will imply at best the removal of one out of many difficulties. It will leave the Persian aspect of the empire, and its language, inconsistent with the early Babylonian date which, against the most ancient external testimony, is claimed for the book. The organization by Satrapies, and the reception of a Jewish exile into the strictly sacerdotal caste of the Chaldees, remain unexplained. The appearance of Darius the Mede, whether we identify him with Cyaxares or Astyages, or following a late ducal author, imagine him to represent Darius Hystaspes, remains a mystery insoluble

by all historical canons of credibility. The seventy weeks still end in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, with the awkward result, that the writer details accurately enough the annals of the Syrian Seleucidæ and of the Egyptian Ptolemies down to the period of his own day, but is disappointed in the glowing vaticinations with which his patriotic fancy depicts a future which he expected immediately to succeed. It is a strange assumption, that by casting any history into a prophetic form, a writer may acquire credit for predictive powers, without offering the slightest proof that his prediction existed previously to the event. Prophetic inspiration is not so ordinarily a normal gift in literature that its claimants can afford to dispense with some indication of priority on part of the record. To silence, in the lecturer's fashion, all who ask for such indications, by calling them rationalists, is surrendering the question of fact. The more closely an injudicious advocate binds up the fortunes of Christianity with the Babylonian genuineness of the book of Daniel, the worse must be the result for Christian evidences. It would be wiser to leave the religious faith, that Christ teaches men to worship in spirit and in truth, independent of the critical error which misplaces a Jewish record. Mr. Rawlinson betrays an imperfect acquaintance with Chaldee when he tells us that the idioms of Daniel, which approach more nearly those of the Targums, denote the same date as the Chaldaic portions of Ezra. It is more wonderful that the same literary misrepresentation should be repeated by the author of the article "Daniel," in Mr. Murray's new "Biblical Dictionary." Both that article so far, and the one by Dr. Thompson on the Life of Christ, convey a painful impression of the degree in which the Dictionary is adapted to traditional tastes, or at least of its inadequacy as an exposition of the *bona fide* researches of critical scholars. Mr. Westcott confounds Maurer with Beer.

When the lecturer leaves the dangerous ground of the book of Daniel, and dwells upon Ezra and Nehemiah, he has somewhat better success, because he had less to prove. Not that here his criticism adds anything to our reasons for supposing those books substantially genuine, or aids us in eliminating portions which are doubtful. But the prosaic character of the books, and their general consonance with the spirit natural to a sacerdotal colony returning from exile, tend to disarm critical analysis. But here a difficulty occurs, which it would have been more to the lecturer's purpose to remove, than to cite shoals of witnesses to the undisputed history of Pharaoh Necho or Apries. In these chronicles, which are not improbably contemporary with Ezra and Nehemiah, all that supernatural interference which was so prominent in the poetical legends of a remote antiquity quietly disappears. Now, if ever, in the hour of trial and of restoration,

Jehovah might have been expected to confirm his people's faith, and to shame their infidel adversaries with overpowering miracles. Nothing of the kind occurs. We see patriotic spirit and sacerdotal zeal, the latter taking a singularly unamiable form, when it violates the sacred bond of marriage, by compelling the people to put away the wives of foreign race whose tenderness had clung to them in exile. This is a sad degeneracy from the true feeling which dictated the book of Ruth. It prepares us for the harder fanaticism with which the later Pharisees set their artificial *Corban* against the dictates of natural piety, and is but one out of a thousand indications, that the sayings of old time which Jesus of Nazareth set aside, and the traditions received from his fathers, whose yoke the Apostle Paul shattered, were not merely unscriptural additions, but rather parts of Judaism, included in the volume, and inherent in the substance of the Old Testament. We do not find Ezra, like Elijah, calling fire from heaven on the sacrifices, or leading Tobiah and Sanballat under a miraculous blindness into the midst of Jerusalem. Everything proceeds by natural order and human agency. If this striking discrepancy between the older books and those of the Return is not best explained by ascribing a poetical character to portions of the older ones, and by acknowledging large traces of imagination which has taken the form of legend, Mr. Rawlinson at least does not help us to a better explanation. Much less has he attempted to meet the suspicious inferences drawn by Professor Newman from a comparative analysis of the two books of Chronicles. It betrays a singular and hardly credible lack of judgment, that he detracts from the approximate genuineness of the later books by comparing them, as if they stood on the same level, with the Pentateuch. Having utterly failed to produce external testimony to Deuteronomy, approaching within many centuries of its assumed date, he speaks as if Ezra and Nehemiah, which would for the most part be conceded to him, gain by being placed in the obscure and debateable region to which Deuteronomy belongs. On the book of Esther, he gives us nothing to countervail the paramount judgment of Niebuhr, which is confirmed by De Wette, and generally accepted. The book is antecedently improbable, and not confirmed by any historical testimonies; nor, in the judgment of most divines, has it a directly religious interest. If we choose to draw a line of credibility between its narrative and that of the book of Judith, the only reason for doing so is, that one was written in Hebrew and the other in Greek, so that the first became Scripture and the second Apocrypha. The lecturer has a strong opinion as to the antecedent value of this distinction; but he adds no historical corroboration.

It required a careful examination of the first half of Mr. Raw-

linson's volume to learn the entire barrenness of all the Assyrian discoveries at Nineveh, or elsewhere, in respect of adding anything to the religious authority of the Old Testament Scriptures, or to the credibility of such portions of the volume as are miraculous. After the claims which had been paraded on this subject, we must plead guilty to some expectations, which nothing short of the demonstration furnished by Mr. Rawlinson's volume could have so entirely removed. With the solitary exception of *Bil-shar-uzur*, which, if it be not suspicious, is trifling, there is nothing alleged on the slightest show of evidence, throughout the first four lectures, which the boldest rationalist need hesitate, if he please, to admit. Nor again is there anything important, as tending in the direction in which Mr. Rawlinson would lead us, for which the evidence does not manifestly break down. We believe in the Pyramids. We have read of Nineveh. We never doubted that Sennacherib and Necho are mentioned in Herodotus. We accord a rational credence to the conquests of Nebuchadnezzar, though his madness in the book of Daniel suspiciously resembles that of Cambyses. But the abundance of testimony produced for those elements in Scripture which no one cares to dispute, only increases our desire to discover a hieroglyphical representation of the drowning of Pharaoh, or a sculptured record in Nineveh that the destruction of Sennacherib's army was miraculous. We should like some attestation to those elements in the Jewish annals, which are professionally affirmed to take them out of the range of ordinary history, but which criticism daily teaches us to estimate by the rules of evidence elsewhere. Mr. Rawlinson's failure on this head is not simple, but cumulative. If he had produced no illustration, he might have pleaded that the region was too remote. Whereas he illustrates abundantly what sober rationalists concede; he fails only on the side of Revelation. He leaves the Pentateuch of any age or of many. He permits us to see the compilation of poetical fragments in Joshua. He suggests to us, by his comparison of the Psalms, the probable origin of the marvellous—that is, of the the miraculous—features in the prose books, which are arranged in our Bible as if they were written first, but to which no such priority belongs in fact. He does nothing to confirm the prophetic prodigies of the books of Samuel and Kings, or to explain the discrepancies of Chronicles. He produces no critical reason for placing Esther in a different category from Judith, or for dissociating the book of Daniel from those of the Maccabees. In whatever degree he succeeds better with Ezra and Nehemiah, his success is proportionately suggestive of a dangerous inference as to the cessation of miracles upon the contemporaneousness of records. All this result becomes far more significant, when we consider the claim

to our respect which the lecturer derives from his relationship to the great Assyrian discoverer. Making large allowance for possible defect of judgment or grasp of mind on part of the lecturer, we cannot but conceive that, if the disembowelling of buried cities had brought to light any confirmation of the supernatural claims of the Bible, he would certainly have produced it. The moral effect of the Bampton Lectures for 1859 is to establish beyond reach of cavil, that neither Sir Henry Rawlinson, nor any one of his associates in discovery, has done anything towards the demolition of Rationalism. *Opinionum commenta delet Dies; Nature judicium confirmat.*

The four later Lectures deal with what are ordinarily styled Evidences for the New Testament. The only novelty we have observed in this portion, is a reference to the relics of burial in the catacombs at Rome. The lecturer does not help us to decide whether the higher estimate which of late years has been formed as to the genuineness of supposed Christian remains in the catacombs arises from any increase of evidence, or from a development in the Anglican Church of a taste for legend. It is highly probable that the Christian relics are but partial additions to a mouldering heritage of burials long before the Christian era. Even if we adopt the view most favoured by Catholic antiquarians, the only result is to show that a large Christian population existed before the reign of Constantine. If there had not been something of the kind, the politic Emperor would hardly have triumphed in the sign of the cross. Here, as elsewhere, Mr. Rawlinson betrays a singular incapacity, either for weighing evidence, or for measuring the extent and value of the matter proved. If the numerical strength of Christianity under Decius had been (what is very unlikely) four times what Gibbon calculated, this would prove nothing as to the miracles of the New Testament.

If the latter and more important portion of the lecturer's task had been more skilfully executed, we would gladly have taken the opportunity of estimating the present state of Christian evidences, and analysing the result of recent works on both sides. But it is waste of time to argue over the remains of a writer, who speaks of the testimony of the four Evangelists, as if nothing had been done from Bishop Marsh to Dr. Baur, towards an examination of the traditions preserved, with varying degrees of fidelity, in the synoptic Gospels, and commented upon, with theological amplification, in the fourth. The orthodox will hardly accept a treatment so superficial as fit advocacy of their cause. The critic may reserve his steel. We will but indicate to the lecturer rapidly points upon which our critical readers would have been glad to have received from him farther satisfaction. Might he not have analysed the historical antecedents of Christianity,

so as to show how far a confluence of general causes generated its spirit, and local peculiarities determined its form? Was not an age of light, amidst the convergence of Hebrew sacerdotalism with Greek imagination, likely to produce a milder offspring of the Old Testament, and a purer monotheism than that of the classical nations? At the same time would not the superstitious atmosphere of Galilee, with the credulity of its devout peasants, provide a scene of easy acceptance for marvels? How far again did the allegorizing interpretations of Philo and of the Alexandrine school afford the nucleus of the doctrine of the Logos, and generate the Pauline phraseology? Would the lecturer have ventured to investigate the apparently strange citations from the Old Testament by the Gospel writers; or could he provide a criterion which would lead us to trust as witnesses for extraordinary stories those who manifestly fail as guides in criticism? The alleged miracles are remote, but the misapplied prophecies are in our hands. Did not the lecturer's argument require him to offer a particle of proof that the Gospels existed even in fragments before the destruction of Jerusalem, that they were edited in a complete form earlier than some seventy years later, and that the canonical collection of books was fixed before the fourth century? Should not the importance of the subject have led him to treat more satisfactorily the taxing of Cyrenius, the star of the Magi, the unattested massacre of the infants by Herod, and the desolation of Gaza? Is it not strange that Lysanias of Abilene should appear to have lived earlier than the New Testament places him, but Theudas and Sergius Paulus probably later? Does not a comparison of the accounts given in Josephus and in Eusebius respecting the death of Herod Agrippa tend to throw doubt on the entire texture of ecclesiastical miracles? Is it not equally significant, that Greek medical writers apply to epilepsy and lunacy the identical word, out of which our New Testament writers and their orthodox commentators extract the strange notion of demoniac possession? The two aspects of simple disease thus presented to us open a wide field for the tendencies of the Rationalist and the Scripturalist. Such topics, and their analogies, might have been dwelt upon. The well-known dissonances in the Evangelists, commonly noticed from the Rev. Mr. Evans to Strauss, deserved a more analytical explanation. Even in the second Gospel, which retains the greatest simplicity in its form, the combination of distinct and varying narratives, as of the marvellous feeding with loaves, connected in each case significantly with the Saviour's solitary prayer, the boat, the storm, the sending from Jerusalem, has been thought by critics to imply an aggregation of traditions. The phenomenon which struck us in the Old Testament of a paucity of miracles in proportion to con-

temporaneousness of record, may in a less degree be traced in the New. In those Epistles of Paul which are probably genuine, the assertion of miraculous powers is dubious, or absent. The gift of "tongues" has not yet become a power of speaking foreign languages. The great Apostle appeals chiefly to the response of his hearers' consciences. In the Acts, a book of less definite, probably later, date, the Pentecostal gift becomes more difficult to explain by natural or moral causation. In the same book the Saviour is represented as communing with his disciples at intervals during forty days. It is a difficulty to be explained how the author of that book, if he were the writer of the third Gospel, could have described the Ascension as taking place "in the self-same hour" as the return of the two disciples from Emmaus, on the identical day of the Resurrection. Could not the lecturer have instituted a fresh "Trial of the Witnesses," in which he might have confronted Sherlock with Dr. Donaldson, and have removed the serious appearances of discrepancy? Until he does so, a tone of less exuberant confidence will become him. May he not be asked why the first Gospel, written probably in Judæa, dwells principally on the apparition after the Resurrection, which is ascribed to the remote province of Galilee, and which even there "some doubted?" Why were the evidences of Resurrection in the second Gospel so scanty, that they required to be eked out by a fragment evidently written by some different hand? By what process was the consciousness of the Church enlarged in the course of years, so that at length in the fourth Gospel she has become aware of sundry appearances of the risen Saviour, which amidst numerous contemporaries of the supposed events had been written with very inferior clearness? The best answer to such questionings might be found in St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians; but St. Paul's testimony seems to be that of hearsay; his own vision seems to have been one of the inner consciousness. The remarkable change in his text, Romans xiv. 9, where the words *ἀπόστολος* καὶ have been interpolated before *ἀπέζησεν*, implies that his later readers desiderated a more substantial assertion of the visible corporeity of the revived Saviour than the Apostle himself left them.

Not less remarkable, and for the lecturer perplexing, is the development of ideal doctrine in juxtaposition with the growth of marvellous narrative. There are traditional fragments in the Gospels, betokening a time when the people of Nazareth recognised in Jesus only the carpenter's son. St. James, the brother of the Saviour, speaks throughout his epistle in terms compatible with the merest humanitarian view. St. Peter, the chief of the apostles, may be interpreted, somewhat less obviously, in the same sense. The synoptic Gospels are claimed confidently by

Unitarians. In St. Paul's epistles appear phrases which may be heretically glossed as the outgrowth of mystical Hermeneutics, borrowed from the school of Philo, or considered by orthodox commentators as denoting a growth in the conceptions of the Church, and a declaration of the divinity which had been veiled in the flesh. In either case there is a development of doctrine within the books of the New Testament. Some may view it as a legitimate growth; others as a corruption. Only St. John at last, as ancient critics remarked, ventures to call Jesus expressly God. *The supernatural generation appears with St. Paul as an informing of humanity by the divine spirit. In the fourth Gospel it is still spiritual or metaphysical. But in the prefaces, of which it is disputed how late they were prefixed to two of the Gospels, and which were not universally received in the first ages, that conception of *partheno-genesis* is brought forward, which modern critics have been tempted to regard as a symbolical legend. Could the Bampton lecturer have explained to us, why this physical form of the Incarnation appears neither in the simplest, nor in the most spiritual of the Gospels? If he had looked abroad for historical confirmation, would he not have been embarrassed rather than aided, by finding a similar development of simple spiritual truth into marvellous legends amongst the literature of Buddhism? This Indian faith now degenerate, but originally, if we may trust our Oriental explorers, profoundly democratic in its philosophical creed, has, like Christianity, its scriptures ratified by councils, its saviour, its missions, its faith, repentance, spiritual life, and at last its stories of a founder born of a virgin, transfigured by divine enlightenment, and translated, or absorbed, into parent Deity. The parallel is more striking, because Buddhism stands in nearly the same relation to Brahmanism, as a hostile offspring, which the early faith of the Nazarenes occupies towards Judaism. In each case we observe the spirit of humanity escaping from the bondage of formalism, triumphing over sacerdotalism, assimilating itself to the revelation which it supplanted, and at length congealed into a new ecclesiastical system. No historical treatment of Christian evidences can henceforward be complete, which does not handle the parallel of Buddhism in a manner different from any usually attempted. If the one is a revelation from heaven, and the other a development from earth, the distinguishing criteria should be clearly explained; nor ought the advantage of priority of date to be overlooked.

Our readers should observe, we by no means insinuate that some of the questions above raised do not admit of satisfactory answers. Our duty, as critics, is to remark that Mr. Rawlinson has not answered them. Instead of meeting substantial difficulties, which men generally feel, he contents himself with the puerile

triumph of showing that the Roman emperors, from Augustus to Nero, are mentioned in the New Testament in their right order—with many other such simplicities. Would he consider it a proof of the miracles alleged at La Salette in the south of France, if it were shown that their narrators knew Napoleon III. to be now emperor? Would Mormonism be much strengthened if its literature enumerated correctly the Presidents of the United States? If the parallel seems indecent, the peculiar argumentation of the lecturer has tempted it. There is something provocative of dissent in the easy assurance with which Mr. Rawlinson ignores real difficulties, or sneers unwarrantably at those who have stated them, and plumes himself upon establishing what few persons doubt.

We should exceedingly regret if our tone in the above remarks should cause the lecturer personal pain, or seem to cast a shade of doubt upon the excellence of his intentions. Nothing in his volume would justify the most captious critic in suspecting him of any insincerity. Even his argumentative failure is more respectable than the sickening rhetoric of writers who disparage all the elements of natural piety, and the signs of spiritual progress in humanity, in order to ask with professional whine, *to whom shall we go*, if not to the personal object of their exclusive homage. Such writers have little in common with the spirit of the great teacher, the sufferer for truth, and the benefactor of humanity, in whose name they would build up a system as formal as the one which he overthrew. Mr. Rawlinson has addressed himself in good earnest to his subject, and has adduced the best arguments his learning could furnish, with such appreciation of their force as his peculiar logic suggested.

But we would respectfully ask the University of Oxford, whether the present state of things ought to continue? In two successive years she has placed in her principal pulpit two champions of the faith, such as her authorities thought good to select. The first informed us that the contents of Christianity must not be criticised, because, as he was understood to argue, we have no moral or reasoning faculty trustworthy enough to test them. A necessary consequence, in the judgment alike of devout Christians and of critical inquirers, is that religion can have little, if any, moral evidence. Removed from moral cognizance, it is lost to spiritual perception. Presenting to our minds the same insoluble questions, and the same imperfect or provisional solutions, as all human philosophies, it differs from them only in that its miraculous attestations compel us to accept it. Thus revelation was made to supersede our faculties, without improving on them; threw scorn on philosophy, and repeated its perplexities in a more embarrassing form; became divine, because difficult; and was revelation, because it revealed nothing.

If this be not Mr. Mansel's own representation of his argument, it is the impression left by his volume on readers differing widely in almost every other respect. It is manifest that no approximation to such a method of reasoning would have been adopted by any champion of orthodoxy who had been duly aware of the existing state of Christian evidences, or whose training had made him acquainted with theological difficulties. It is acknowledged that the moral effect of the volume is to throw the burden of sustaining Christianity upon its external proof, and to increase our need of such proof. We turn anxiously to Mr. Rawlinson for a supply of this need. He comes laden with the spoils of antiquity. Buried cities have yielded up their treasure. The stones cry out from the wall in attestation of what he promises to prove. *Parturiant montes*. We have perused his volume with anxious candour, and never knew, until we laid it down, how much must be deducted from the imperfect argument of Paley, and how near an approach to nothing on the side of Revelation had been effected by all the Assyrian excavations. Difficulties of the Pentateuch, difficulties of the prophecies, difficulties of the miraculous portions of the Bible in general and in particular, are only magnified by so vain an attempt to remove them. Even the moral ideas, which have enabled Christianity to hold so many cultivated intellects within its grasp, lose something of their beauty and vigour, when their advocates choose to make their genuineness depend upon a peculiar kind of testimony, which crumbles in proportion as it is handled. How far such deplorable results are due to want of judgment on the part of individual pleaders, and how far to an inherent weakness of the case involved in common preconceptions of Revelation, we need not attempt to decide. As believers in human progress, and disposed to cherish those lessons of evolving civilization to which the pretended authority of a stereotyped volume has been often found hostile, we cannot pretend to regret a failure, which yet we have expounded without any exaggeration. If stronger arguments can be adduced for an infallible literature, or for the tradition of a miraculously attested Revelation, as distinct from the spiritual progress of humanity, let either of our Universities select some one to do them justice, or let the oracles in higher places of the Establishment at length break their suggestive silence. In the mean time, it is trying dangerous experiments with the faith of undergraduates, to fortify them by such discourses as the *Bampton Lectures* of 1859.

ART. IV.—THE POST OFFICE MONOPOLY.

1. *Reports of the Postmaster-General on the Post Office.* London. 1855, 1856, 1857, 1858, 1859, 1860.
2. *Report from the Select Committee on Packet and Telegraphic Contracts; together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, &c.** London. 1859.

THE Post Office has of late attracted such general attention that we need offer no apology to our readers for introducing it to their notice. The subject is interesting on account of its connexion with certain grave political considerations as well as by reason of its intrinsic importance to all classes of society. We have before us the six annual Reports already published, addressed by four successive Postmasters-General to the Lords of the Treasury, and presented to both Houses of Parliament. The series commences with one bearing the date of 1855, and terminates with another bearing that of the current year. The first purports to be the production of Earl Canning, the three following of the Duke of Argyle, the fifth of Lord Colchester, and the sixth of the Earl of Elgin and Kincardine. Before the year 1855, no regular periodical report seems to have been made by the Postmaster-General, and to Lord Canning belongs the credit of having introduced this salutary custom. Looking upon the Post Office as a department in which improvement was constantly called for, and concerning which many misconceptions were afloat in the public mind, his lordship was anxious that better means of information should be open than were presented by communications with the office itself or by questions asked in Parliament. He, therefore, proposed that annual Reports should be published under authority, for the purpose of laying the affairs of the Post Office before the public, and of inviting their criticism upon its details and general system.

In the First Report, some interesting particulars are given in the history of the postal system, but, with this exception, they are all of them constructed upon the same plan. The extension of the inland service, the number and weight of the letters carried, the money orders issued and paid, the foreign and colonial mails, the revenue and expenditure during the years to which they respectively refer, are passed in review, and under the heading Miscellaneous are contained a variety of subjects embracing the physical condition, the moral state, the mental aspirations, and even the

martial sentiments of the Post Office servants. Each Report is supplied with a copious appendix, the rear of which is brought up with examples of groundless complaints made by careless or malevolent persons against this apparently immaculate Department. These, unhappily, do not prove much. They strongly resemble the testimonials given by certain dyspeptic noblemen in favour of the Revalenta Arabica or Holloway's pills and ointment. We have not had the opportunities of a Postmaster-General, but we have heard of cases of complaint which certainly were not without foundation. On the whole, these reports are about as good as the ordinary run of official documents. Neither their composition nor the arrangement of their matter can be commended. A vein of contentment pervades them, and, like all their family, they seem intended as running comments upon the dictum of the poet—

“And spite of pride, in erring reason's spite,
One truth is clear, whatever *is is right*.”

The question now to be answered is, whether or not the Post Office should remain a Government department; whether it be right or expedient that the State should carry the letters of the public? No one can maintain that Government is instituted for this purpose; that this is one of the main objects for which it exists; or even that there is anything in that occupation which points it out as peculiarly belonging to Government. It may be a very good thing that we should have an efficient postal service, as it may also be a very good thing that we should have an efficient manufacture of hats, but this is surely not a conclusive reason for the Government making our hats or carrying our letters. Assuming that the State would make the best postman or the best hatter possible, then even, we say it would not be justified in becoming either hatter or postman.

It must now be recognised as a principle in politics, that it is not so much the form of Government which obtains in any given society, as the sphere within which its action is confined, that constitutes the measure of the liberties of a people. The problem of who shall rule and who shall be ruled is mainly important, so far as it bears upon the much more important problem of how much personal freedom the latter shall retain. The security of the citizen in person and in property is the only legitimate care of the Legislature, and the right of averting or avenging an injury is the only natural right which the individual man wisely resigns to society and its organic centre the State. When the Legislature secures to its subjects the unmolested enjoyment of their rights—when it enables them to develop their powers to their own advantage without hindrance from foreign or domestic foes—it has done all it should be deputed to do, all it has a right to do, and,

moreover, all it is fitted to do. If afterwards it seeks to regulate this enjoyment or to stimulate that development, it assumes an authority which does not belong to it, dangerous alike to individual liberty and national prosperity, and further destructive to its own efficiency. Even if its measures were the most excellent that human reason could devise or human power could enforce, they would still be pernicious in their ultimate consequences. The horse which is well groomed and well fed is not less the creature of his master than the ass which is badly groomed and badly fed ; so the people who are surrounded with the most salutary rules laid down by the State are not the less slaves than if they were surrounded by the worst. A child who has everything done for it, who is never required to do anything or judge for itself, will grow up an useless and a helpless man ; so the nation whose government does everything for it—washing it, feeding it, physicing it, thinking for it, will continue improvident, thoughtless, and unfit for self-rule.

The provinces of governmental activity and private enterprise are distinct, and any encroachment of the one upon the other cannot be supported upon any just principle. Whilst, in the present state of society, private armies, private navies, and companies for the administration of justice must be condemned, so likewise must State religions, State educations, and Sanitary Commissions.

Taking the ground of expediency, we arrive at the same conclusion. If the Legislature attempts to do everything for the people, it makes itself responsible for things with which in truth it has no concern. It paves the way to revolution and discord. It gives a handle to those demagogues and agitators who would persuade the populace that if they have not bread enough it is the fault of the Government—a theory pregnant with confiscation. Whenever the Government oversteps the narrow round of its legitimate functions, it fails to accomplish its object. Compare, for instance, the industry, or, as it is called, zeal of the Catholic priest or Dissenting minister with that of the beneficed clergyman—a private or public school (miscalled so) with a State educational establishment—a merchant's house with a Government office,—the Bridgewater with the Caledonian canal—the New River with the Serpentine, and it must be acknowledged that private enterprise in all these cases has beaten Governmental activity. The Poor Laws have increased poverty, and the Emigration Board has decreased emigration ; the Factory Acts have heightened the discontent of the working classes, and the Building Act has diminished the stability of our houses.*

* See Article on Over-Legislation in Vol. IV. of this Review—New Series.

But not only are these things, which the Government has no right to do, done badly, but its own duties are neglected. Borrowing a phrase from the Liturgy of the English Church, we may accurately describe the conduct of the English State:—"It has left undone those things which it ought to have done, and it has done those things which it ought not to have done." It has left the National Defences in a notoriously inefficient condition, and the Law in a plight which disgraces the nineteenth century, but it has sent out Expeditions to explore the North-West Passage, and it has regulated the tariff of cabmen. Its own duties being unperformed, and attempts being made to perform those of the private citizen, the latter is expected to do the work of Government. Thus with an army costing the country sixteen millions a year, in a time of panic it relies upon Volunteers, and yet, forsooth, we cannot take care of our own health, but must be vaccinated under the direction of the State.

Therefore, *à priori*, and arguing from analogy, there seems no reason for the Post Office being, or remaining, a Government department, although we freely acknowledge that its management contrasts most favourably with many other departments of the State.

In the gradual progress of mankind, means for the transmission of intelligence become as much matter of necessity as those for the conveyance of persons or merchandize, and analogous causes to those which originated the use of coaches and trains, converted them into *mail* coaches and *mail* trains. Posts established for the purposes of Government have existed in almost all times and all countries, whilst those intended for the convenience of the public at large are of less ancient and general institution. The former kind are mentioned by historians from Herodotus to Macaulay, and were found by travellers from Mexico to Japan, the latter are the fruits of private enterprise—a consequence of advancing civilization. At one time the conveyance and delivery of letters was a part of the ordinary-occupation of pedlars and others whose avocations induced them to make frequent journeys between the same places; but as commerce extended, these precarious means were superseded by regular conveyances for correspondence, instituted by municipal corporations, by opulent or benevolent persons, either as commercial speculations or for the purpose of furthering the interests of particular places. Of this nature were the posts of the Universities, those established by the common councils of Bristol and Aberdeen, by the company of Merchant Adventurers and by the noble family of Taxis in Germany.

Although at an early period the posts had attained to some system, yet the conveyance of letters, especially between distant

places, was very irregular and insecure. The despatches of Government were certainly transmitted with some celerity and safety by special messengers, but the letters of the public, unless carried in this expensive method, were conveyed by posts which for the most part were local and temporary. At a period then in which large private combinations were unknown, it was natural for the people to desire that Government should take upon itself the regulation of the posts, and Government would the more readily do this since opportunities were thus offered for espionage and gain. All over Europe the postal service has become a department of the State; it is easy to trace its adoption in our own country, for this was of late occurrence.

Records, in the Close and Miscæ Rolls, of payments made to *nuncii* for carrying the letters of the king, commence in the reign of John, and are continued through many subsequent reigns. In that of Edward the First, we find the word *cokinus* also used in the wardrobe accounts, the chapter referring to such payments being termed *Titulus de Expensis Nunciorum et Cokinorum Regis Edwardi filii Regis Henrici*. In the First Report we are told:—

“Government posts, that is, relays of horses and men under control of Government, were not established till nearly two centuries later; but as early as the time of Edward II. horses were kept by private individuals for hire, so that a messenger might travel post—*i. e.*, by relays; and as ‘Haste, Post Haste,’ is found written on the backs of private letters at the close of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries, it may be inferred that the use of this mode of conveyance was not restricted to the correspondence of the Government.” —(p. 8.)

In 1481, Edward IV. established a system of posting-stations at distances of about twenty miles along the northern road, by means of which messengers could travel about sixty-six miles in the day. The king was then at war with the Scotch, and the posts fell into disuse at the restoration of peace.

In the reign of Henry VIII., we find Sir Brian Tuke described as *Magister Nunciorum, Cursorum sive Postarum*, who, in a reply to some complaints made by Thomas Cromwell, the king's secretary, says:—

“Sir, ye knowe well that, except the hackney horses between Gravesende and Dovour, there is no such usual conveyance in post for men in this realme as in the accustomed places of France and other partes: no man can kepe horses in redynes withoute som way to bere the charges, but when placardes be sent for such cause, the constables many tymes be fayn to take horses oute of plowes and cartes wherein can be no extreme diligence. But, sir, not taking upon me to excuse

the postes, I wol advertize you that I have knowen in tymes past folkes whiche for their owne thank have dated their letters a day or two more before they were writen, and the conveyers have had the blame."—(*“Encyclopædia Britannica,”* vol. xviii. p. 403.)

In 1545, Sir Brian Tuke was succeeded by Sir William Paget and Sir John Mason as joint postmasters, the office being granted to them, and the survivor. Sir John Mason was succeeded by Thomas Randolph (who is mentioned by Camden), and he by Sir John Stanhope (afterwards Lord Stanhope, of Harrington), in whose family the office was considered hereditary.

In 1548 the charge for post-horses, impressed in the service of the Crown, was by the Statute 2 and 3 Edward VI. c. 3, fixed at a penny a mile. A proclamation of Philip and Mary, preserved by the Society of Antiquaries, regulates the supply of horses for the conveyance of letters to Dover, and in 1566 the Council ordered that postmasters should keep books in which to enter each letter they received, the date of its delivery, and the name of the person bringing it to them. In 1591, “A proclamation for redresse of disorders in postes which convey and bring to and out of the partes beyond the seas packets of letters,” was published. It recites previous attempts at redressing these disorders, and makes provision—

“That no persons whatsoever should take upon them publicly or privately to procure, bring in, or carry out, any packets of letters to or from the countries beyond the seas, except such our ordinary posts and messengers for those parts, as either by our master of the posts or the masters of the posts-general of those countries reciprocally should be found nominated for that kind of service.”

And further, the officers of justice and of the post are ordered “to make diligent search of all mails, budgets, and other carriages of all such disavowed carriers, messengers, and suspected persons, and all such so discovered to apprehend and stay.”

We are therefore surprised to find it stated in the First Report that “The first establishment of a letter post by the Government was in the reign of James I., who, as it is stated by a proclamation of Charles I., set on foot a post office for letters to foreign countries ‘for the benefit of the English merchants’” (p. 9); since we find such a post office the subject of a royal proclamation long before that monarch ascended the English throne.

In 1619 a new office of Postmaster-General for foreign parts was created by letters patent of James I., in favour of Matthew de l’Equester and his son. This was considered by Lord Stanhope, who had succeeded to his father, as an infringement of his

patent, and a trial in the King's Bench, without however any definite result, was the consequence.*

As early as 1514, the Alien merchants in London had established a post from the capital to the outports. In 1568 a quarrel arose between the Spaniards and the Flemings about the appointment of a postmaster, and the English merchants also complained that these foreigners kept back their letters, and thus gained advantages in the markets. In 1626, the Merchant Adventurers were called upon to show cause before the Council why they should not send their letters by De l'Equester's post, but the monopoly was so clearly unconstitutional, that upon a hearing they were permitted to employ their own.

In 1635, one Thomas Witherings, to whom the office of Postmaster had been assigned by De l'Equester, to be held jointly with William Frizell, submitted to the king a proposition, which is still preserved in the State Paper Office, "for settling of staffits, or packet posts betwixt London and all parts of his Majesty's dominions, for the carrying and recarrying of his subjects' letters." In consequence of this proposition, in which it is stated that the net cost of the Post Office to the Crown was 3400*l.* annually, we find that—

"The King issued a proclamation in which he recites that up to that time there had been no certain communication between England and Scotland; 'wherefore, he now commands his Postmaster of England for foreign parts, to settle a running post or two to run night and day between Edinburgh and London, to go thither and come back again in six days, and to take with them all such letters as shall be directed to any post town in or near that road.' It is at the same time ordered that bye-posts shall be connected with many places on the main line, to bring in and carry out the letters from Lincoln, Hull, and other towns; a similar post to Chester and Holyhead, and another to Exeter and Plymouth, are to be established: and it is promised that, as soon as possible, the like conveyances shall be organized for the Oxford and Bristol road, and also for that leading through Colchester for Norwich. The rates of postage are fixed at twopence the single letter for any distance under eighty miles, fourpence up to a hundred and forty miles, sixpence for any longer distance, and eightpence to any place in Scotland. By a subsequent proclamation, of 1637, it is ordered that *no other messengers nor foot posts shall carry any letters but those alone which shall be employed by the King's Postmaster-General*, unless to places to which the King's posts do not go, and with the exception of common known carriers, or messengers particularly sent on purpose, or persons carrying a letter for a friend. This new establishment was entrusted to Thomas Witherings, who had before been appointed Foreign Postmaster, but in 1640 he was superseded for alleged abuses.

* Latch's Reports of King's Bench Cases, p. 87.

in his office, which was sequestered and placed in the hands of Philippe Burlenchy, to be exercised thenceforth under the care and superintendence of the Principal Secretary of State. From this time the Post Office may be considered to have become one of the settled institutions of the country."—("First Report," p. 10.)

It may be true, that from this time the Post Office became an institution of the country—that it was settled as such is not the case. Witherings, upon his accusation, assigned his patent to Robert Rich, Earl of Warwick, and Lord Stanhope petitioned the House of Lords, setting forth that the resignation of his prior patent was compulsory. The mails were stopped and seized by the contending parties upon several occasions, the welfare of the public being sacrificed, as usual, to the paltry quarrels of officials.

"The prohibition of the carrying of letters by persons other than those employed by the King's Postmaster caused great dissatisfaction, being viewed as an unwarrantable stretch of prerogative. In 1642, a Committee of the House of Commons was appointed to inquire into the matter, and the subject afterwards engaged the attention of Parliament."—(First Report, p. 10.)

In 1646, the case was submitted for the decision of the judges, who pronounced, with reference to the patent granted to Witherings, that "The patent of the Inland Letter Office was well created; that the clauses of restraint in the said patent are void and not good in law; that notwithstanding these clauses be void, the patent is good for the rest."—(Report of Secret Committee on Post Office, Appendix, pp. 60-69.)

So difficult was it even in that bad age to establish such an unjustifiable monopoly.

In 1650, an attempt was made by the Common Council of London to establish a post, and the scheme was carried out with respect to Scotland, but the Attorney-General of the Commonwealth, Edmund Prideaux, who had obtained a grant of the monopoly, promptly interfered, and the Commons, so urgently opposed to the formation of one by the Crown, proceeded without delay to protect that of their minion.

In 1653, the Post Office was farmed to John Manley for 10,000*l.* a year. Under the rule of Oliver Cromwell the rates of postage and the rights of postmasters were determined by an Act of 1657, c. 30, and in a report upon the revenue, two years later, we find the item, "By postage of letters in farm, 14,000*l.*"—(Parliamentary History, xxiii. 50.)

At the Restoration, the Post Office remained in much the same state as under the Commonwealth. "The Statute 12 Car. II., c. 35, re-enacts in substance the ordinance of the Commonwealth,

and this Act, being the first strictly legal authority for the establishment of the Post Office, has been called its charter."—(First Report, p. 11.)

Henry Bishop was appointed Postmaster-General, and he contracted to pay the king 21,500*l.* a year. In 1662 he was succeeded by Daniel O'Neil, and in 1663 the surplus revenue of the Post Office was settled, by the 15 Car. II. c. 14, upon James, Duke of York, and his heirs male. It is important to bear in mind that post-horses as well as letters formed part of the Government monopoly at this time.

During the receipt of the Post Office profits by the Duke of York, in 1688, a penny post for letters and small parcels was established in London. It is thus described by Lord Macaulay:—

"To facilitate correspondence between one part of London and another was not originally one of the objects of the Post Office. But in the reign of Charles II., an enterprising citizen of London, William Dockwray, set up, at great expense, a penny post, which delivered letters and parcels six or eight times a day in the busy and crowded streets near the Exchange, and four times a day in the outskirts of the capital. This improvement was, as usual, strenuously resisted. The porters complained that their interests were attacked, and tore down the placards in which the scheme was announced to the public. The excitement caused by Godfrey's death, and by the discovery of Coleman's papers, was then at the height. A cry was, therefore, raised that the penny post was a Popish contrivance. The great Doctor Oates, it was affirmed, had hinted a suspicion that the Jesuits were at the bottom of the scheme, and that the bags, if examined, would be found full of treason. The utility of the enterprise was, however, so great and obvious that all opposition proved fruitless. As soon as it became clear that the speculation would be lucrative the Duke of York complained of it as an infraction of his monopoly, and the courts of law decided in his favour."—(History of England, vol. i. p. 385.)*

* In the commencement of his description of the Post Office Lord Macaulay has fallen into an error: He says, "The mode in which correspondence was carried on between distant places may excite the scorn of the present generation; yet it was such as might have moved the admiration and envy of the polished nations of antiquity or of the contemporaries of Raleigh and Cecil."—(vol. i. p. 384.)

Gibbon's description of the Roman posts does not justify such a statement. He says, "The advantage of receiving the earliest intelligence, and of conveying their orders with celerity, induced the emperors to establish throughout their extensive dominions the regular institution of posts. Houses were everywhere erected, at the distance only of five or six miles; each of them was constantly provided with forty horses, and by the help of these relays it was easy to travel an hundred miles in a day along the Roman roads."—Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, 1 vol. ed., p. 20.

There was nothing superior to this in England in the reign of Charles II. Lord Macaulay states himself that the English mails only travelled five miles an hour, forty miles less in a day than the Roman messengers.

Dockwray's services were rewarded with a pension of 200*l.* a-year, and his undertaking was the commencement of the London District Post, which, until 1854, remained a distinct branch of the General Post Office, and of which Dockwray was appointed controller. From this office he was removed on account of alleged mismanagement, and we hear nothing more of private enterprise entering into competition with the Government until 1708, when one Povey established a halfpenny post for London. This enterprise was suppressed by a lawsuit, and Povey was cast in damages.

In 1710, the 9 Anne, c. 10, was enacted, repealing the Statute 12 Car. c. 11, consolidating the post offices of the British empire into one department, and settling its organization upon the basis upon which it remained until the time of Sir Rowland Hill. In 1720, the cross-posts were farmed to Mr. Ralph Allen, who made great improvements in their management, the fruits of which he reaped in an annual sum of 12,000*l.* for more than forty years.

At this time the net revenue of the Post Office had increased from 10,000*l.* in 1653, 21,000*l.* in 1663, 65,000*l.* in 1685, to 90,000*l.* in 1701. Allen's lease fell in in 1764, when the net income was 157,571*l.*; and in 1783 it reached 159,025*l.*

In 1784, Mr. John Palmer, the manager of the theatre at Bath, gave an enduring impulse to the postal service. Mr. Palmer's position rendered him familiar with the condition of the great western road. On no other was so much wealth conveyed, and on none were so many robberies committed; so habitual were those of the mails that the Post Office officials commenced to regard them as necessary adjuncts to the postal system. The public were warned to send bank notes in halves, "since there were no other means of preventing robberies with effect, as it had been proved that the strongest carts that could be made, lined and bound with iron, were soon broken open by a robber;" and the functionaries remarked, with the philosophic intention of choosing the lesser evil of the two, "that when desperate fellows had once determined on a mail robbery, the consequence would be murder in case of resistance."

"Up to that time," says the Report, "the mail bags had been carried by post-boys on horseback, at an average rate, including stoppages, of from three to four miles an hour." Mr. Palmer, in his scheme submitted to Mr. Pitt in 1783, gives the following account of the then existing system:—

"The Post at present, instead of being the swiftest, is almost the slowest conveyance in the country; and though from the great improvement in the roads other carriers have proportionately mended their speed, the Post is as slow as ever. It is likewise very unsafe, as the frequent robberies of it testify; and to avoid a loss of this nature,

people generally cut Bank bills or bills at sight in two, and send the bills by different posts. The mails are generally entrusted to some idle boy without character, mounted on a worn-out hack, and who, so far from being able to defend himself or escape from a robber, is much more likely to be in league with him."—(p. 16.)

Mr. Palmer had observed that when persons at Bath were particularly anxious for the safe delivery of a letter, they sent it by coach as a parcel; he therefore proposed that the mails should be sent by passenger coaches, well horsed, and attended by an armed guard. "This plan," continues the Report, "was vehemently opposed by the officers of the Post Office, but Mr. Pitt saw its merits, and under his auspices an Act of Parliament was passed authorizing its adoption." One official stated that he regretted the "author of the plan should not first have informed himself of the nature of the business;" and said that the improvement which had taken place in the postal arrangements "has made them now almost as perfect as can be without exhausting the revenue arising therefrom;" and another predicted that Mr. Palmer's scheme, if adopted, "will fling the whole commercial correspondence of the country into confusion, and will justly raise such a clamour as the postmaster will not be able to appease."*

The following year, the net revenue of the Post Office increased to 264,109*l.*, thus giving a satisfactory reply to these false prophecies; and during a quarter of a century the mails were carried over an aggregate of seventy millions of miles without one case of mail robbery. Mr. Palmer was appointed Controller of the General Post Office Revenues, a place which enabled him to superintend the carrying out of his plan. This was soon made too hot for him, and in 1792 he retired upon a pension of 3000*l.*, a sum much below that for which he had stipulated. In 1813, after repeated and unsuccessful applications to the Treasury, he brought his case before Parliament, and received a grant of 50,000*l.*

Early in the year 1837, Sir Rowland Hill broached his plan of Penny Postage in a pamphlet termed "Post Office Reform." In 1796, the rates had been raised to a scale varying from 3*d.* to 9*d.* the single inland letter, but subsequently they were enhanced to one varying from 4*d.* to 1*s.* 8*d.*, giving an average charge of 9*d.* each letter. Sir Rowland instituted a comparison between the increase of population and private means of conveyance during the previous twenty years with that of the postal service. He found that had this kept pace with the former, its revenues should have shown an advance of 507,700*l.*, or if with the latter, of

nearly four times that sum ; whilst, on the contrary, he discovered in them a slight but steady diminution. Thus, in 1815, the population was 19,552,000 ; in 1835, 25,605,000. In the former year, the stage-coach duties produced 217,671*l.* ; in the latter, 498,497*l.* ; whilst the revenue of the Post Office had decreased from 1,557,291*l.* to 1,510,300*l.* At the time Sir Rowland Hill published his pamphlet, no accurate account of the number of letters that passed through the Post Office was kept, but he arrived at an approximate estimate from data supplied by the London District Post. He calculated the number of chargeable letters at about 88,600,000 ; of franked letters at 7,400,000 ; and of newspapers at 30,000,000 ; giving a total of about 126,000,000. The cost of distribution and management was altogether 696,569*l.*, and he found upon analysis that the expenditure depending upon the distance which the letters were conveyed was 144,000*l.*, and that not so depending was 282,000*l.* Applying to this the estimated number of letters passing through the Post Office, there resulted a probable cost of 81-100ths of a penny for each, of which 28-100ths was the cost of transit, and 56-100ths that of receipt and delivery. Taking into consideration, however, the greater weight of newspapers and the number of franked letters, the charge for transit became reduced to 9-100ths, or less than one-tenth of a penny. An estimate of the price of carrying a letter from London to Edinburgh gave an average cost of only 1-36th of a penny.

Sir Rowland Hill now proposed that the charge for postage should be made proportionate to the whole expense in the receipt, transit, and delivery of the letter, and in the collection of the postage. This, he maintained, should be made uniformly one penny, the same from every post town to every other post town in the United Kingdom, since it would take a ninefold weight to make the price of the carriage of a letter amount to one farthing.

The old method of charging for letters was by the number of sheets upon which they were written, and not by their weight—these charges also being excessive. The respect for the sanctity of private correspondence, which with such pains should be cultivated in Post Office servants, was constantly destroyed by the necessity of exposing letters to a strong light for the avowed purpose of ascertaining their contents. The high rates of postage encouraged illicit traffic in letters, induced a complicated method of keeping accounts, which proved a continual invitation to fraud, and diminished the postal revenues. To remedy these evils, Sir Rowland Hill advocated the adoption of his reforms, and, after a great deal of opposition, the new law came into operation on the 10th January, 1840.

In the debates in the House of Lords, on the 15th June and

18th December, 1837, Lord Lichfield, then Postmaster-General, said of Sir Rowland Hill's scheme—"Of all the wild and visionary schemes I have ever heard of, it is the most extravagant;" and again—"The mails will have to carry twelve times as much weight, and therefore the charge for transmission, instead of 100,000*l.* as now, must be twelve times that amount. The walls of the Post Office would burst, the whole area in which the building stands would not be large enough to receive the clerks and the letters."* Colonel Maberly said, in his evidence before the Postage Committee of 1843:—

"My constant language to the heads of the departments was:—'This plan we know will fail. It is your duty to take care that no obstruction is placed in the way of it by the heads of the department and by the Post Office. The allegation, I have not the least doubt, will be made at a subsequent period that this plan has failed in consequence of the unwillingness of the Government to carry it into fair execution. It is our duty as servants of the Government to take care that no blame eventually shall fall on the Government through any unwillingness of ours to carry it into proper effect.'"

He said, also:—

"After the first week, it was evident, from the number of letters being so much below Mr. Hill's anticipations, that it must fail, inasmuch as it wholly rested upon the number of letters, for without that you could not possibly collect the revenue anticipated."—(*Encyclopædia Britannica*, vol. xviii. p. 411.)

Sir Rowland Hill was, for the purpose of superintending the development of his reforms, made an officer of the Treasury, and not of the Post Office. Here he was placed to great disadvantage. All his measures had to be proposed through the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and Mr. Goulburn, who then held that office, was unfavourable to them. They were commenced at a time of great commercial depression, but their results soon silenced, if they did not convince their opponents. The chargeable correspondence of the country in the two following years increased from 88,000,000 to 231,000,000, and the gross revenue showed an advance of 65 per cent. Since that time the business and income of the Post Office have been gradually augmenting, the statistics given in the six reports before us being as follows:—

Years.	Number of Letters.	Gross Revenue.
1854	443,000,000	£2,597,700
1855	450,000,000	2,620,000
1856	478,000,000	2,764,606
1857	502,000,000	2,928,858
1858	523,000,000	2,975,939
1859	545,000,000	3,197,258

* *Mirror of Parliament*, Debates, June 15th and December 18th, 1837.

Showing in each year a considerable advance per cent. in the income, and the traffic to be nearly sevenfold what it was twenty years ago.

In looking over the foregoing historical summary of that which must be acknowledged to be the most perfect of Government Departments, our readers must have been struck with the examples of incompetence and prejudice which it discloses. They will have noticed that the Government monopoly of the Post Office, against which we are contending, was only created in the reign of Charles I. At that time the House of Commons pronounced it to be unconstitutional, and the judges more definitely held it to be void in law. They will also have seen, that after the adoption of the Post Office by the State, every successive improvement has been introduced into its system, not only by private persons, but in imitation and on account of improvements already made in analogous undertakings by private enterprise. It was the comparative safety secured by sending letters by passenger coaches, which turned the attention of Mr. Palmer to the establishment of mail coaches, and it was the increase in coach traffic which induced Sir Rowland Hill to speculate upon the condition of the postal service, and led to the introduction of his reforms. Even within the walls of the Post Office itself, the power of private enterprise has been felt. The Money Order Department originated and continued for more than forty years the speculation of three Post Office clerks, trading as "Stow and Company." It was commenced in 1792; it was made an official branch in 1838; it yielded a net income of 29,115*l.* in 1859; and remains an example of the intelligence of public servants when engaged in furthering their own interests, of the supine carelessness of Government, and of the success of private undertakings.

The power of the officers of the Government to open and examine the correspondence of persons suspected of offences is sanctioned by law, but must be universally condemned, except in very peculiar cases. In a proclamation of 1632, concerning the Postmaster of England for Foreign Parts,* it is stated by the king "how much it imports his State and this realm that the secrets thereof be not disclosed to foreign nations, which cannot be prevented if a promiscuous use of transmitting foreign letters and packets should be suffered;" and in a letter from Sir John Coke to Lord Conway this motive for the monopoly of the Government is more clearly set forth. He says:—

"Your lordship best knoweth what account we shall be able to give in our places of that which passeth by letters in or out of the land,

if every man may convey letters under the covers of merchants to whom and what place he pleaseth.”*

A communication is also cited from an Englishman to a Scotch correspondent in Mr. Lang's "Historical Summary of the Post Office in Scotland," in which it is stated, "I hear the posts are waylaid, and all letters taken from them and brought to Secretary Cooke."

During the Commonwealth the practice of opening letters was continued, inducing upon one occasion a formal remonstrance by the Venetian Ambassador, and in the Act of 1657 it is affirmed to be one great advantage of a State Post Office that it had been found one of the best means "to discover and prevent many dangerous and wicked designs which have been, and are daily contrived against the peace and welfare of this Commonwealth, the intelligence whereof cannot well be communicated but by letter of escript."—(Scobell's Acts and Ordinances, 1657, p. 511.)

After the Restoration, in a proclamation of Charles II. it is ordered that "no one, except by the immediate warrant of our principal Secretaries of State, shall presume to open any letters or packets not directed unto themselves."

By the Statute, 9 Anne, c. 10, the power of the Secretaries of State to open letters was confirmed, and it is enacted that after the 1st day of June, 1711, "no person or persons shall presume to open, detain, or delay any letter or letters after the same is or shall be delivered into the General or other Post Office, and before delivery to the persons to whom they are directed, or for their use, except by an express warrant in writing under the hand of one of the principal Secretaries of State for every such opening, detaining, or delaying."

For nearly a century after the passing of this Act, no record was kept of the granting of such warrants, but in the numerous State trials of the period we may trace the progress of corruption.

In 1723, at the trial of Bishop Atterbury, certain copies of letters were adduced in evidence, sworn to be correct by a Post Office clerk, who had seen the originals opened and read at the Post Office. The bishop asked if he had had an express warrant under the hand of the Secretary of State for such opening; but, upon a debate upon this question, the House of Lords determined that—

"It is the opinion of this House that it is inconsistent with the public safety, as well as unnecessary for the prisoner's defence, to suffer any further inquiry to be made upon this occasion into the warrants which have been granted by the Secretaries of State for the stopping and opening of the letters which should come and go by post, or into the methods that have been taken by the proper officers at the Post Office in obedience to such warrants."—(Lords' Journals, xxii., 183—186.)

* Encyclopædia Britannica, vol. xviii., p. 404.

In 1735 complaints were made by several members of the House of Commons that their letters had been opened. A committee having been appointed to inquire into the matter, they condemned the practice when employed against members of the House, and pronounced it to be a breach of privilege. Before the Committee of Secrecy upon the conduct of Robert, Earl of Orford, it appeared from the evidence of the Secretary of the Post Office, that 45,675*l.* had been paid to him without voucher or account, and that the greater portion of this sum had been employed by that corrupt minister in defraying the expenses of a private office, in which a legion of spies and informers were maintained, for the purpose of examining suspected correspondence, both foreign and domestic.

The very letter-carriers were impregnated with this inquisitorial spirit. They opened letters with impunity, and gave their ill-acquired information with pride upon several Crown prosecutions. The Secretaries of State not only employed their prerogative in matters of public concern, but became the willing instruments of private tyranny. In the Report from the Secret Committee of 1844 (p. 12), an instance is mentioned in which, "at the request of A, a warrant issued to permit the eldest son of A to open and inspect any letters which the youngest son of A might write to either of two females, one of whom that youngest son had imprudently married."

In 1806, Lord Spencer, then Secretary for the Home Department, introduced the custom of recording the dates and nature of these warrants, and since 1822 the warrants themselves have been preserved. They form an admirable instalment towards an official literature for this country. The whole number of warrants for opening letters at the Post Office from 1806 until 1844 (the time at which the Secret Committee was sitting) was 323, of these 53 had been granted within the previous three years. Since the commencement of the century 372 warrants had been issued affecting the correspondence of 724 persons, and eight of these, though they applied to some particular object, were not restricted to the letters of any definite number of persons, these being in direct contravention of the statute of Anne. The Secret Committee of 1844 reported that the warrants issued from 1799 up to that time might be classified as follows:—

Bank of England	13	Revenue	5
Bankruptcy	2	Foreign Correspondence	20
Murder, theft, fraud	144	Letters returned	7
Treason, sedition	77	Address copied	1
Prisoners of war	13	Forged Frank	1
Uncertain 89*			

* Report from the Secret Committee on the Post Office, p. 11 (1844).
[Vol. LXXIV. No. CXLV.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. XVIII. No. I. F

The last item may possibly astonish our readers. In a period within the memory of many now living eighty-nine warrants have, *for uncertain reasons* been granted, for the violation of the sanctity of private correspondence by English statesmen.

It may perhaps be remembered that the Secret Committee, from the report of which we have been quoting, was appointed by the House of Commons on account of an event which happened in 1841, under the superintendence of Sir James Graham. In that year, the letters of an Italian refugee were opened at the General Post Office, under warrants from the Secretary for the Home Department, and their contents were communicated to a foreign Government. A cry of indignation went throughout the length and breadth of the land. The occurrence was considered a national disgrace, and although the abusers of power received a merited amount of censure, its unhappy victims were numbered among the martyrs of Italian liberty. The Committee finally reported that this power should *not* be abrogated; that were the right of the Secretary of State to open letters at the Post Office denied, it would be equivalent to advertising to every criminal and conspirator against the public peace that he might employ the Post Office with impunity.

As long, therefore, as the Post Office remains a Government Department, this power is to continue. It came into use as soon as the Post Office was usurped by the State, and will be employed as long as that usurpation lasts. Surely no man could advocate this custom in England, more fitted as it is for the atmosphere of Naples. It almost amounts to a proof, that we who have been for so long idolizing the spirit of freedom, have, like the Athenians of old, been worshipping an unknown God.

The Post Office is in no case answerable for the safety of a letter. There is no chance of compensation for the sufferer from the neglect or fraud of the Post Office servants. Even registration does not involve postmasters in the responsibilities of ordinary carriers. Article 7 of the Regulations published in February, 1859, says:—

“Registration of inland letters or book packets may be made by the prepayment in stamps of a fee of 6*d.*, in addition to the ordinary postage. Such registration makes it practicable to trace a letter from receipt to delivery. A receipt must be obtained by the sender at the post office window, and a receipt is required from the receiver by the letter-carrier on delivery.”

But there is no word of responsibility; and it is a legal doctrine that the Post Office, being a branch of the public service, instituted by statute and administered by Government, postmasters receive no hire from, and enter into no contract with, private in-

dividuals. In the case of *Laue v. Cotton*,* tried in the reign of William III.,—

“The plaintiff brought an action upon his case against the defendant (Sir John Cotton), as Postmaster-General, for that, that a letter of the plaintiffs, being delivered into the said office to be sent by the post from London to Worcester, by the negligence of the defendants in the execution of their office, was opened in the office, and divers Exchequer Bills therein enclosed were taken away *ad damnum*.”

Mr. Justice Gould, in delivering judgment, said of the Post Office: “This office is founded in Government and reposed in the king, and it cannot (*therefore*) be answerable for defaults.”—(p. 648.)

In the case of *Rowning v. Goodchild*,† which was an action brought in 1773, by a resident in Ipswich, against the postmaster of that town, for neglecting to deliver a certain letter, the Court held—

“That the question in the present case doth not arise upon any private contract, nor is it like the case of a common carrier, but must be determined upon construction of the Statute 9 Anne, c. 10, which was made for the general benefit of the people of these kingdoms, and with a political view to the better securing the revenue arising from the General Post Office.”—(p. 452.)

In 1778, one Whitfield brought an action against Lord le Despencer,‡ the then Postmaster-General, to recover damages for the loss of a bank note, stolen by one of the sorters out of a letter delivered into the Post Office; and Lord Mansfield, differing from an opinion of Chief Justice Holt, said:—

“Now with all deference to so great an opinion, the comparison between a postmaster and a carrier, or the master of a ship, seems to me to hold in no particular whatsoever. The postmaster has no hire, *enters into no contract*, carries on no merchandise or commerce. But the post is a branch of revenue, and a branch of police erected by Act of Parliament. As a branch of revenue there are great receipts, but there is also a great surplus of benefit and advantage to the public arising from the fund. As a branch of police it puts the whole correspondence of the kingdom (for the exceptions are very trifling), under Government, and entrusts the management and direction of it to the Crown and officers appointed by the Crown. There is no analogy, therefore, between the case of the postmaster and a common carrier.”

We see, therefore, that the irresponsibility of the Post Office is a consequence of its connexion with the State. What guarantee is there of care in the transmission of letters when neglect entails

* Lord Raymond's Reports, i. 646.

† Cowper's Reports, 754.

‡ Wilson's Reports, iii. 443.

no penalties? Carelessness is the cause of as much loss as crime. There is no remedy to be had for the former in Post Office servants; for the latter, there is punishment, but to inflict it is an extra loss and no compensation to the injured parties. It entails upon them the expense of a criminal prosecution, but neither restores to them their property nor any equivalent for it. Were the postal service in private hands the public could have redress. The proprietors of the Post Office would then receive hire, enter into a contract, and be liable to the consequences of its breach.

In its present condition, the British Post Office is the most gigantic undertaking of the kind which exists, or has ever existed. With a few trifling exceptions, it has the exclusive right of conveying the whole correspondence of the United Kingdom. It also carries newspapers and books, and undertakes the remittance of small sums of money; but it is only with regard to letters that it enjoys a monopoly. By means of railways, stage coaches, omnibuses, mail carts, boats, and foot messengers, letters and parcels are received and despatched daily in almost every portion of the country. In Scotland and Ireland, however, there are a few places in which the deliveries are limited to twice or thrice in the week. By packets and private ships mails are despatched at short intervals to nearly every part of the globe. In the United Kingdom there are 11,412 post offices, of which 825 are head offices and 10,587 sub-offices. To these must be added 1985 road letter-boxes, making a total of 13,370 receptacles for letters, as compared with 4518 existing before the introduction of the Penny Postage. The mails are now conveyed on each week day a distance of 140,391 miles, about 7500 miles more than in 1858; 35,674 miles by rail, at an average cost of 9½*d.* a mile; 32,936 miles by coach, omnibus, and cart, at an average of 2¼*d.* a mile; 2817 miles by packets and boats between different parts of the United Kingdom, at 9½*d.* a mile; and 68,904 miles on foot, at 1½*d.* a mile.

During the year these mails carried 545,000,000 letters, making an average of 18 to each person in the United Kingdom—22 to each in England, 16 in Scotland, and 7 in Ireland, showing an increase of 4¼ per cent. over 1858, and of 700 per cent. over 1839. The number of these letters which were returned to their writers, owing to failure in attempts to deliver them, was 1,900,000, being about 200,000 more than in the previous year, and equal to one in 280 of the whole number of letters. "Nearly half the non-deliveries," says the Report, "was owing to the letters being addressed either insufficiently or incorrectly, more than 11,000 having been posted *without any address at all.*"—"Sixth Report," p. 16.) The number of

registered letters was 1,400,000, and in 785 cases they did not reach their destination. About 70,500,000 newspapers were passed through the Post Office, and 470,000 of them were lost, being about 1 in 150. Money orders to the amount of 13,250,930*l.* and the number of 6,969,108 were issued. "The unclaimed money orders," says the Report, "last year amounted to 2013*l.*, which according to the established rule, was carried to the fund for assisting the officers of the department in insuring their lives. In proportion to the whole number of orders there were twice as many unclaimed in Ireland as in England or Scotland."—(p. 18.) There was an increase of 4½ per cent. over the money orders issued in 1858; and on an average 1 to every 4 persons in the United Kingdom—1 to every 3 in England, 1 to every 6 in Scotland, and 1 to every 13 in Ireland—and whilst in the former countries the Money Order Department yields a large profit, in the latter it costs the Government a considerable yearly sum. This work is performed by a staff numbering 24,608 persons. Of these about 3300 belong to the London District, and in England and Wales alone there are 14,806 provincial officers. The General Post Office is divided into seven departments, namely, the secretary's, the solicitor's, the mail, the receiver and accountant-general's, the money order, the circulation, and the surveyor's offices. In Dublin and Edinburgh the same divisions are, of course, upon a smaller scale, preserved. The officers of the Post Office in the United Kingdom, in 1858 and 1859, are thus classified in the Sixth Report:—

OFFICERS IN BRITISH ISLES :	On 31st Dec. 1858.	On 31st Dec. 1859.
Postmaster-General	1	1
Secretary, Assistant Secretaries, and Secretaries for Ireland and Scotland	5	5
Other Superior Officers; viz., Heads of Departments, Chief Clerks in the Metropolitan Offices, &c.	18	18
Surveyors	15	15
Postmasters	11,235	11,398
Clerks, &c.	1,632	1,594*
Mail Guards and Porters	197	209
Letter-Carriers, Messengers, &c.	11,076	11,363
Marine Mail Officers	7	7
	<hr/> 24,186	<hr/> 24,608

A comparison of the number of Post Office servants in 1859 with what it was rather less than a century ago, gives some notion of the increase of the business of the department.

* The decrease in the force of clerks is mainly attributable to the revision of the Money Order Office.

“The office at this time” (1764), says the First Report, “though much increased since its first establishment, was of very insignificant proportions compared with those it has since assumed. Thus the records show that in 1763 the Secretary had one clerk and two supernumerary clerks assigned to him, whereas the Secretary’s office now comprises sixty-seven clerks. The Receiver-General had two clerks, and the Accountant-General a deputy and one clerk, though these two offices (now united in one) require at present the services of fifty-one clerks. Two clerks only were employed to open ‘dead and insolvent letters;’ but the like duties now occupy the time of thirty-five clerks.” —(p. 14.)

The efficiency of the postal system is not in proportion to its extent. As a specimen of the method in which it is managed, and as an example of its arrangements, we have only to look at the central establishment in St. Martin’s-le-Grand, and at the working of the London district. From the period of its origin by Dockwray until 1854, the London District Post remained a separate institution. In that year it was absorbed into the General Post, but by the division of the metropolis into departments, which are treated as different towns, by the vast number of letters delivered in them, equalling the whole quantity in England and Wales twenty years ago; and by the frequency of the deliveries themselves it may still be considered as a distinct concern. Besides this, the London Office is very absurdly made the heart of the whole postal service. From and to it flows all the correspondence of the country, even in its passage between neighbouring places, and any deficiency in it is necessarily felt in every part of the kingdom from Land’s End to the Orkneys.

In 1814 the old General Post Office in Lombard-street was discovered to be too small for the business there to be transacted. Ten years afterwards, the building in St. Martin’s-le-Grand was erected, and in 1820 it was opened for public use. Since that time, the work to be done has become sevenfold more extensive, but no efficient methods have been adopted for supplying the needed amount of room. Lord Lichfield’s prophecy, inspired by official blindness, has, by the same influence, been fulfilled: ‘To use his lordship’s elegant metaphor, “the walls of the Post Office are bursting; the whole area in which the building stands is not sufficient to hold the clerks and the letters.” For years the attempt has been made to adapt the postal service to the building, and not the building to the postal service. For more than a quarter of a century the country has been edified by a series of illustrations on the part of its Government of the condemned methods of piecing old garments with fresh cloth, and of putting new wine into old bottles. Chambers have been hung from the ceiling of the Post Office, or excavated in its walls, in frantic

efforts for more room; yet still there is no adequate space for the business to be done. The want of room prevents a sufficient number of persons from being employed, and a further want of ordinary mechanical appliances prevents the labour of those who are employed from being economized.

At the time for despatching the mails, the letters by thousands are cast through apertures in the letter-boxes into a trough. A shoot would convey them quickly, and without trouble, to that part of the edifice where they could be faced and stamped. But there is no shoot, and instead, they are swept by porters, with carpet brooms, into a multitude of baskets. After this delicate treatment, they are brought to tables (which are too short for the purpose) to be faced, *i.e.*, turned with their directions upwards. They are next carried to tables where the date and hour of their delivery into the Post Office are stamped upon them; then again to other tables where the postage stamp is obliterated; then again to other tables where they are sorted into divisions; and then again even to other tables, where they are arranged for various postal towns. All this stamping and obliterating is done by hand by persons who would be too few to do it properly even with the aid of machinery. We are glad, however, to find it stated with some *naïveté* in the Sixth Report:—"After many efforts, some machines have at length been constructed, which are found in practice to perform the work of stamping and obliterating more quickly and perfectly than by hand."—(p. 9.)

The circulation room is still in the same condition in which it was before the introduction of the penny postage system. It was then, as we have already stated, the practice to submit letters to a strong artificial light, for the purpose of detecting whether they contained enclosures. The light of day was necessarily excluded, and with it a great portion of necessary atmosphere. The apartment still remains dark and ill-ventilated, although the reasons for its being so have long since ceased. We are here again met with promises from the Postmaster-General. He says in the Sixth Report of the establishment in St. Martin's-le-Grand:—

"It is fortunate that the original construction, although in many respects very defective, allowed of very considerable additions being made to the available room, and at a very moderate cost; while either by an additional story, or by carrying the building over the area reserved for the railway vans, abundant space may be obtained for all requirements within the extremest range of probability."—(p. 8.)

It is not strange, under these circumstances, that the mails should so often be delayed, or that the General Post Office should be contemplated with such growing discontent.

In the Second Report (1856) the Duke of Argyll broached his

plan of District Post Offices in London, which, however, has not yet been fully carried out. He says—

“To remove the obstacles arising out of the enormous magnitude of London—obstacles constantly on the increase—the whole metropolis has been divided into ten districts, and each district will be treated in many respects as a separate town. Thus, instead of all district post letters being carried, as at present, from the receiving-houses to the office in St. Martin’s-le-Grand, there to be sorted and re-distributed, the letters will be carried to the principal office of the district in which they are posted, and being sorted there, will be distributed at once to the different districts to which they are directed. To secure,” the Report continues, “so great an advantage, it is perhaps not unreasonable to hope that the public may be willing to give its ready co-operation. The whole plan of acceleration in the delivery of the General Post letters, depends upon the first assortment being effected previously to the arrival of the mails. As London will, for postal purposes, be in effect divided into ten towns, it is essential to the complete working of the plan that the letters should be directed accordingly. For this purpose it would suffice, if to the address there were appended initial letters indicating the district, as N. for the Northern, S.W. for the South Western.”—(p. 10.)

This is simply a plan for making the public do the work of the Post Office. It imposes upon them the necessity of acquiring, with considerable labour, an accurate knowledge of the districts into which it may please the Postmaster-General to divide the city. In practice, it is found that the wrong initial letters are often appended to letters, greatly increasing the number of those returned,* and that when the right ones have been used, they have been disregarded by the Post Office servants; in some cases, letters inscribed with N.W. or S.W. having been dispatched to North or South Wales. To diminish the work in the London districts, newspapers have been made liable to an extra charge if posted within three miles of St. Martin’s-le-Grand. The consequence of this is, that vast numbers of them are taken to the suburbs for posting, the Post Office thus bringing upon itself the expense of transmitting them a much longer distance than necessary.

An agitation has also been commenced in behalf of the Post Office servants of all grades. It has been stated, with considerable force on their side, that nearly ninety per cent. of them, employed in the subordinate positions of messengers, letter-carriers, or sorters, have had their hours of labour so much increased, and at the same time their wages so much diminished, that these situations no longer offer inducements to men of ordinary education

* There were 200,000 more returned letters last year than the year before.—(Sixth Report, p. 15.)

and character. These three classes of persons number about three thousand, the messengers receiving 10s. a week, the letter-carriers from 18s. to 23s. a week, and the sorters from 30s. to 2*l*. Of these nearly three-fourths, it is said, are letter-carriers or messengers, for some of the sorters are required to do the work of clerks, whilst the letter-carriers and sorters are employed indiscriminately in sorting or taking out the mails. In an able article in the *Times* newspaper, which has adopted the cause of these officers, their daily life is described :—

"These men come to the Post Office at five in the morning, and work at sorting the letters and papers till eight, some of them finding time in the interval to swallow down their breakfast in the shape of a lump of dry bread. At eight o'clock they have to take out the letters for delivery till eleven or twelve, and they are then supposed to have the interval between twelve and five in the evening to themselves, though they must not be out of the way, as they are held to be liable for duty when called upon. At five they return to the Post Office, where they again sort the letters, and again at eight take them out for delivery until nine or ten. Nominally, the messengers are not supposed to sort or take out letters at all; but, in fact, as these men are employed at only 10s. a week, their number has been increased, and they discharge each duty as much as the letter-carriers themselves. The great chiefs of the Post Office, indeed, endeavour to excuse this dreadful under-payment by asserting that those employed at 10s. can make a shilling extra by over-hours. But in effect this is denied by the working chiefs of departments, who allege that the men cannot always find this extra work to do, and that as an over-tasked and ill-fed man has not an inexhaustible fund of energy in him, those who do work over-hours one night, are next day unable to get through their regular labour, and the public service suffers in consequence. Again, it is said that the letter-carriers *de facto* work at tailoring or job work of various kinds, in the interval they are supposed to have to themselves between twelve and five in the day; but this, if true, only shows that the men are driven to seek other aids besides their regular Government duty in the Post Office to keep life and soul together. The wages were formally some three or four shillings a week higher, but without the least reason assigned they have been reduced, and the characters of the class of persons employed have sunk in proportion. Hard worked and ill-paid, the men are discontented and sullen—they are indifferent to the proper performance of their duties, and hold the threat of dismissal in utter disdain, feeling sure, as they say, that even stonebreaking on the roadside would not be harder labour and scarcely less remunerative. These things have borne their natural fruit; and there is no concealing the fact that Post Office robberies are certainly not on the decrease, though they are less discovered than formerly, notwithstanding the immense extent to which the system of espionage has been developed. It may seem incredible, yet we are informed on the most reliable authorities, that there is scarcely a person at the General Post Office,

from letter-carriers up to heads of departments, who has not, at some time or other, been suspected and placed under the surveillance of Post Office detectives. Many, indeed, have even been actually searched for missing letters specially marked and sent through their division to detect their supposed felonies. No one can tell with accuracy the extent to which this espionage has been carried. It is only felt to be everywhere and shrewdly guessed to cost a far larger sum for its maintenance, than would, if divided among the salaries of the subordinate officials, be sufficient to secure men of a higher class and better character."—(*Times*, Friday, March 30, 1860.)

The clerks have contented themselves by presenting a foolish memorial against promotion by merit to the Postmaster-General. To these statements of the *Times*, Lord Elgin, in the Sixth Report, replies in a strain which we do not know whether to refer to Uncle Toby's category of the *retort courtois* or that of the *lie direct*. He says—

"Your Lordships will remark, that the average length of service at which persons attached to the London Office retired on pension last year was twenty-six years.

"All the reports concur in speaking highly of the general conduct of the officers during the past year, though, of course, in so great an establishment there will be exceptions."—(P. 38.)

And, again :—

"With reference to statements which sometimes appear in the newspapers regarding the condition of the letter-carriers and other officers of the department, I would appeal to the good feeling of those who conduct the public press to be very cautious in promulgating reports which may tend to render those officers discontented and restless, and to produce evils which happily have hitherto existed only in imagination. It is scarcely necessary to remark that order and discipline must be maintained among the large number of men in the service of the Post Office, even (if necessary) by the infliction of heavy punishment, however the misconduct may have originated, and by whomsoever it may have been excited; and that a grave responsibility rests on those who, by heedless remarks in influential organs of publication, may produce evils, the consequences of which must fall on working men, whose very livelihood may be at stake. The letter-carriers belong in the main to the same class of society, a portion of which was lately led, by exaggerations and false reasoning, into the folly and misery of the strike among the builders. The present body of the letter-carriers are, I feel sure, too intelligent and too well aware of the many benefits they enjoy to be worked upon by misrepresentations; but it would be too much to expect that this is the case with all of them."—(P. 39.)

"While on this subject, I may state that at the London Office the rate of wages for the lowest class of letter-carriers ranges from 18s. per week to 25s., each one, though necessarily under twenty-one years of age at the time of admission, beginning at 18s., and advancing

1s. per annum, supposing him to be diligent and well-conducted, until he reaches 25s., and always having a prospect, as promotion now in all cases depends on merit alone, of rising to a class of sorters, or even, if qualified, to one of clerks.

“Besides this payment in money, which, it should be observed, is subject to no uncertainty from change of season or state of trade, every letter-carrier is partly supplied with clothing, has gratuitous medical attendance and medicine, is secured a pension in old age, and receives assistance in insuring his life for the benefit of his family.

“As respects the amount of labour, the limit aimed at is eight hours per day; notice being given, that if any one finds his work occupy more than that time, he is at full liberty to apply for inquiry and rectification.

“Lastly, every letter-carrier has, once in each year, a fortnight’s holiday, without any deduction from his income.”—(P. 40.)

It is also stated in a note that there are a few auxiliaries attending for five hours in the day who are nominally paid 10s. a week, but who, as they generally supply the place of absentees, and attend for seven hours in the day, are actually paid 16s. a week, and are appointed to regular places as vacancies occur. The Report continues:—

“There need not be the least difficulty in procuring, at the present wages, honest, intelligent, and industrious young men, perfectly qualified for the office of letter-carrier: and I may add, that in cases of dismissal—happily a rare occurrence, considering the number of men employed—the most strenuous efforts are often made to obtain re-admission to the service.”—(P. 40.)

These pictures are certainly rather different. The latter, deliberately drawn by a great officer of State, and sanctioned by his name, must carry more weight with it than the one produced by an anonymous author, however ingenious, even in the *Times*. No one thinks of painting in glowing colours the trials and wrongs of railway porters or telegraph boys, because with them competition is open, and should they find their work too great, or their pay too little, they are at liberty to seek for better places. It is because these Post Office servants are Government officials that an excitement is got up among them, that they are invited to take measures, which would have the effect, at least for a time, of throwing the whole country into confusion, and that the public are called upon to arbitrate in a matter, to the details of which they have neither time, inclination, nor opportunities to attend.

The Postmaster-General does not refer to the system of espionage, which is asserted to be carried on at the Post Office, and, we fear that this is, in truth, one of the corruptions so plenteously introduced into the Postal service by the State. The practice in itself is mean and contemptible. We had almost condemned it as *un-English*; but deeper investigations into the

institutions of our country induce us continually to modify the applications of that term.

There are two arguments which are sometimes brought forward in defence of the State monopoly of the Post Office, which it may be well to consider. Sometimes it is said the Postal service is a means of taxation, and therefore should be maintained in the hands of Government; or, again, it is affirmed the Post Office is not so much a method of raising money as an institution intended for the benefit of the public, the advantages of which could not be so universally diffused were it not supported by the State, since some parts of it are not remunerative. These two opinions are mentioned by Serjeant Stephens in his Commentaries on the Laws of England. He says:—

“It is the opinion of Blackstone, that there cannot be a more eligible method than this (the Post Office) of raising money upon the subject, and he remarks, that it affords to both the Government and the people a mutual benefit, because the Government acquire a revenue, and the people do their business with greater ease, expedition, and cheapness than they would be able to do if no such tax and, of course, no such office, existed. Of late, however, the Post Office has been regarded less as a source of revenue than as affording an easy, ready, and cheap conveyance of correspondence for the convenience of the public, and the promotion of the commercial interests of the country.”
—(Vol. ii. p. 578.)

We deny the truth of the first part of this passage. Had the Government never interfered with the carriage of letters, there is no doubt whatever but that a system for their conveyance, every whit as efficient as that now existing, and probably more so, would have been flourishing in the country. We have seen how posts were originally called into existence by the ordinary action of a demand for their services, and how many of them, particularly those established in London by Dookwray and Povey, were not usurped by the State until their success and utility had excited its envy. In this, as in every other branch of commerce, the want would have produced the supply, and the Post Office would have been originated, like the Parcels Delivery Company, or the Great Western Railway. The assumption by the Government of the exclusive right of carrying persons or packages as a means of taxation, or for the promotion of the interest of the country, would not be more worthy of censure than the assumption for these reasons of the exclusive right of carrying letters. If the Post Office yields a revenue equal to the paper duty, the Parcel and Railway offices would yield one equal to the Income Tax, and if the interests involved in the safety of letters are too important to be entrusted to the care of private persons, those involved in the safety of merchandise and human beings are so,

à fortiori. But whether intended as a means of profit to the State, or of advantage to the public, the practice of our postal system must be condemned. In the first case, certain branches of it are maintained, as, for instance, the colonial posts, which, so far from bringing anything into the Exchequer, cost money; and, in the second, it is acknowledged to be in an extremely inefficient condition, and improvements; it is stated, cannot suddenly be made in it for fear of exhausting the revenue. The two principles cannot be combined; they destroy each other. Between them the authorities oscillate, and by them they are cruelly perplexed. With Captain Macheath they might sing—

“How happy could I be with either,
Were t’other dear charmer away.”

Thus we find Lord Elgin saying, in the Sixth Report:—

“For the further development of the provincial rural posts, a work in constant progress, the department has incurred an additional expense of more than 11,000*l.* per annum, but I trust that in time all this expense will be repaid, and will be found, in addition, to yield a fair profit. Indeed, had I not expected that the new or improved rural posts would be at least self-supporting, I should not have considered the expenditure justifiable.”—(Report G, 1860, p. 9.)

Whilst Mr. Hamilton, the Assistant Secretary to the Treasury, in giving his evidence before the *Committee of the House of Commons upon Packet and Telegraphic Contracts*; on 21st July, 1859, says, in answer to the question—

“Q. When you speak of political considerations in connexion with the colonies, are the Committee to understand that you think it necessary to conciliate the colonies by giving them postal facilities greater than would be required upon the mercantile principle of supply and demand. —A. Not to conciliate in that sense of the word, but I think there is an amount of consideration due to any important interests, what I should call a political consideration due to all interests like the colonial interests. A colony might reasonably complain if it was deprived of the advantages of postal communication, simply because that postal communication might not be remunerative; and that is what I mean by political consideration.”*—(Report of Committee, p. 27.)

Here we have the two principles laid down:—Posts cannot justifiably be established in England unless they pay, but they cannot justifiably be refused to the colonies, even if they cost money. An Englishman in Devonshire cannot have a post-office in his village unless it yields a revenue to the State at least equal to its expenditure, but a colonist in Van Diemen’s Land is not to be annoyed by paltry pecuniary considerations. The postal

It may be political consideration, but it certainly is not political economy.

system is inaugurating a new theory of colonial government worthy of a liberal and onlightened age. The old controversy which produced the American War has been reversed. The colonies are not to be taxed for the mother country, but the mother country is to be taxed for the Colonies.

The clear profit derived by the Post Office, as compared with its expenditure, is absurdly large. In 1859, there was an outlay of 2,312,114*l.*, and a profit of 1,135,960*l.*, about fifty per cent—ten times greater than the interest of money lent upon any decent security, five times as much as would satisfy sanguine private speculators, and twice as much as is made by the most successful retail dealer. There is no doubt but that much less net revenue would content any companies or company which might undertake the carriage of our letters, and that this would be done proportionately cheaper. There is not a telegraph or railway company in England which would not rejoice if it made a third of the profit which the Government makes out of the Post Office.

The Penny Postage and the charge for letters by weight were certainly great improvements; but the system of Sir Rowland Hill cannot justly be considered, as it seems sometimes to be, the *summum bonum* of letter rates. A charge of one penny for the carriage of all letters of a certain *weight* within the United Kingdom, irrespective of the distance which they have to be conveyed, is eminently arbitrary. It could only have been adopted as a means of taxation, and it is founded upon the consideration of only two of the three items of expense which make up the price of the conveyance of correspondence,—namely, receipt and delivery and weight in transit, the extent of the latter being ignored. No one in London who has written two letters, one to a friend residing in the same town as himself, and another to one in Edinburgh, can have failed, in affixing the stamps to them, to observe the unfairness of charging the same sum for carrying the one four hundred yards and the other four hundred miles, when the cost of transmission must in the one case be so much more than in the other. The uniform penny rate is one of those injustices which at the first blush appear to be just, but the unfairness of which becomes plainly manifest upon a little closer inspection. Take a parallel case. Suppose the Parcels Delivery Company or the Great Western Railway made all their charges for parcels or persons of the same weight the same, irrespective of the distance in the United Kingdom which they were to travel. Suppose they charged the same fare from London to Hanwell as from London to Birmingham, the whole community would exclaim against such an imposition, yet in the case of the Post Office this is gravely justified and maintained.

It costs the same to issue the tickets in both cases; it requires

an equal amount of labour or steam to carry parcels or people who are equally heavy; the only difference is that of distance, the one element which is ignored by the Post Office, and which is by far the most important of them all. Mr. Hamilton, in his evidence, before quoted, explains the cause of this. He says,—

“The view which I myself entertain is this, and in expressing it of course I mean that it should be regulated by a proper consideration for economy; but the view that I take is this: a certain amount is levied as Post Office revenue, and I think the first charge upon that revenue is to supply reasonably all portions of her Majesty’s dominions with postal communication. I do not regard the Post Office revenue as merely a question of Revenue.”—(Report of the Committee on Packet and Telegraph Contracts, p. 27.)

Which is simply an elaboration of the proverbial principle of robbing Peter to pay Paul. What right has the State to take more money from Peter for carrying his letter from the Temple to Brompton than is absolutely necessary, in order that it may take less from Paul for carrying his letter from Finsbury-square to Bath or Barbadoes? The same observation applies to newspapers. The average cost of transmission by post of a newspaper is $1\frac{1}{4}d.$, for a letter $\frac{1}{36}$ th of a penny, yet they are charged alike. Surely it is unjust to the letter sender to make him pay dearly in order that the newspaper sender may pay cheaply. Lord Elgin, in the Sixth Report, makes some remarks upon this point, which we are most willing to endorse, but his Lordship does not see that his reasoning strikes at the very root of our present system. He says,—

“It was urged that the wide circulation of newspapers is a very desirable object, as it tends to diffuse knowledge and to bind countries and colonies to each other. No one is more convinced of this than myself, or more highly appreciates the talent with which our newspaper press is conducted, or its general value. But the same remark on the diffusion of information and the strengthening of the ties of friendship applies to letters and books, and ease of attainment is also very desirable with regard to all other comforts and benefits, and in a yet higher degree as relates to the necessaries of life. It is of great importance, doubtless, that every person should be able to procure cheap bread, yet no one now proposes to establish State mills, at which corn should be ground at half the cost, or even at the full expense, without profit. In truth, the demand for special privileges in the case of newspapers, is, in my opinion, only one of the many forms of a claim for *protection*, and resolves itself into a proposal to tax the country at large for the advantage, real or imaginary, of a particular class, and is no more valid than a proposal to protect corn, hardware, or cottons.”—(P. 24.)

We may reverse his Lordship’s comparison without affecting

his argument, and maintain that if such a course would not be right in the case of newspapers, neither is it so in that of letters. In Sweden, they act upon the principle here condemned much more consistently than we do in England. In that country, there is no charge for postage, the whole expense of the Post Office being defrayed out of the general taxes. Whilst the Post Office remains a Government Department, the inhabitants of towns have peculiar claims upon it to carry their letters cheaply. They pay various rates and taxes which are unknown in the country, and, upon Mr. Hamilton's theory, they at least should receive advantage from their place of residence. This has been felt in Quebec, and there is an halfpenny post for the city and its environs. Were the postal service in private hands this anomaly would certainly disappear; for we have seen that, even in the time of Queen Anne, a halfpenny post was established in London.

The injustice of the postal system becomes even more apparent when we consider its foreign and colonial branches. The whole question of mail contracts has been so fully discussed in a late number of this Review, that it would be unnecessary, even if we had the space or inclination, at present to go into it. We shall now, therefore, content ourselves with exposing the vicious principle upon which they rest. Contracts have always been the *bêtes noires* of Government, and those of the Post Office attracted Parliamentary notice as early as 1788. At that time the Commissioners of Fees and Gratuities reported that, in the seventeen years previous, the cost of mail contracts had been 1,088,133*l.*, and they laid some stress upon the fact, that "many officers of the Post Office were owners of such packets, even down to the chamber-keepers." The mail service was then performed partly by means of hired vessels and partly by those which were the property of the Crown. The Commissioners proposed that the latter should be sold, and the whole provided for by public and competitive tender. The matter was again considered by the Finance Committee of 1798, which reiterated the recommendations of that of 1788. The war with France at this time much increased the average cost of the packet contracts. In 1771 it was 61,000*l.*; in 1797, 78,439*l.*; in 1810, 105,000*l.*; and in 1814, 160,603*l.* In the succeeding years of peace it fell to an average of 85,000*l.*, but in 1829 it reached 108,305*l.* Since then, expenses have been augmenting, abuses have been accumulating, Parliamentary Committees have been sitting, but no great improvement has been made. In 1853, Mr. Gladstone appointed a Committee to inquire into the mail and telegraphic contracts, and another in 1859, which has just made its report. The Postmaster-General does not refer very explicitly to the contracts for the carriage of inland mails, but he remarks, that only a few are carried at the ordinary parcel rates.

The subsidies now paid to persons and companies for the conveyance of foreign and colonial mails amount to nearly a million of money, and entail an actual loss of 514,900*l.* There are eight lines of communication, only one of which yields any profit. This is the notorious Churchward Contract between Dover and Calais, and Dover and Ostend, the nett revenue derived from which is 60,500*l.* The Peninsular line costs 17,500*l.*; the North American, 79,000*l.*; the West Indian, Pacific, and Brazilian, 215,500*l.*; the West Coast of Africa, 26,000*l.*; the Australian, 68,000*l.*; and the East Indian, 84,000*l.* In 1837, the Marine Mail Contracts were transferred from the management of the Post Office to that of the Admiralty, under the supervision of the Treasury, but the Committee of 1859 has recommended that they should again be returned to that of the Post Office.

“Since,” says the Sixth Report, “much of the cost of the packet service is incurred for other than postal purposes, only part of it, as already stated, is placed to the debit of the Post Office; the rule being, in those cases where the expense is not defrayed by the amount of sea postage, and where, therefore, it could not on postal grounds be justified, to debit the Post Office with such portion as is covered by the sea postage, the whole cost being charged to the Post Office when the amount of sea postage is equal to the expense.”—(p. 34.)

Now this has very much the appearance of cooking an account. The evidence given before the Committee on *Packet and Telegraphic Contracts* (1859), shows pretty clearly that these other than postal purposes are, as far as the Government is concerned, purely fictitious. It was in contemplation, it appears, at the time the care of the contracts was given to the Admiralty, to make the mail packets reserved ships of war, but it was of course discovered that vessels intended for “rapid postal service were not calculated in any way to carry guns.” Mr. Clifton, chief clerk to the Admiralty, says:—

“The Committee of 1853 reported that it would in all probability endanger the honour of the British flag if any of the vessels were employed in war as proposed, and we have discarded the idea wholly from our late contracts. Q. The Admiralty still superintend the building of vessels, do they not?—They do, so far as examining the plans before the vessels are laid down, in order to see that they are capable of performing the service contemplated in the contract.”—(pp. 2 and 3.)

The other than postal services (unless election bribery is included in the term) disappear upon inquiry. For more than twenty-years, therefore, the foreign and colonial mails upon seven of the eight existing lines have been carried at the expense, not even of letter writers, but of the whole community.

A large annual sum, now amounting to half a million, has been taken from our packets for the purpose of conferring a factitious appearance of prosperity upon our Colonies, for, notwithstanding the profound remarks of Mr. Hamilton, we must be permitted to believe that postal communication is a consequence, and not a cause of commercial activity. If it be wrong, as is maintained by Lord Elgin in his remarks upon the privileges of newspapers, to tax the whole country for the benefit of a certain class in one case, it must be so in another. If it be wrong to grant advantages at the expense of the whole community to A, B, C, in England, who read newspapers, it must also be wrong to grant like advantages on the same condition to X, Y, Z, in Australia, who read letters. Looking at the question, therefore, with the official eye of a Postmaster-General, we must condemn the whole system of unremunerative mail contracts, or at least of those which are not self-supporting. It cannot be denied that were there a sufficient demand for letters in the colonies, means for transmitting them without State assistance would be found. Persons and merchandise are as regularly conveyed to Australia and America by private agency as letters are by public. In 1856, whilst the Cunard Company was being paid 173,000*l.* a year, the Canadians contemplated the establishment of an ocean line of steamers. They petitioned the Treasury to consider their claims at the expiration of the Cunard contract, and received a reply in a Treasury minute, "that their lordships hoped at the expiration of the term of the Cunard contract to make more equitable arrangements with respect to the Canadian Mail Service." Without any further notice of the matter, however, in 1858 the Cunard contract was renewed until 1867. A line of steamers from Liverpool, which had been running for a long period, was willing to carry the mails without any subsidy, and for the sea postage alone. Sir Charles Trevelyan, the then Secretary to the Treasury, promised to afford them every opportunity for competing for the service; but instead of tenders being solicited, the contract was given to Mr. Lever, with a subsidy of 3000*l.* a voyage. The offers of the Montreal and Liverpool Companies were disregarded in favour of a gentleman whose only claim was that he was a supporter of Lord Derby, and the manner in which the public weal was considered in the matter, is amply proved by the fact, that the Montreal Packet Company have bound themselves to take the contract off Mr. Lever's hands, and to pay him an annual sum of 25,000*l.* for the privilege. Such is the price which the people of England have to pay for Mr. Lever's valuable influence during the late election.

There are some remarks made in his last Report by the Post-

master-General of the United States, quoted by Lord Elgin, and, in our opinion, applicable on both sides of the Atlantic. He says:—

“There are those who maintain that the adjustment of the mail service should be made subservient, if not subordinate, to the interests of commerce and of travel, and that the rapid and cheap conveyance of passengers, and the support of railway, steam-boat, and stage companies should be as carefully looked to and as anxiously provided for by the department as the transportation of mails. This is the fatal fallacy whose bitter fruits may now be seen in the enormous sums paid to these companies for mails, some of which are so light as scarcely to yield a revenue sufficient to defray the expense of carrying them on horse-back. Four-horse coaches are thus run upon border and unfrequented routes, and steam-boat lines are subsidized at an outlay which would afford postal communication to entire States, merely that the owners of these lines may be enriched, and that the public may have easy, certain, and economical modes of conveyance for themselves, their baggage, and their goods. Every dollar appropriated to such purposes is a perversion and abuse of the postal fund; and every one of these extravagant and semi-commercial contracts deprives whole communities in other sections of the country of the mail facilities to which they are entitled. The department, from this misinterpretation of its functions, is made virtually the carrier of passengers and merchandise, and, what is yet more to be deplored, a carrier without remuneration.”—(p. 36.)

But we can hope for no permanent amelioration in our contract system until its whole principle is changed; until it is placed upon the ordinary basis of commercial transactions; until, in fact, as regards the Post Office, it ceases to be the business of the State.

In conclusion, let us cast a glance at the ground we have gone over, and briefly look at the probable effects of throwing the postal service open to public competition and private enterprise. We have seen how a State Post Office is the last rag of the old political theory of Government interference with commerce. When Turgot inquired of the merchants of France how he could most promote their interest, they replied, with a truth which every fresh advance in science confirms, “*Pas trop gouvernez.*” We have seen how the opening of private letters, and the irresponsibility of the Post Office to the public for loss or delay are incidental to its assumption by the State. We have seen that it is full of mismanagement and maladministration; that it is unjustified as a means of taxation or as a means for promoting the welfare of the community; that it is unfair in the rates which it imposes, and corrupt in the contracts into which it has entered; that it places burdens upon the diffusion of knowledge; that it protects local interests at the expense of the whole nation; and that it is one more example of over-legislation. Were it in private

hands, like every other branch of the commerce of traffic, these evils would no longer exist. It is sheer nonsense to suppose that private enterprise, which has covered our country with canals and railways and webbed it with telegraph wires, which conducts the whole trade of the world, is incapable of carrying our letters. Once all these things were under the direction of the State, and, as we have seen, there is no more reason for the Post Office remaining so than for them. That it would be better managed, there can be no doubt. Those who superintended it would have a direct personal interest in its efficiency; the best possible guarantee for improvement. The postal system would probably not be undertaken as a whole. Why should not letters be carried like ordinary packages; as, in fact, they are now to a great extent, at an absurdly high rate. Responsibility would ensure care, competition would induce low rates, and self-interest would prevent abuses. Every successive improvement has been introduced into the Post Office by private persons; the last great improvement will be its abandonment to them altogether by the State.

The postal system cannot remain long unreformed. As regards it, one great advantage of direct taxation is secured. In these days, everybody writes letters, sees what he pays for their carriage, and knows what he expects to receive in return for his money. He can, in the homely phrase of Benjamin Franklin, himself once postmaster in New York, judge "what he pays for his whistle." No belief in the omnipotence of the State can here exist—that pernicious prejudice of the vulgar, both rich and poor. Yet we must acknowledge that the present state of the department contrasts favourably with its former condition, and encourages us to hope for the future.

"O passi graviora dabit deus his quoque finem."

—

ART. V.—ARY SCHEFFER.

Memoir of the Life of Ary Scheffer. By Mrs. Grote. Murray. 1860.

TO the greater part of the English public the subject of this memoir is only known as a painter, whose pictures denote a somewhat ascetic cast of mind, and are less admirable for richness of colour, or grace of outline, than for elevation of sentiment and

purity of expression. This, though it is and must be the highest aim of every artist who makes the human face and figure the subject of his pencil, is not in itself sufficient, and seldom wins popularity without the superadded charm of attractive colouring, and a design that speaks easily and readily to the spectator's imagination. For, it must be remembered, that pictures, like books, are not now produced for a select and educated few, nor for churches, where the many may gaze in awe-struck and ignorant wonder at the delineation of sacred persons and places respecting which their ideas are but vague and dim. In England, at the present day, an artist of any mark addresses men and women of all orders and degrees of intelligence and refinement; busy and respectable persons, whose lives are filled with the crowding cares, the bustling activity, and the multiform preoccupations of modern existence, and who have neither the time nor the inclination to appreciate a picture which requires much study and thought. It is remarkable how, year by year, our exhibitions show fewer mythological and scriptural pieces; the general taste is all in the direction of real, careful representation of the living Present (it may be questioned whether Mr. Holman Hunt's great picture will prove an exception); and those who watched the visitors to the Manchester Exhibition in 1857 will remember that the *greatest* crowd was not to be seen pausing before rare specimens of the old masters, the choice *chef-d'œuvres* of the finest collections,—but before "The Awakened Conscience," "The Death of Chatterton," and above all, Webster's "Slide." Yet there must have been some, if not many, who seeing there for the first time the "Beatrice and Dante," the "St. Monica with St. Augustin," and the four illustrations of "Faust," would instantly recognise the spirit of the true artist, and feel the wonderful power with which he has seized and expressed the most sacred as well as the most passionate feelings of the human heart; while the pure, spiritualized sentiment pervading each of these works would awaken the wish to enter more fully into the artist's mind, and to know if the lofty ideality of Ary Scheffer's pictures bore witness to any corresponding ideality in Ary Scheffer himself.

Such questions will find an answer ready and clear in the memoir before us, and that answer is untinged by the chagrin and disappointment which too often chill the natural longing to trace in the excellence of the thing done, the true reflection of the goodness of the doer. Mrs. Grote was intimately acquainted with Ary Scheffer the man, as distinct from the artist, and although she writes of him with the affectionate reverence of personal friendship, it is impossible to doubt the wise discrimination and truthful impartiality of her biographical sketch; and the character it represents is precisely that which the student of Scheffer's works

would instinctively wish for and expect. Very little of happiness, not one gleam of joyousness, seems to have lit up that toilsome life: the sensitive affections torn by affliction and bereavement, the high patriotic spirit chilled by disappointment and despair, Scheffer stands out as a sublime example of the patient endurance that ennobles, and of the self-abnegation and the suffering that purify as by fire. His early years were passed in that face to face battle with poverty by which so many great characters have been trained and chastened. His father, a German by birth, and a painter by profession, had been possessed of a competent fortune when he married Madlle. Lamme, the daughter of a Dutch gentleman, residing like himself at Dordrecht, in Holland; but when that country became part of the French Republic, M. Scheffer experienced the usual blessings of the First Consul's rule in the reduction of his income by one-half, so that on his death, in 1809 [or 1810], his widow found herself with three boys to educate, and a fortune of about 150,000 francs. Of these three, Ary, born in 1795, was the eldest. He had early shown a decided taste for the art his father cultivated, and which was probably one of the most powerful influences of his childhood, since it was pursued by both parents, his mother having attained to sufficient skill to eke out her slender means by the practice of miniature portrait painting, and, in after years, to copy the best pictures of both her sons, Ary and Henri. Before he was twelve years old, Ary had exhibited in the "salon" at Amsterdam "a picture which attracted much attention and approbation," and Henri evincing also a decided aptitude for painting, their widowed mother resolved to remove to Paris, where, in the beginning of 1811, Ary became a pupil in the atelier of Guerin, then high in repute as a teacher. For a short time before this, however, she had placed Ary *en pension* at Lille, for the sake of instruction in his art; and we may be allowed to quote a passage from one of the letters she wrote to him during his stay there, to show how well fitted was this excellent and high-minded woman to guide her son's mind, and incite him to set the highest aims before him. "I cherish the fond hope of seeing you, one day, take your place among the first painters of the age, perhaps of any age! Work diligently, be above all, modest and humble, and when you find yourself excelling others, then compare what you have done with nature herself, or with the 'ideal' of your own mind, and you will be secured, by the contrast, which will be apparent, against the effects of pride and presumption." Such exhortation might well kindle the enthusiasm of a boy who already loved art for itself; but enthusiasm, alas! will not supply the place of bread, and the *res angusta domi* compelled the young student to paint for the market, instead of complying with his father's last injunction, that

he should be withheld from composing pictures until he had obtained a greater mastery of anatomy and drawing; and before he was twenty, Ary had produced a number of saleable works, some few of which were exhibited in London in 1859. To the same end he practised portrait painting; and, in 1818, Lady Morgan writes of him as thus engaged at the Château de la Grange, painting the portrait of General Lafayette. Here, too, the ardent painter of three-and-twenty listened to the exciting political discussions of the dissatisfied Liberals who were wont to gather round the old Republican soldier, and vent their well-grounded disgust at the growing unconstitutionalism of the government of the Restoration, and the proceedings of "la chambre introuvable." We are not surprised to find both Ary and his brother enrolled among the Carbonari, taking an active part in the projected rising in Alsace, and running serious risks of life and liberty in the well-known conspiracy of BÉfort in 1822, upon which occasion, after the failure of the plot, Ary re-entered the town to look for his brother Henri, at the imminent peril of his own arrest. Four years of strenuous labour followed these youthful indiscretions; Scheffer's reputation rose: he had begun already to shake off the bonds of the old, moribund classical school to which his master Guerin belonged, and aspired to free the art of painting from the conventional fetters it had borne for the last half century, and restore it—to use his own words in 1828—to "its legitimate range, comprising the employment of colour, of effect, the faithful representation of the passions of the soul, of local scenes of every time."

In 1826, an event occurred which exercised a powerful influence on the whole of Scheffer's subsequent career; he was introduced by the Baron Gérard to the Orleans family, in the capacity of instructor of the children in drawing and painting; and the connection thus formed proved the commencement of a sincere and disinterested friendship, alike honourable to both sides, the history of which forms one of the most interesting portions of Mrs. Grote's work. As an instance of the firm spirit of independence which was characteristic of Scheffer, we give the following anecdote in her own words:—

"During one of the lessons which, at a later stage, Scheffer was giving to the children of the Royal family, one of the brothers forgot the respect due to the master, and used some unbecoming expressions towards him. Scheffer banished the offending Prince from the lesson. The Queen interposing to obtain a remission of this penalty, Scheffer resigned his appointment. The brothers and sisters were so grieved and discomposed at the loss of their master, that they begged and entreated him to resume his position; yet he was inexorable, until the

King, adding his own earnest endeavours, Scheffer was induced to give way, and he presided anew over their artistic studies. But he made it a condition that the mutinous pupil should never more join in the lesson, and he was accordingly excluded. I am afraid it must be added, that this incident was long remembered by both parties."

Equally resolute was Ary Scheffer when the claims of the artist and not the teacher were resisted by a royal will. The king had begged him to make a design for a monument to be placed in the little memorial chapel erected on the spot where the lamented Duke of Orleans met his death:—

"Scheffer willingly set to work, and after a time brought his drawing to show to his Majesty. Having attentively studied it, the King said, 'It is just the thing, and quite meets my wishes: Pradier shall execute this.' 'Pardon, sire,' replied Scheffer, 'mais Pradier n'en est pas capable.' 'Et pourquoi non?' inquired the King. 'Parceque, votre majesté, Pradier a fait, ces dernières années, trop d'objets de métier pour vendre.' 'Eh bien, n'importe! c'est toujours Pradier qui le fera.' 'Pardon, sire,' said Scheffer deliberately, 'mais Pradier-ne-le-fera-pas.' 'Comment ne le fera pas? Eh! si je l'ordonne?' 'Ce sera encore la même chose; la volonté de l'artiste aura plus d'autorité sur lui que les commandes du monarque même.' The King now became irritated at this quiet, yet firm resistance to his will, and losing his temper, he began to use somewhat strong language, so Scheffer quitted his presence."

Next morning, an officier d'ordonnance du Roi arrived, bringing the most apologetic messages from the king for his vehement behaviour; but although the question was renewed in many following interviews, and the king tried all his arts of persuasion, Scheffer was inflexible, and positively refused to consent to M. Pradier being employed.

The gifted Princess Marie found in her instructor not only a master anxious to develop her talents as an artist, but a devoted friend, who could sympathize with her eager aspirations after something higher than the narrow routine permitted to a carefully educated princess. We would gladly transfer to our pages the highly interesting sketch of her character from the pen of Scheffer himself, given by Mrs. Grote, but we must content ourselves with a few extracts, which may explain to English readers the reverence in which her memory is held by those who knew her rare worth and mourn her early death.

"She was brought up," writes Scheffer, "after the manner of all princesses, by Madame de Malet, a person of education, and religiously disposed, but having exceedingly narrow and restricted ideas of things. . . . Upon the marriage of her elder sister, this young girl, till now careless and unreflecting, became all at once serious and pensive. She entreated me to give her some lessons that might occupy and fill

her mind, declaring that mere copying tired her to death. So she tried to paint historical subjects in water-colour. Her very first attempts revealed to me undoubted talent and imagination. Within two years she executed more than fifty drawings; all showing a certain power of design, carried out with originality and good general effect, but very incorrect in drawing and indifferently coloured. The contracted notions of Madame de Malet, the scruples of the Queen, and my own feelings on the subject of modesty, hindered her progress, and as she might only copy draped figures (and those abundantly draped), she was necessarily ignorant of the structure of the human body. At length, weary of composing cleverly and executing unskilfully, she became out of humour with her drawing, and asked me one day if I could not give her something less monotonous to do, and not what everybody else could do as well? . . . I suggested then to the Princess the idea of attempting sculpture, which I had never done myself, and which would be an equal novelty to us both."

In this new field of art, the genius of the princess at once shone forth, and she pursued it with passionate fervour. Of her first bas-relief, from "*le Reveil du Porte*," Scheffer says,—

"Viewed as an ideal piece of sculpture, and, furthermore, as a triumph over recognised difficulties, this performance must be regarded as something extraordinary in itself; but as the production of a young girl who was only at her third attempt in modelling, and who had read works of poetry and fiction under the sober influence of a *gouvernante* of strict piety, this work is truly surprising; the gradations of the ground plan, and the characteristic indications of the various personages introduced, being managed with singular and happy ingenuity."

It was not long after this that she began her celebrated figure, "*Joan of Arc watching by her Armour*,"—

"The best modern statue to be seen at Versailles. Not alone does its impressive attitude, its simplicity, and its distinctive feminine character contrast favourably with certain vulgar productions among which it stands, but it bears the stamp both of the genius and the elevation of soul of the author. Its success was immense; nor was adulatory applause wanting; but I never saw a greater contempt for flattery than was expressed by the Princess, . . . yet she was delighted, like any child, at the success of her work among the people, and especially among the soldiers. . . . Her dream was to become a great artist, and to exercise a beneficial influence upon French art. She read everything that could develop her mind,—scientific treatises, imaginative works, books of all kinds,—whatever was or seemed to be great and excellent she admired. . . . Her religious faith was such as became her noble woman's heart, but she never shrank from recognising the legitimate consequences of any inquiry upon any, the most difficult, questions."

The loss of such a pupil and friend was a severe blow to Scheffer; but his fidelity to the family of Louis Philippe continued as

unshaken as when on the 30th of July, 1830, he had leaped his horse over the barricades, and set forth with M. Thiers (this latter in spectacles, white stockings and shoes, creating much amusement amongst the mob by his blundering horsemanship, and scrambling through by dint of their good-humoured assistance) to carry a communication from the Hôtel de Ville to the Duke at Neuilly. He had not been a passive observer of the political agitations which preceded that decisive day; and had shared to the full the growing discontent of the liberal party at the encroaching absolutism of Charles X.'s priest-ridden government. Scheffer being personally connected with the advanced members of that party, and sharing the counsels of its most distinguished leaders, was again, as in the days of the Restoration, a constant visitor at La Grange, still the rendezvous of the Opposition. Though it diverts us for a moment from the direct current of our story, we cannot forbear quoting Mrs. Grote's description of a scene of which she and her husband were eye-witnesses while staying with General Lafayette in the spring before the memorable days of July, when Charles, with the incurable blindness of a Bourbon, had dissolved the Chamber:—

“It was in the month of May, that on one of the mornings of our stay, there came to La Grange a numerous body of electors of the ‘arrondissement,’ for which M. Geo. Lafayette was a candidate for re-election. The general elections being close at hand, it was desirable that the electors favourable to him should communicate personally with him and the General. I think that about forty of them sat down to breakfast along with the family, in the great hall of the château, and a striking sight it was to us, as I well remember. The General sat in the centre; I was placed by his side, and the numerous branches of the family dispersed themselves among the company at different parts of the table. The cordiality, courtesy, and good feeling which reigned amongst this large assemblage, it was most pleasing to witness. The repast was plain and abundant; but little talk prevailed, and no healths were drunk, although wine formed, as usual, the common beverage. After the ‘dejeuner,’ the house guests withdrew, and the electors held a long consultation on the business which had brought them thither, with their hosts. The spacious courtyard of the château, into which we strolled the while, was crowded with the vehicles in which these good people had travelled (many from a long distance) to La Grange. Every sort of ‘patâche, cabriolet, char-à-banc, and cariole,’ was there: all, of course, covered with dust and dirt, the harness equally begrimed; cleaning of wheels and harness being a practice nearly unknown (at least at the period of which I write) among the rural inhabitants of the provinces. The horses found ample stable room and provender on the premises. In Paris, and at other places on our homeward route, the animation which we found everywhere prevailing on the subject of the elections, attested the importance of the crisis. Wherever we stopped to change horses, the villagers

—women as well as men—came flocking out to interrogate the postilion about the elections. 'Est-il nommé, M. Harlay? [a liberal candidate], dites donc!' A Postmaster—'Le Roi veut donc une nouvelle chambre! Et bien! nous allons lui en envoyer une,' &c., &c.—(pp. 29, 30).

As we have said, Scheffer's attachment to the Orleans family continued unabated, and the young Comte de Paris was his pupil in drawing, as his uncles had been; but he was too sincere a patriot to mark without bitter mortification the course followed by the new dynasty, and after 1840 he seldom saw the King. Nor was he slow to perceive the gathering of the storm which burst over France in 1848. Two days before the famous "Banquet" was to take place, he came to the Tuileries to give the Comte de Paris his customary lesson, when the Duchess of Orleans looked in at the door: "Scheffer," said she, "when you have done with Paris, come to my private room; I want to speak to you." Scheffer obeyed. "What do you think," said she, "about this banquet affair? Do you entertain any apprehensions as to the consequences which may ensue from its being held?" Scheffer replied, "Madame, I think that the precautions which have been taken are sufficient to warrant the belief that no danger is to be anticipated, and that the affair will pass off without any serious results, *for this time*. But your Royal Highness must allow me to add, that unless some concessions are made to the reasonable demands of the nation, some fresh manifestation will not fail to arise, which may not perhaps be quite so effectually resisted." This plain speaking offended the Duchess; but that mattered not to Scheffer, who never could speak otherwise, and was always accustomed, as he says of himself, "*de dire simplement la vérité aux princes*." And seldom have princes had so steadfast a friend: it was he who brought to the Tuileries the news that Odillon Barrot and his friends had given up the intended "banquet"—it was he who on the memorable 24th of February assisted the Royal Family to escape from the Tuileries, and escorted them to the two public "remises" in which they quitted Paris,—it was upon his arm that the Duchess of Orleans leaned when she faced the populace in the Tuileries gardens, while, with his right hand he led the young Comte de Paris, fearless and self-possessed as the boy of that brave-hearted princess should be;—and he was the friend—the only one—whom the widowed Queen, Marie Amélie, wished to see when, upon the news of Louis Philippe's death reaching him, he immediately hastened to Claremont.

During this period of two-and-twenty years that Scheffer maintained his close relations with the Orleans family, he laboured zealously at his easel, and before its close had been recognised as one of the foremost painters of his school. His celebrated

picture, the "Francesca di Rimini," was first exhibited in the Louvre in 1835, and at the sale of the Orleans' property after the Revolution (it had been bought by the Duke), it was purchased by Prince Demidoff, and placed in his gallery at Florence.* The "Annunciation to the Shepherds" and the "Saintes Femmes," besides numerous less known compositions, belong to this period. In 1839, he produced his two portraits of his mother;—her noble and striking features often meet the eye in St. Monica, Beatrice, and others of his works, and bespeak the moral beauty and dignity of her character. As a matter of course, portraits of the royal family occupied him, though he never laid aside his ideal pieces for the sake of this, the more lucrative branch of his art; but the means of living necessitated unremitting industry, and besides the support of his own household, he was generous in assisting all who had, or who he thought had, any claim on his purse. He would supply his pupils with funds to take them to Rome or elsewhere for the furtherance of their artistic studies, and would often buy the copies of the old masters they brought back, as an encouragement to their perseverance. In the year 1853, his brother Arnold (who had been imprisoned by Louis Philippe for writing against his government,) fell ill; he took him into his house in the Rue Chaptal, where he died, after protracted suffering of many months, during which time Ary watched over him with the utmost affection, often passing the night beside his sick bed. During many years of her life, his mother's uncertain health was a source of continual anxiety, and her death in 1830 deprived him of *the* being for whom he cherished the devoted and grateful love which such a mother can alone inspire. He did not marry until he was past middle age, and the union, in spite of sincere attachment on both sides, appears to have brought him less happiness than it should have done, considering the many excellent qualities of which the lady of his choice was possessed; but in his daughter all his strongest affections were centred; and from some few of his letters to her, quoted by Mrs. Grote, we derive many touching proofs of the wisdom and tenderness with which he sought to make her, what she became—capable of sympathy and companionship with minds noble and elevated like his own. He had watched over this beloved child from her birth in 1830, and when she was seven years old, her existence coming to the knowledge of his mother, she wisely proposed to bring her up herself. The name and con-

* A copy of this picture was purchased by Lord Ellesmere in 1856 for a large sum, under the belief that it was the original painting. The picture exhibited in 1859 was also a "replica," but executed by Scheffer himself, with all the added skill and knowledge of twenty years' experience in his art.

dition of "Cornélie's" mother were never known; she had died soon after the birth of her child.

Such were the main facts of Scheffer's life. As we pass them in review, the remark naturally suggests itself, "There is nothing here very trying or sad; he raised himself by his own talents to a high place as an artist; the noblest minds sought his friendship; in his own domestic circle he was adored; he was virtuous, disinterested, self-sacrificing, without any of the faults by which so many men mar their own and other's happiness; why is the story so tinged with gloom? whence his 'profonde satiété de la vie?'" The answer may be given in few words. Scheffer had made the cause of his adopted country his own; with the earnestness of a true patriot he had watched for the dawn of better days for France—the Restoration had failed, the Revolution of July had failed, he was still sanguine enough to look for good in the "Republic"—how *that* failed we all know too well. His was not a soul to be satisfied with personal success, or even with the sweeter rewards of domestic affection and sympathy (had these been his in more abundant measure than they were), and with the ever tightening grasp of despotism upon his unhappy country, his spirit drooped, and hope forsook him. The *coup d'état* of December, 1851, came upon him as a final and overpowering blow. "I called at his residence," says Mrs. Grote, "within a day or two of the terrible slaughter of the Parisians in their houses and in their streets. I found him at home, and alone with his wife. The interview was at once solemn and sad. The collective ruins of thirty years' illusory hopes and struggles stood before me, as it were; whilst in the few broken phrases which Scheffer's emotion permitted of his uttering, was revealed the anguish of final despair." Henceforth, he gave himself up more completely than ever to painting, often passing whole days in his studio, and avoiding the humiliating sight of streets swarming with soldiers. "Les Gemissemens," the "Tentation," and the "Angel Announcing the Resurrection," belong to this period; but even his art could not suffice to him, though he thanked God for "l'amour de travail," which enabled him at times to devote himself exclusively to it. In 1856 he lost his wife and his lifelong friend, Augustin Thierry, and his own health began to show those symptoms of increasing disease of the heart, which eventually terminated his life on the 15th of June, 1858. His determination to attend the funeral of the Duchess of Orleans at Weybridge, when friends and physicians implored him to avoid all fatigue, hastened his end, and he only survived his journey to England a few weeks. For him, existence had long lost its zest; the country for which he would willingly have died was fallen and in chains, and it is hardly too much to say that the spectacle

broke his heart. Piteous, indeed, is the condition of that nation of which words such as these of Mrs. Grote can be spoken :—

“If there be a spectacle touching on the morally sublime, it is that of a high-souled man, conscious of having strenuously laboured for his country’s weal, in every way open to him, during his whole life, who beholds that country’s laws and liberties abrogated by the audacious employment of military force. . . . Among the noble, patriotic, and pure-minded Frenchmen, with whom it has been my good fortune to be acquainted, three of the most distinguished may be said, figuratively speaking, to have ‘died of their wounds;’ namely, Léon Faucher, Ary Scheffer, and lastly, Alexis de Tocqueville, of whose mental anguish I have been, in each case, a sympathizing witness.”

ART. VI.—THE IRISH EDUCATION QUESTION.

1. *Reports of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland.* Dublin. 1834—58.
2. *Parliamentary Debates on the Colleges (Ireland) Bill.* Hansard. 1845.
3. *Report of the President of Queen’s College, Galway.* 1856.
4. *Report of the Queen’s Colleges Commission.* 1858.
5. *The Queen’s University and the Queen’s Colleges.* By a PROFESSOR. London. 1859.
6. *The Calendar of the Queen’s University in Ireland.* Dublin. 1860.

THE subject of national education may be regarded from either of two points of view—the political or strictly educational—as connected with the wider and more fundamental topics of the sphere and duties of Government, or with reference to the principles upon which education, claiming to be national, should be based. The solution of both these problems should doubtless be included, as essential elements, in any discussion of the subject pretended to be exhaustive. But for the present, our object is of a more special kind. We propose to consider the question of national education in Ireland in connexion with the recent controversies to which it has given occasion; and for this purpose it will not be necessary that we should travel beyond the purely educational aspects of the case.* The subject will pro-

* Although throughout this article the doctrine that the State ought to provide funds for the education of the people is assumed as true, we hold it to be at least questionable, and hope before long to discuss it in an article devoted exclusively to the subject.—EDITOR.

perly divide itself into two distinct branches; one involving the question of primary education for the masses; the other, those higher forms of education to the benefits of which the wealthier portions of a nation can alone aspire.

In order to understand the present position of education in Ireland, it is necessary that we should take a short historic retrospect of the stages through which it has been reached. At the commencement of the present century, notwithstanding the backward state of the country, alike in its material and mental aspects, it would seem that a sort of intellectual activity prevailed to a considerable extent among the people. A certain demand for education existed, and a certain supply was forthcoming; but unfortunately, as the demand was made in entire ignorance of the nature and scope of that which was required, so the supply was answerable to the demand; and the education given was a curse rather than a blessing. This education was procured mainly by voluntary exertion. In many parts of the country it was carried on in evening schools, to which the children of parents too poor to spare their services during the day were sent, and where they picked up in an indifferent manner, and blended with much that was dangerous, the merest rudiments of knowledge. The progress, however, which the movement was making was such as to convince those most competent to judge, that it could not be simply arrested, and that if it was to be diverted from its course, it must be provided with another channel—that, in effect, the question did not lie between knowledge and ignorance, but between knowledge which was sound and useful, and knowledge which was shallow and pernicious. Such was the condition of affairs in 1806, when a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into, and report upon, the subject. In their report, which was not published till 1812, the Commissioners, fully recognising the imperative necessity of the case, recommended that the question of National Education for Ireland should be taken up by the Government.

It was thus absolutely necessary that the State should interpose, and the only question was, by what principle its action should be guided. On this important point the commission which we have mentioned was not silent. It recommended the adoption of “a system which, while it should afford the opportunities of education to every description of the lower classes of the people, might at the same time, by keeping clear of interference with the particular religious tenets of any, induce the whole to receive its benefits as one undivided body, under one and the same system, and in the same establishment.” And the commissioners go on to observe:—

“We conceive this—to disclaim and effectually guard against all

interference with the particular religious tenets of those who are to receive instruction—to be of essential importance in any new establishment for the lower classes in Ireland, and we venture to express our unanimous opinion, that no such plan, however wisely and unexceptionably contrived in other respects, can be carried into effectual execution in this country, unless it be explicitly avowed, and clearly understood, as its leading principle, that no attempt shall be made to influence or disturb the peculiar religious tenets of any sect of Christians.”

This recommendation is signed by the highest dignitaries of the Established Church, and is remarkable as well on account of the source from which it emanates, as from being the first of a *catena* of authorities for the principle upon which the national system of education was subsequently based.

Unfortunately the Government of the day, instead of instituting a public board of education, as had been recommended by the commissioners, sought to carry out their suggestions through the agency of a private society, familiarly known as the Kildare Place Society, the leading principle of which was entirely at variance with the principle which had been so wisely laid down. The fundamental rule of the Kildare Place Society was, that the reading of the Scriptures should be obligatory upon all receiving instruction—a regulation ill-adapted, one would imagine, for recommending education to a Roman Catholic community; and such in the event it proved. The Kildare Place Society was found wholly unequal to the task it had undertaken. In 1824, when there had been fully time to test the efficiency of the system, the result was as follows. The total number receiving instruction in the Society's schools was 56,201, of whom 26,237 were Protestants, and 29,964 Roman Catholics; figures the full significance of which, with reference to the principle of the Society, will be better understood when we add, that while this small fraction alone of the Roman Catholic population were availing themselves of the *gratuitous* instruction given in its schools, there were at the same time attending in the general schools of the country, in which the education was paid for, out of a total of 400,348 children, 319,288 Roman Catholics. Nor was this the only society which gave practical proof that the contradiction of a fundamental tenet of a people's faith is not the way to win its confidence. Simultaneously with the Kildare Place Society, two other societies adopting the same principle, received support from the State—the Incorporated Society for Promoting Protestant Schools in Ireland, and the Association for Discountenancing Vice. The result was even less promising than in the former case. It may suffice to say, that in the year 1825, there was in the schools of all three

societies a total of 69,638 children, educated at an expense to the State of 68,178*l*.

Failure so signal led to renewed inquiry. A fresh Commission was appointed in 1824. Its report was made in 1826. In this report the Commissioners, following in the steps of their predecessors of 1812, recommended that "schools should be established for the purpose of giving to children of all religious persuasions such useful instruction as they might severally be capable and desirous of receiving, without having any grounds to apprehend any interference with their respective religious principles." They have, however, proceeded farther, and stated their opinion, that the manner in which this should be effected was by giving religious instruction to Protestants and Roman Catholics, not jointly but separately. Acting upon the suggestion of these commissions, a Select Committee of the House of Commons, to which, in 1828, both the reports were referred, recommended a system to be adopted "which should" (to employ Lord Stanley's summary) "afford, if possible combined, literary and separate religious education, and which should so far be capable of being adapted to the views of the religious persuasions which prevail in Ireland, as to render it in truth a system of national education for the poorer classes of the community." Lastly, the recommendation of this Committee is fully endorsed by a Committee appointed in 1830 to examine into the state of the poor of Ireland. The Committee express a hope that no further time will be lost in giving the public the benefit of the expensive and long-protracted inquiries before the Royal Commissioners of 1806 and 1825, and the practical recommendations of the Committee of 1828. This hope was soon realized. In the following year, 1831, the National Board of Education was established, the principle of whose constitution is thus stated by the Commissioners.

"The principle of this Board is, that the national schools shall be open alike to Christians of all religious denominations, and that accordingly no child shall be required to be present at any religious instruction or exercise of which his parents or guardians may disapprove; and that opportunities shall be afforded to all children to receive separately, at particular periods, such religious instruction as their parents or guardians may provide for them."

Such is the principle on which national education in Ireland is based—a principle, it will be seen, from this brief review, not hastily adopted nor on slight grounds, recommended by two Royal Commissions and two Committees of the House of Commons, but urged still more forcibly by the utter failure, after prolonged experiments, of all schemes into which the opposite

principle entered. Before bringing the system to the test of practical success, it will be desirable here, in order to appreciate fairly the results which have been obtained, as well as to point the lesson which its history teaches, to state somewhat more particularly the extent of the field which the Commissioners proposed to occupy, and the spirit with which they were animated toward the other educational bodies in the country. It was no part of the design of the National Board to monopolize educational activity, or to throw obstacles in the way of the freest development of private enterprise engaged in the same task. The functions which they undertook to discharge were not to supersede, but to supplement, to aid, and to improve—to supply schools where schools were wanting, to assist them where they were in operation, and above all, through the example of their own models, to raise the general character of education. Agreeably with this design, the Board framed its rules upon a threefold plan, under which three distinct classes of schools were established—the model, the vested, and the non-vested schools.* In the first of these the Board supplied all the funds, and exercised in return exclusive control, appointing the teachers, selecting the books, and regulating the courses of instruction. Of these model schools it was originally intended, though the intention has as yet been but partially realized, that one should be placed in every county in Ireland, with a view, as the name indicates, not merely of supplying education, but still more of serving at once as rivals and models to stimulate and direct the existing educational machinery. In the case of the vested schools the assistance was more limited, as was also the authority exercised. The State supplied to them, as a maximum, two-thirds of the expense of the original foundation, requiring the remaining third to be made up by local exertions; and further contributed to the current yearly expenditure according to the exigencies of each case. In return for this assistance it exacted an adherence to the fundamental rules respecting religious teaching, and claimed a general superintendence over the school, but left to local patrons, subject to the approval of the Commissioners, the appointment of the teachers, and the regulation of the details of instruction. Lastly, in the case of the non-vested schools, the connexion with the Board was of a still slighter kind. In this case, what may be called the “capital” of the undertaking was supplied entirely by local parties, the State merely contributing in the way of salaries and books; while the control was limited to a general

* That is, schools vested in the Commissioners as trustees for the public, and schools not so vested, but remaining the property of those by whom they were erected.

veto on the books and teachers employed, the right of inspection, and a prohibition of all compulsion in imparting religious instruction.

Such was the machinery by means of which the Board, established in 1831, proposed to carry out the important task of national education, and the success of the scheme has been commensurate with the wisdom with which it was framed. The Commissioners had, from the commencement of their labours down to March, 1858, trained nearly 5000 teachers. At that date they had under their control 5308 schools; and these schools were attended by 509,364 pupils. These numbers speak for themselves. They leave no doubt as to the magnitude of the operations of the Board; it is instructive to compare them with the futile results of former systems. It is further curious to observe, that the number of children in attendance is as nearly as possible that for which the Commissioners originally estimated that the aid of the national schools would be required. Their estimate was, that ultimately 570,000 children would need to be brought under public instruction. No less unquestionable is the excellence of the education given. We but express the concurrent opinion of all who have examined the subject, when we say that the primary education of Ireland is not surpassed, if equalled, in any portion of the empire. When we add that the National Board do not confine their attention to literary and scientific training, but are disseminating, with the happiest effect, a sound knowledge of the principles and practice of agriculture in 160 establishments in various parts of the country; and that the Parliamentary grant by which all this is achieved does not much exceed 270,000*l.*, we may confidently assert that never were grander results brought about by a smaller outlay. So much for the first criterion of the system's success—that afforded by the extent of its operations. Let us now apply a second test to which in fairness it must submit. It professes to be a *mixed* system; how far has it succeeded in bringing together children of different religious persuasions for common instruction?

The most extraordinary misapprehensions prevail as to the success of the national system of education considered as a mixed system. The last time a discussion was raised on the subject in Parliament, it seemed to be taken for granted by both friends and foes, that the system would not bear investigation on this score; that whatever its theoretic principle might be, it was practically denominational; and that save the surrender of a principle—a matter of light moment in politics—but little would be lost by making the theory correspond to the fact. Now nothing can be more erroneous than all this. We have been favoured with official returns made up to March, 1858, which

prove incontestably that, even regarded as a mixed system, the national system of education has been reasonably successful. We shall place some of these results before our readers.

It appears, then, that of 5222 schools from which returns had been received on the 31st March, 1858, 2929, or more than fifty-six per cent. of the whole had, in point of fact, a mixed attendance. Nor were these schools in isolated districts, but diffused through the whole country, apparently in fair proportion to the geographical distribution of religious sects. Thus, according as the humbler classes, from which the national schools derive their pupils, were more divided in religious persuasion, the number of mixed schools increased, while it fell in proportion to the prevalence of some one form of religious belief. In several of the counties of Ulster, for example, where the various religious sects are fully represented, the proportion of mixed schools was above ninety per cent., and in the whole province it was eighty-four per cent.; while in some of the Roman Catholic counties it fell as low as thirty per cent. It is, however, satisfactory to think, that in two counties alone in the whole of Ireland did the proportion fall below this per centage, and still more so, that the proportion is increasing. The return from which we quote exhibits an advance of two per cent. on a return made in 1853. How, in the face of facts like these, the national schools can be said to have failed in bringing together for common instruction the children of the various religious sects, we are wholly at a loss to conceive. They have succeeded in this object to an extent which, looking at the numerous obstacles they have had to contend with, may well excite surprise.

But there is a third test by which the system may be tried, and according to which it has been again pronounced a failure. It is admitted—for this point appears to be too clear for cavil—that the national schools have succeeded so far as the Roman Catholics are concerned; but it is maintained that this is the limit of their success, and that the Protestant portion of the nation derives no adequate benefits from the system. Let us for a moment inquire how far this charge is consistent with the facts of the case. As we have already seen, the number of children on the rolls of the national schools for the year ending March, 1858, was 569,364. To this aggregate the different denominations contributed in the following proportions:—

Roman Catholics	481,000
Presbyterians	57,018
Established Church	29,130
Other Protestants	2,216

It hence appears that the Presbyterians contribute considerably

more than their quota to the total sum;* on the other hand, it must be admitted that the numbers contributed by the Established Church are below their due proportion; but we shall not find much to wonder at in this, when we remember how much more wealthy the Protestants are than the Roman Catholics, and consequently how much better able to provide education for themselves; as in fact they do through the schools of the Church Education Society.†

Thus much for the pupils. It is interesting to observe that amongst the teachers the various creeds are represented with equal fairness. From returns which lie before us it appears, that while the proportion of Protestants of the Established Church on the school rolls is five per cent., the proportion of teachers of the same communion comes out six per cent. The Roman Catholic pupils make up eighty-four per cent., and the proportion of Roman Catholic teachers is eighty per cent. Lastly, the Presbyterian pupils number ten, the Presbyterian teachers twelve per cent. This correspondence, amazingly exact, considering that it was undesigned, and in fact accidentally brought to light by a hostile critic,‡ admirably illustrates the skill with which the rules of selection have been made, and the fairness with which they are administered by the National Board.

On every ground, then, whether we regard the admixture of children in particular schools, or the aggregate numbers of the great religious denominations which divide the country amongst

* In the last census, in which the religious denominations of the population of Ireland were noted, the Presbyterians were less than one-tenth of the Roman Catholics.

† It is further to be observed that the number of Protestants has in recent years largely increased. If we again compare the returns given above with those of 1853, we find that of the gross number of pupils on the rolls in that year (490,027) there were—

Of the Established Church . . .	23,629
„ Presbyterians . . .	39,751
„ Other Protestants . . .	2,083

making a total of 65,463 as against 88,364 of the year 1858. We have thus an increase of 35 per cent. in favour of the latter year, an increase shared by all the items of the calculation. Surely, if there is any faith to be put in statistics, these figures show that the national system is largely and increasingly acceptable and beneficial to Protestants. We may add that in the model schools, where the highest class of education is given, the Protestants of the Established Church considerably exceed their due proportion, making up one-third of the entire number of pupils in attendance. This fact confirms our impression that the deficiency of members of this communion in the ordinary schools is due to other causes than hostility to the system.

‡ The correspondence was discovered from returns called for by Mr. Mounsell, M.P. for the county of Limerick.

them, or again the representation of the several creeds in the staff of teachers, we assert that the national system of education in Ireland is fairly entitled to be called a mixed system; and that in this respect, no less than in the extent to which it has been instrumental in diffusing education, it has fairly vindicated its claim to success. It might have been thought that success so complete would have silenced all opposition: and so it would, were the education of the people the primary object of religious parties. This, however, is far from being the case, and consequently the success attending the scheme, instead of disarming, has, it is to be feared, in some instances inflamed the hostility of its opponents. These comprise, on the one hand, the bulk of the clergy of the Established Church, and, on the other, the ultramontane party in the Church of Rome; and are represented respectively by the Church Education Society and the Roman Catholic prelates. We shall endeavour to state the objections of each to the system, and the plan which they severally propose to substitute for it.

The main objection of the Church Education Society to the national system is that the reading of the Scriptures is not made compulsory on all the children who attend the schools. It is not denied that the National Board has recognised the right of patrons to give any kind of religious instruction they please in the schools under their control. This permission, however, is accompanied with a proviso, that they do not compel the presence of those children, whose parents or guardians disapprove of the instruction given; and to the objectors the proviso destroys all the merit of the concession. To use their own language,—

“They conceive that no system of education can be sound in principle, or prove beneficial in its results, which exempts any portion of the pupils it admits into its schools from instruction in the inspired volume. Whatever such a system may be, as regards those whom it permits to *receive* such instruction, it is essentially defective as regards those whom it permits to refuse it.”

This objection, it will be observed, goes very far beyond the principle of denominationalism. The ideal of a system which it presents is one in which Scriptural teaching is made an indispensable element in every course of instruction; in which every school is fashioned on the society's model. Nor does the society make any secret of its views in this respect. Even in a recent address it thus deprecates the introduction of a denominational system:—

“There is hardly any measure which the Church Education Society would contemplate with deeper regret than that which would partition off, under irresponsible management, the public funds given for educa-

tional purposes, to the several denominations of which the people are composed. They are convinced that the result of such a measure would be seriously to retard educational progress, to foment the strife and bitterness of party spirit, and to place the Church of the country in a grievously false position, namely, that of being only one denomination out of a number equally recognised by the State."

Nay, so strong is the objection to having a denominational character fastened on the Church, that it has been alleged as an insuperable obstacle to the society's co-operation with a Mixed Board.

"They cannot," they say, in one of their earlier appeals, "co-operate with the National Board, because of the constitution of the Board itself. Not only are the clergy of the Established Church deprived of the trust committed to their hands by the legislature, of superintending national education, but this superintendence is taken from them for the purpose of being vested in a Board composed of persons whose qualification for the office consists in their being representatives of the most conflicting religious opinions. The principle thus practically acted upon, that persons of all religions are equally fitted to guard and conduct the education of the country, has a manifest tendency, by overlooking the distinction of truth and error in a matter of such vital importance, to make them be overlooked in all, and thereby tend to that indifference respecting any particular form of religion, which, at least in the vulgar mind, is almost identical with attachment to none."

These were the pretensions of the society in their palmier days; while the recollection of Protestant ascendancy was still fresh in their minds, and while the national system was still struggling with the difficulties of its first establishment. But those days are past; the national system has become firmly rooted in the institutions of the country and the hearts of the people; and the pretensions of the clergy have undergone a corresponding abatement. Descending from the lofty ambition which was satisfied with nothing short of universal dominion, they are now content to stipulate for such conditions as these: (1) That aid and superintendence be extended to those schools of the society which are sufficiently near national schools to afford parents the opportunity of choosing to which they will send their children, and to those alone; or (2), failing this, that the Society's schools may be admitted as exceptional schools, under the precedent of the monastic and conventual schools, which, as it is stated, now enjoy exceptional privileges.* We have here two proposals: with respect to the former we cannot help observing that the solution

See the recent correspondence of the Church Education Society with the Chief Secretary.

of the difficulty appears singular, as coming from men who have grounded their opposition to the national system of education upon principle. If the clergy have hitherto kept aloof from the system, because its principle is inherently vicious, how can they justify to themselves the recognition of its principle which the proposal involves? Not only do they give up their exclusive pretensions to be the educators of the people, but they make their own activity, so far as it is recognised by the State, depend on the presence of those very agencies which formerly they sought to exclude. Suppose the condition realized, and never was so deplorable a case of divided will as the poor clergyman must exhibit. On the one hand he must wish to drive out from his parish the objectionable school, because pernicious to his people; on the other, he must seek to bring it in as the necessary preliminary to his own operations. He must erect a fortress for the pleasure of besieging it. Without doing the evil that he would not, he cannot do the good he would. Can absurdity be pushed farther?

With reference to the latter proposal, the simple answer is that it is founded on a mistake. Not the slightest relaxation of the rules of the National Board have been made in favour of conventual schools. It is true that these schools have, as might have been expected, shown a disposition to evade the rules; but the disposition has never received any sanction, and its manifestations have been checked when brought under the notice of the authorities. We do not wish to use harsh language, but it certainly seems to us that there is something highly derogatory, we had almost said degrading, to the Church in this proposal. The Committee of the Church Education Society objects to the denominational system, because it would place the Established Church on a level with the other religious communities into which the country is divided. But surely there is something almost dignified in being ranked with the great body of Roman Catholics, as compared with the position of being classed with an obscure section of that community, which has gained the unenviable reputation of seeking to evade the rules under which it receives assistance from the State.

So far, as to the Protestant opposition to the National System. The demands of the Roman Catholic prelates present themselves in a more specious guise, but are really not a whit less unreasonable, and would, if conceded, we cannot doubt, prove far more practically mischievous. The form which they take is a demand for the denominational system. "It is the denominational system which is in force in England; it has been found to answer there; and why should not the same measure of justice, and the same rule of expediency, be applied to both countries? What is there in Ireland that it should be treated exceptionally in our national

policy?" It cannot be denied that there is some plausibility in this: we shall endeavour to meet fairly the argument which it contains.

In the first place, then, we must observe that the educational institutions of the two countries differ in other respects than those in which the Roman Catholic prelates require assimilation, and further that the particulars in which they differ are of the essence of the case. In Ireland, as we have seen, the expense of elementary education is supported principally by the State. In the Model Schools the expense is exclusively borne by the Government, if we except the small sum derived from pupils' fees; in the vested schools it sustains perhaps three-fourths of the expense; and even to the non-vested schools its contributions are considerable; while the training of teachers is conducted exclusively at the public expense. On the other hand, in England, the principal weight of the charge falls upon the local subscriptions and pupils' fees: it is estimated that over the whole country the resources derived from voluntary effort bear to those derived from the State the proportion of three to two. With this difference in the mode in which the schools in the two countries are supported, it does not seem strange that there should be a difference in the mode of imparting religious instruction—it is not strange that, while in England schools which are called into existence, many through voluntary efforts, take their religious tone from the localities in which they are founded, those in Ireland, which are supported chiefly by the State, should exhibit, in their mode of dealing with religion, somewhat of the comprehensive character of the source from which they derive their origin.

What the Roman Catholic prelates really desire, in appealing to the precedent of England, is to obtain all the privileges possessed by the various denominations in England, without making the sacrifices with which those privileges have been purchased. They wish to dispose of the funds of the State with as much freedom as the English enjoy in disposing of their voluntary subscriptions. Their demand is, not that they may be placed on the same footing with the English—for we have had no intimation of a desire to undertake the English share of the expense—but that they may be permitted to deal with the national funds according to their uncontrolled discretion—that they may be entrusted with prerogatives which have never yet been entrusted to any religious party, not even to the national Church. An exceptional privilege which is to be conceded for what purpose? Why, for this—that the Irish youth may be moulded after the fashion of the most approved ultramontane models.

But we may go farther than this line of argument carries us

We may accept the claims of the hierarchy as made in good faith—with an honest desire to assume the responsibilities along with the privileges of the English position; and even on this assumption we have no hesitation in saying that a concession of their demands would be nothing short of a death-blow to educational progress in Ireland.

For what is the history of national education in England—if indeed any education given in England at present deserves that name?—and what are the social forces on which its progress depends? On this subject we gladly refer to the authority of Mr. Temple:—*

“Nearly, if not quite, half of the elementary schools have been founded since the establishment of the Committee of Council in 1839. The religious action has been, in fact, to a great extent the mask behind which the influence of the Government has been at work. When Sir J. Shuttleworth commenced his operations, he found (as his failures in 1839 and 1843 would have been enough to prove, if proof had been needed) that the time was not yet ripe for legislation, nor even for independent action by the executive. It was necessary to lay hold on some popular impulse to give it guidance, and inspire it with energy, and compel it to work for the public good. No impulse, except religious zeal, had the independent strength necessary for the purpose. Religious zeal was thus made the driving wheel of the machine. The Government defined its aim so as to be thoroughly in harmony with the force on which it was intended to rely. No schools were to be aided which did not embody religious teaching as a part of their system. The archbishop was to have a veto on the appointment of inspectors of Church schools. The feelings of the Dissenting communities were to be consulted on the appointment of the inspectors of Dissenting schools. Religious liberty was to be so scrupulously respected, that the Government was not to interfere, except indirectly, with the management, discipline, or instruction. Founders of schools were, in fact, to be fettered by no restrictions except such as were necessary to secure permanent efficiency.”

In this way the Government adroitly pressed into its service what constituted its main difficulty in establishing a comprehensive system of national education. The various religious communities, being set to work on a plan perfectly congenial to their own principles, vied with each other in giving it effect. Prodigious efforts were made, and unquestionably important results have been produced; but, ere the plan so eagerly embraced had been long in operation, the incurable defects of its origin began to display themselves; and it has now become but too evident that it is incapable of expanding into a really national system.

* “Oxford Essays,” 1856, p. 234.

The fundamental vice of the English scheme it is not difficult to discover. As grants are only given to meet local subscriptions, it is necessary—if the system is to be universal—that persons should be found in every part of the country able and willing to contribute to the establishment of schools. Now, so far is this from being the case that no such persons are forthcoming in districts which most stand in need of aid. Hence arises the anomaly that the assistance of the State is given most liberally when its aid might best be dispensed with. A striking instance is given by Sir John Pakington.* He mentions four poor parishes in London, which having an aggregate population of 138,900 had received 12*l.* 0*s.* 8*d.*; and four rich parishes, which having an aggregate population of 50,000, had received 3908*l.*

Such is the mode in which this miscalled national system provides for the education of the poor! But the system is not merely inefficient, it is unjust. The poorer districts pay their taxes equally with the richer. We do not know the proportions in which the parishes referred to by Sir John Pakington contribute to the national resources; but the poor parishes yielded, if not as much as the rich, at all events their full quota to the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and it is certain that many districts pay largely to the State, which yet are too poor to fulfil the conditions on which alone its assistance can be obtained. Thus the English plan not merely fails to furnish aid when aid is most needful, but positively increases the burden of education to the poorer classes; it makes no provision for their education, while it taxes them for the education of the comparatively rich.

Nor should the objection be overlooked that while theoretically conceding liberty of conscience, the system frequently violates it in practice. Take for example the common case, where the members of a religious community residing in the same parish are too few or too poor to have a school of their own. For persons so circumstanced the only educational means available are the schools supported by other sects, in which doctrines are taught of which they disapprove; in which, consequently, a sacrifice of conscientious conviction is the price exacted for the education of their children.

The truth is, the system is as ineffectual in practice as it is indefensible in theory, and its failure as a *national* scheme is now generally acknowledged. It has become apparent that it cannot reach those parts of the country which are most deficient in education, while its operations in those districts which it has penetrated is partial, embracing not the people at large, nor even necessarily the most numerous religious sects, but only those

* Cited by Mr. Temple, *ubi sup.*

whose members are sufficiently rich and liberal to comply with the conditions on which grants are made. The practical result is, that of 3,000,000 of children, who, according to the best estimates, ought to be brought under public education, only 821,000 are receiving instruction in schools assisted by the State. Thus two-thirds of the work still remains to be done, and yet the system seems incapable of much further expansion. "Religious zeal," Mr. Temple tells us, "has reached, or nearly reached the limit to which religious rivalry could push it; and religious zeal without religious rivalry is a much weaker power. The towns have done as much as the system will get them to do, and yet there is much improvement wanted in the towns: extensive rural districts will do nothing, and can do nothing."

It may well seem strange, if anything in the history of religious party could seem strange, that the moment in which these defects are all but universally recognised in the English system of education should be chosen for urging its adoption in Ireland, where another system, simply by avoiding these defects, has attained unexampled success. The demand is the more remarkable when it is considered that the objections to the English system would be increased a hundredfold were it transplanted to Ireland. In truth, it would puzzle the ingenuity of man to find a scheme of education less adapted to that country than one based on the rivalry of religious sects, and giving aid under inflexible rules to meet corresponding local exertions. The effect of such a scheme would be to confine the area of instruction within the limits of moderate wealth, leaving the larger portion of the country entirely unprovided for, while it would at the same time embitter to the utmost religious differences, already one would think sufficiently strong,—differences which, by the admission of statesmen of every party, have hitherto presented the most serious obstacle to all improvement.

It is true, as we have already intimated, that the object proposed to themselves by the Roman Catholic prelates, is far different from this. Voluntaryism is a heresy that has never struck deep root in the Irish soil. What these gentlemen want is the license enjoyed by the English sects, not the sacrifices by which the license was purchased. But just for this reason it cannot be too strongly insisted upon, that voluntaryism is the very basis of the English system; that it is this alone which saves it from unmeasured condemnation; and that just in proportion as it ceases to be voluntary, it must cease to be denominational. Were this more fully understood, we should be perhaps less importuned with an analogy which fails just in the important point: and some of the opponents of the National Board in Ireland would be less disposed to substitute a halting expedient

—adopted only because the public mind was unripe for legislation, and now that it has done its work ready to pass away—for a well-ordered plan which every day gives increasing proof of the marvellous vitality and fruitfulness of a sound principle.

We have hitherto treated the demand for the introduction of the English system as proceeding exclusively from the Roman Catholic prelates; but although the principle of that system has been, as we have shown, repudiated by the authorities of the Established Church, this repudiation has not been very consistently adhered to, and the two extreme sections of religionists are frequently found urging precisely the same objections, and apparently aiming at the same result. We shall in conclusion notice two of these objections, which are thus held in common by both parties, though one of them is more insisted upon by the Church clergy, the other by the Romish hierarchy. These objections are—(1), that the national system does not make sufficient provision for religious teaching; (2) that it involves a violation of religious liberty.

In answer to the first of these objections, it may be said that the State could not go further than it has done without introducing that defect which we have seen so fatal to the development of national education in England. It gives to all Christian ministers the amplest facilities and encouragement to instruct children of their own persuasion. But this is the extent of its concession. It leaves no scope for proselytism: no child is compelled to be present at any religious instruction to which his parents or guardians object. It is against this permission to withdraw from a part of the instruction that the Church clergy most strongly protest. The most distinguished opponent of the National Board has admitted “that he could as patron of a school under the National Board give a perfect education to his own flock, but that for the sake of the Roman Catholic he would not accept it.” Now, not to dwell on the preposterous injustice involved in the demand, that the clergy of one denomination should lay down the conditions under which the children of another should receive a public education, we have no hesitation in saying that the interests of religion itself are better secured by the present rule than by the scheme which finds favour with the objectors. The great vice in our ordinary religious teaching is that it is doctrinal rather than practical; sharpening the intellect, not moulding the character; helpful rather as a manual of controversy than as a rule of life. This blemish, as might be expected in a country where religious rivalry so much prevails, is peculiarly conspicuous in Ireland, reaching its maximum in those districts where proselytism has been most active. We remember being greatly struck, when visiting some

years ago, some of the schools of the Irish Church Mission, with the extent to which the wrangling spirit was developed in the children. A slight anecdote may perhaps convey to the reader a part of the impression produced on our own mind. A clerical friend, wishing to turn the examination into a practical channel, asked some children in one of these schools for a text which forbade them to be idle. He was immediately answered—“Little children keep yourselves from *idols* ;” and, what is still more significant, the same question drew forth the same answer in a similar school in a different part of the country. Religious teaching, of which this is a specimen, is simply noxious, and we can scarcely conceive a greater curse to Ireland than the emission from its schools of a swarm of such urchins—*mala gramina pastos*—scattering the venom of controversy throughout the land. But the most effectual way to prevent such a consummation, is to bring together children of different religious persuasions for secular instruction, and by barring all hope of proselytism, to take from religious teachers all temptation to controversial teaching. We would recommend those who are doubtful of the capabilities of the combined system for inculcating religion to read the reports of the various ministers attending to the spiritual wants of the Belfast Model School. The catechist of the Established Church, after stating that the bishop in whose presence the annual examination was conducted, expressed his entire satisfaction with the proficiency of the children in the various subjects in which they were examined, goes on to say: “The Rev. Professor Reichel, who examined the senior class in the Evidences of Christianity (a subject which was entirely new to the children, not having been taught in any of the Church schools in Belfast), has permitted me to say that he never met so good answering, in a subject of corresponding difficulty, in any school in which he had previously examined.” Again, the Roman Catholic clergyman says, “The progress of the children in the knowledge of their religious duties, always steady, has been, in many instances, most astonishing—a fact which I attribute partly to the very abundant time set apart for such purposes, and partly to the zealous energetic co-operation of the Catholic teachers.” Lastly, the ministers of the Presbyterians say, “that the answering of the children at the examination called forth repeated expressions of admiration from the visitors present.”

Now, how are we to account for these remarkable results. We think they are traceable to two causes—first, the capacity of the children’s minds for receiving religious truth is enlarged by the high order of the intellectual training they receive, while their reverence for things sacred is not impaired by the vain jangle of controversy, and the rude gibes of unlettered disputants; secondly,

the teachers, having no by-ends, husband their energy for the proper work of their calling—the inculcation of a religion of peace. Far, then, from conceding that the system is irreligious, non-religious, or even inadequate as regards religion, we hold it the very best that, in existing circumstances, could be devised for fostering the spirit of true religion—well calculated, if any, to further the poet's aspiration—

“ Let knowledge grow from more to more—
But more of reverence in us dwell,
That mind and soul according well,
May make one music as before.”

The statement that the combined system is an infringement of religious liberty is not only not true: it is the reverse of the truth. What gives it a moment's plausibility is the ambiguity of the phrase, religious liberty. This phrase may denote either the liberty of religious communities to regulate their own internal affairs, or the liberty of individuals to act in accordance with the dictates of conscience.* Now, as the concessions in favour of religious freedom have been most frequently made, not to the abstract right of liberty of thought, but to the menace of powerful religious sects, the former sense is that which our historical recollections at once call up, and hence the danger that the latter sense should, in the minds of the unthinking, be obscured, if not altogether extinguished.

Such an illusion is the more to be deprecated, as the two species of liberty, far from being identical, are often found in inverse ratio to each other. And this is actually the case in the instance we are considering. It is notorious that in agitating against united education the Roman Catholic priesthood are not seeking to redress what is felt to be a grievance by the members of their communion. On the contrary, there is nothing which the great bulk of the laity more strongly dread than the success of the agitation. It is seen to be a hierarchical move to strain the bonds of spiritual authority, already too tight, and to extend it over a domain now exempt from its influence. True, we have had no loud protest against clerical usurpation; but it is no less true, that the sense of it is widely diffused, and the people have hitherto opposed a passive resistance, which has been proof against the most energetic assaults.

In these circumstances the course of true policy is perfectly plain. It may be that the Church of Rome denies the right of private judgment, not merely in the affairs of religion, but in civil matters also, and in the arrangements of society. But she

* This distinction is admirably illustrated by Mr. Temple, “Oxford Essays,” 1856, p. 240.

can scarcely call the State to assist her in enforcing such a doctrine as this. To make such a demand in the name of religious liberty is to invoke religious liberty against itself. The freedom asked is freedom to oppress. No well-ordered State would be so fatuous as to enthrall its subjects to a principle of despotism—nay more, of despotism not only not coincident with its own power, but strongly antagonistic to its aims. On the contrary, any Government worthy of the name would encourage the assertion of natural freedom against an arbitrary and noxious exercise of authority.

The National System of Education led to the establishment of the Queen's Colleges in two ways: first, the very high order of education given to the lowest classes, while those of a superior station were wholly neglected, gave weight to the only objection which can be urged with any plausibility against the education of the people—that, namely, arising from its unequal diffusion; and secondly, the marvellous success which attended the application of religious equality to primary education, led to the hope that the same principle might be equally fruitful if applied to the higher education.

The deficiency of the provisions for academic education in Ireland at the time the Queen's Colleges were founded, was indeed remarkable: while Scotland, with one-third the population of Ireland, had five Universities, attended by about 2900 students, Ireland had but one, and even this one was, from its constitution, not available for the nation at large. True, the University of Dublin offered education equally to all; but being in immediate connexion with a Church opposed to the religious faith of the vast majority of the people, and excluding all dissenters from its administration and higher emoluments, it at once discouraged them from seeking admission, and produced in their minds a feeling of irritation which perhaps almost counterbalanced the benefits it conferred. The result was, that of nearly 6,000,000 of Roman Catholics in Ireland, about 100 were receiving an university education.

Such a state of things in any country might well have arrested the attention of thoughtful statesmen; but there were circumstances connected with Ireland which invested it with peculiar gravity. In that country, from the habitual absence of the higher aristocracy, the middle classes enjoyed an importance and exercised an influence, political and social, to which elsewhere they are strangers. Now, the only way to prevent this influence from being noxious, and to turn it to good account, was to make its possessors worthy to wield it; and yet no effort was made for the attainment of an object so desirable. Already, not to speak of Protestant dissenters, a large proportion of the classes we

speak of were Roman Catholics, and the proportion, thanks to the repeal of the penal laws and the removal of civil disabilities, was daily increasing; but the principle upon which the higher education was conducted was such as, both in tendency and fact, to exclude Roman Catholics from its advantages. And this was all the more unfortunate, as it was just for Roman Catholics, as being most obnoxious to clerical influence, that the antagonistic force of education was most imperatively required, in order to make them safe depositories of power. When to these considerations it is added that, simultaneously with the total neglect of middle class education, the education of the lower orders was pushed forward with the most energetic and successful efforts, we must admit that the state of things was one of serious menace to social order. There are few more explosive conditions of society than that presented by wealth divorced from intelligence seeking to control intellectual poverty. We need not, then, be surprised to find a committee of the House of Commons in 1838 declaring it to be "unwise, dangerous, and pernicious to the social condition of the country and to its future tranquillity, that so much encouragement should be given to the lowest classes, without at the same time due provision being made for the education of the middle and higher classes."*

* As the income tax has but recently been introduced into Ireland, we do not possess the facilities for estimating the increase and distribution of its wealth, which the returns under this tax supply for England; but, in the absence of this more general standard, the following statements, showing the extent, and still more, the peculiar character of the changes which have taken place in the landed proprietary of that country, will give some idea of that rapid growth of a middle class to which we have referred.

The Act for the Sale of Encumbered Estates in Ireland was passed in the autumn of 1849. By the autumn of 1853, the number of estates for the sale of which petitions had been sent into the court established under the Act was 2878, of which rather more than one-third, or 1081, were at the above date sold. The manner in which these sales were distributed over the country will appear from the following table:—

Value of landed property sold by the Encumbered Estates' Commissioners from the establishment of the court to the end of 1853.

In Leinster	£2,768,210
— Connaught	2,218,162
— Munster	3,270,287
— Ulster	2,173,202

£10,430,461

It will be perceived from this, that the districts in which the largest sales have taken place are Roman Catholic districts, and this becomes still more evident when we descend into details. Thus the county in which the largest quantity of land was sold was Galway, the next Cork, the next Tipperary, the next Limerick, the next Mayo—all intensely Roman Catholic districts; the pecuniary value in each being as follows:—viz., Galway, 1,200,000*l.*; Cork, 1,100,000*l.*;

In providing a remedy for the evil thus distinctly recognised three courses were open to the legislature. It might have opened the emoluments of Trinity College, Dublin, to all classes of the population without religious distinction; or again, it might have founded colleges for the several religious communities which divide the country amongst them; lastly, it had the alternative of establishing colleges based upon the principle of religious equality—colleges which should give combined secular instruction, and which, whilst they afforded facilities to the various ministers of the Christian faith to teach their respective flocks,

Limerick, 660,000*l.*; Tipperary, 670,000*l.*; Mayo, 500,000*l.* Such was the mode in which the sales were distributed with respect to locality. Let us now observe the mode of their distribution as regards the number of proprietors. We have said that the total number of estates actually sold at the time specified was 1081. These 1081 estates were divided into about 6000 lots, which were bought by 4214 distinct purchasers, giving on an average about four landed proprietors for one under the former régime. But, further, it is well known that the smaller lots—that is to say, lots ranging from 50*l.* to 70*l.* per annum—brought, proportionally (*i. e.*, when measured in years' purchase), a much higher price than the larger ones, a result which was owing to the greater competition among the purchasers of smaller lots. This strikes us as a very significant circumstance, since it shows in an unequivocal manner the larger amount of disposable capital amongst the middle classes, which is the point we wish to establish. The manner in which the notoriety of this fact led to the breaking up of the large estates is very remarkable. We have been informed on the best authority that the following estates—the Portarlington, the Kingston, the Belmore, the Thomond, the Mornington, the Oranmore, and the Donegal—were broken up into not less than 2094 lots. In some cases, no doubt, the same purchaser obtained more than a single lot; but even on the improbable supposition that on an average there was but one purchaser for two lots, the effect of the sale of these estates would be to substitute 1047 landed proprietors for seven!

We have only further to add that of 10,430,461*l.*—the amount which passed through the hands of the Commissioners up to 1853—only 1,779,608*l.* came from England, Scotland, and the Colonies; the remainder, or 8,650,853*l.*, having been furnished exclusively from Irish sources; and we have been informed that the proportion of English and Scotch investments has since declined. The upshot of the whole is, that in four years, ending in 1853, land in Ireland to the value of ten millions and a half changed hands, passing from the possession of large to that of small proprietors. The funds were in the main furnished from Irish sources, and the purchases took place chiefly in Roman Catholic districts. Though this does not amount to demonstration, we think it is sufficient, when taken in connexion with the testimony borne on all hands to the increasing prosperity of Ireland, to justify us in the assertion that there is rapidly growing up in Ireland a middle class, numerous, wealthy, and aspiring, in which the Roman Catholics are largely represented, and for which the advantages of a university education are, in the interests of society at large imperatively demanded.

We should state that the above figures are from official sources. We have been obliged to confine our review to the period ending 1853, as no detailed statements have been published with reference to the years which have since elapsed.

should steadily repudiate all interference, positive or negative, with the conscientious scruples of their students.

To the first two courses there were insuperable objections. Trinity College was a Protestant foundation, endowed for the propagation of the Protestant faith, and more especially designed as a nursery for the clergy of the Established Church in Ireland. The attempt to open its emoluments to Roman Catholics and Dissenters, not to speak of the shock it would have given to the sentiment of property, would have called forth such a storm of Protestant feeling as would have rendered it wholly impracticable. But had it even been practicable, it would not have been just. Maynooth had just been endowed with the utmost munificence for the education of the Roman Catholic priesthood, and theological chairs had been established in Belfast in connexion with the Presbyterian church. Now the only pretext for these endowments was the exclusive character of Trinity College. They were designed to establish a sort of equilibrium between the leading religious sects, at least so far as clerical education was concerned: had, therefore, the exclusiveness of Trinity College been done away, the balance would have been destroyed, and could only have been restored by the withdrawal of the Maynooth grant, and of the fund destined for the education of the Presbyterian clergy. It is questionable whether the Roman Catholic Church, at least, would have purchased religious equality in the University of Dublin at this price.

No less inadmissible was the second plan. Fairly to have carried it out, it would have been necessary to establish collegiate institutions for all the religious denominations existing in Ireland; and a bare enumeration of these would suffice to show that a measure having this scope would have been utterly repugnant to the religious feelings of the country at large. But again, such a measure would have been decidedly retrograde. It will scarcely be questioned that the sectarian spirit is sufficiently strong in Ireland, but this would have intensified it a hundred-fold; it would have raised throughout the country a series of fortresses, to which the various religious sects would have rallied for the maintenance of a war without truce or herald. Even the small modicum of united education given in the University of Dublin would have ceased, and the reign of exclusiveness been made complete. Lastly, the primary education of the country was conducted on the combined principle, and it was not easy to see on what ground the opposite principle should be applied to the higher education. Such an inconsistency was in truth plainly indefensible; and thus arose the question whether it was expedient to retrace our steps, and for the sake of having the separate system in our colleges introduce it in our elementary schools.

Such a question was easily answered. It would, indeed, have been strange perverseness to have tied again the only knot of the Irish difficulty which had been loosed with complete success. Not only was the combined system alone tenable in theory, but its prodigious growth had shown its singular adaptation to the circumstances of the country. It was this consideration which mainly swayed the minds of the Government in its favour. They wished to complete a work which had been so happily inaugurated, and in doing so they were unwilling to forego a principle which had proved itself of marvellous potency. Throughout the discussion on the Colleges Bill, the new colleges are regarded as strictly complementary to the national schools; they are the crown of an edifice designed on the plan of religious equality, and which must not have its symmetry marred by the introduction of anything heterogeneous to its great idea.

The question of religion having been disposed of in accordance with these views, it became necessary to determine what should be the character of the secular instruction given in the new colleges.

Now, upon this point great misapprehension has prevailed, and still prevails. The idea is, we believe, extensively prevalent that these establishments were intended as a sort of higher schools preparatory to the University of Dublin; and some well-meaning people have expressed their fears that the colleges are aiming too high, and have wished to recal them to what they believe to be their proper function. But such a notion is no less at variance with the original conception of the authors of the scheme than with the requirements of the case.

The object of the new establishments was, as we have said, to correct the inequalities existing among the various religious denominations as regards education,* and more particularly to

* The selection of the three provincial sites followed naturally from this view. It was thought that the Northern College would be mainly for the advantage of the Presbyterians, while the Roman Catholics would chiefly benefit by the colleges in the South and West. From the speeches of Sir R. Peel and Sir J. Graham, it appears that the selection of the provincial sites was not accidental but of the very essence of the measure; so much so, that if a different selection had been made, the nature of it would have been reversed. To have erected, for example, a single college at Belfast, which, according to a late friendly critic, would have satisfied the exigencies of the case, far from answering the purpose of the Government, would have directly contravened their purpose. It would have aggravated the inequality in the conditions of academic education, which it was their purpose to correct.

In the debate on mixed education during the last session of Parliament, Mr. Longfield is reported to have said that he thought "that the Queen's Colleges in Ireland had been reasonably successful. They had, it is true, been overdone. One college in Belfast would have served all useful purposes, but still it could not be said with truth that they had failed." From what we have said above it will be seen that the statement exhibits total ignorance of the

compensate for exclusion from the privileges of Dublin University. Now, this being the case, it is plain that the compensation could be considered as other than illusory only on one condition, namely, that the education given in the new institutions should be at least of as high an order as that given in the old. Otherwise it must be assumed that Roman Catholics and Dissenters are willing to be placed on a lower intellectual level than their neighbours of the Established Church. Such an assumption formed no part of the ministerial project. When, therefore, Lord John Russell, with a strange want of appreciation, urged the objection:—

“For the Roman Catholics you establish colleges suitable to the middle classes, which are open to all, and at which persons devoting themselves to commercial pursuits, civil engineering, and professions of a similar nature, receive a good education; but with respect to a higher education, you find that it is solely to be obtained in the University of Dublin, so that the University of Dublin is presided over by a body exclusively Protestant. Nay more, you find that those scholarships which are intended for the advancement of students in their future career are confined in all cases to Protestants, and that with regard to professorships, such as chemistry or botany, Protestants only can be appointed to them. Here at once is not equality.”

To this objection Sir Robert Peel could triumphantly reply: “Such reasoning is altogether founded on mistake. The education we contemplate is not such as you describe. Our purpose is to give ‘the best education and that without stint.’” Had the case been otherwise; had it been proposed to teach in the open colleges only certain lucrative dexterities, while all the higher culture was reserved for the exclusive one, the reasoning of Lord John Russell would have been perfectly conclusive. The Queen's Colleges regarded from the point of view in which ministers presented them, namely, as the means of establishing equality in academic education, would have been a mockery. Far from conciliating the unprivileged classes, they would have put upon them the grossest affront.*

Once it is thus clearly laid down that it is the function of the

scope of the measure by which the Queen's Colleges were founded. It forcibly illustrates the importance, in estimating the success or failure of institutions, of judging them with reference to the objects with which they were established, not the far different, perhaps opposed, objects which present themselves to the mind of the critic.

* The method of solving the difficulties which beset academic education in Ireland, adopted by Sir R. Peel, was not novel. We find that in 1787, the Irish Parliament came to an unanimous resolution, “that the foundation and gradual endowment of a second University within this kingdom, by the aid and authority of Parliament, in addition to the present excellent establishment of

Queen's Colleges to impart the highest education, the question of determining their curriculum is much simplified. It in effect resolves itself into the more general question—what are the conditions on which the efficiency of university education depends? This is far too wide a subject to be disposed of incidentally. It may not however be out of place to glance at a misconception as to the requirements of the higher education, which, from the circumstances of the country, may be peculiarly mischievous in Ireland. The most obvious aspect which Ireland presents is that of a country of vast industrial resources, the due development of which has been hindered by various causes, not the least potent of which is popular ignorance. Hence we should not find it strange, that the practical tendency, which the reaction against classical learning has everywhere given to education, should in Ireland exhibit itself with singular intensity; that knowledge should be looked on mainly as ancillary to industry; and that the ultimate test applied to any system of education should be its efficacy in removing obstacles from the career of material improvement on which the nation is entering. Such a view is perhaps natural, but it is not the less erroneous, shortsighted, and calculated to defeat in the end the object at which it aims. The adoption of an utilitarian standard would, it is obvious from the nature of the case, at once extinguish our highest education. There is a kind of knowledge, and that the loftiest of all, which cannot be estimated by any weights or measures which the practical sense can employ. To be valued it must be possessed. It will not submit to be challenged, nor to justify itself to those who demand from it practical results. This species of knowledge, therefore, cannot lean on popular support. Its appropriate home is in the great seats of learning, and if these sink to the level of popular thought it will wither and die. If this be true; if the main function of universities is to cherish the higher forms of speculation, and to cultivate the philosophic spirit—that breadth of view which, apart from all special accomplishment, is the one distinctive mark of liberal culture—then, unless the youth of Ireland are to forego the last best gift of academical culture, we must with all earnestness protest against the grovelling policy which would convert the Irish colleges into schools of industry. Such a policy is not less shortsighted than it is sordid. Human knowledge is not a conglomerate of sciences thrown together in any order. It is an organism, and as such obeys organic laws. If then any part of which it is composed arrogates to itself the functions of the whole or of other parts, the natural results follow—the system is de-

Trinity College in this capital, would conduce to the greater perfection of a general system for the improvement of education, and the wider diffusion of science and learning throughout the nation."

ranged, the vital principle languishes, till at last by a just retribution the offending member sinks under the atrophy which it has diffused throughout the frame. It is thus that particular sciences, when cut off from that which is the "fountain-light of all their being," are starved and distorted into pedantries, which, instead of imparting that comprehensiveness of view which, as we have said, is the great end of all university education, narrow the field of "vision to a nutshell," and which, instead of attracting the exclusive regard they claim, fall, from their fruitlessness, under universal contempt.

But it is not merely by neglecting the correlation of the sciences that the utilitarian theory defeats its own purpose. If philosophy is to be fruitfully cultivated, it must have no by-ends. One object, and one alone it proposes to itself—the discovery of truth; and if deserting its high calling, it substitutes for this some practical result, the pettiness of the aim is at once reflected on the pursuit—science is degraded into a craft, its professors into artisans. In this way everything liberal is at once stripped from education. Teachers, instead of unfolding methods, content themselves with stating conclusions; their teaching is not the living contact of mind with mind, but the inculcation of barren dogmas. All spontaneous activity is arrested; and the triumph of utility is complete when the tree of knowledge becomes an *inutile lignum*, cumbering the soil with which it has no vital connexion. In thus condemning the narrowness which refers education to the standard of a spurious utility, we are far from overlooking the paramount importance of a recognition of utility in its true sense. Nothing can be more fatal to academic education than the dissidence between the great seats of learning and the country at large, arising from the blind aversion to the useful evinced by these institutions, and their consequent repugnance to vary their curriculum with the variations of human knowledge. Accordingly to remove this dissidence has been the great problem of university reformers. They have felt that the primary condition of the prosperity of universities is that the mental activity which they embody should be in harmony with the movements of the national mind.

Regarding the University from this point of view, as a centre which collects to itself the highest and best of the national intellect which it in turn propagates and controls, it follows at once that no element which contributes to form that intellect can be excluded from its curriculum. It must be in truth a *generale studium*, admitting the whole cycle of knowledge, not indeed promiscuously, but each part in the order in which it best fulfils the end of liberal culture. And this points to the true mode of reconciling the requirements of that culture with the claims of

utility. Were an university in vital union with all that is best in the great body of speculation diffused throughout the land, the most inveterately practical would hardly impute to it inutility, even though it refused to sanction the claims of certain studies to be the exclusive instruments of education, or again to divest them of their liberal character by bounding them to some practical result.

And this leads us to notice an important use which the foundation of a new university in Ireland might serve, over and above the political gain of establishing education on the basis of religious equality. The principle upon which an university curriculum should be framed is pretty generally admitted. It is agreed by all whose opinion is of weight, that the new studies should be admitted without displacing the old. But beyond this general agreement almost everything remains to be done. How the new studies are to be adjusted to the old—how they are to be pursued so as to impart that mental culture which it was assumed to be the peculiar prerogative of the old to bestow—these great problems, with the numerous questions of detail which they involve, are still to be solved, nor is a solution to be hoped for, save by the method of patient and laborious experiment. Now it is evident that a new university, untrammelled by tradition, and undeterred by false pride from the confession of mistake and failure, is much better fitted to conduct such experiments than a venerable institution, chained to the past and labouring under the prestige of infallibility. In this way a new university might be made available for purposes wider than national—it might afford an arena whereon to test and assign their true value to educational reforms. Its successes and failures would be alike valuable to those older and more conservative foundations with which it would be brought into rivalry.

All these considerations might have been present to the founders of the Queen's Colleges, and they all, it will be observed, point in the same direction. They suppose that, the education given shall be of the highest order—that far from lagging behind, it shall be rather in advance of that given in our ancient seats of learning. No less rigorous in requirement is the motive for extending academic education since called into play by the institution of competitive examinations for the Civil Service.

The design of this great revolution in the public service is thus expressed by the report of the Indian Civil Service Commissioners who inaugurated the movement:—

“It is undoubtedly desirable that the civil servant of the Company should enter on his duties while still young; but it is also desirable that he should have received the best, the most liberal, the most finished education that his native country provides. Such an education

is the best preparation for every calling which requires the exercise of the highest powers of the human mind."

It was a noble conception, and wise as it was noble, to bring our universities into closer connexion with the State, by deriving from them to the public service that mental cultivation which entitles our professions to the name of liberal; but it would be not merely a frustration but a reversal of this generous policy, if it were found that the system of competitive examinations, instead of increasing the capacity of the service, had merely the effect of degrading the standard of general education. The only effectual safeguard against this danger, which is by no means chimerical, lies in a strict adherence to the programme of the Indian Commissioners—in making the examinations a test of the "best, the most liberal, the most finished education which the country provides." If this be done, we augur from the movement the happiest results. It will add another link to bind the votaries of utility to the cause of liberal education, by displaying on a conspicuous theatre the advantages to be derived from mental enlargement.

"Comprehensive intellect," it has been well said, "is nothing in any given sphere of society, until the persons of whom that society consists can be brought to see that such a thing exists. Once its existence understood, and then, like law, or like conscience, which is nothing but a comprehensive understanding of moral relations, its right to judge and to decide is admitted as a matter of course."*

But if, in obedience to these considerations, the competitive examinations for the leading branches of the public service are pitched on the highest scale, it follows that no educational institutions, which are not willing to be excluded from competition, can suffer their teaching to fall below the required standard. And here again we are brought into sympathy with the strictest utilitarian. Unless the youth of Ireland are to be shut out from the honours and emoluments of some of the most dignified and lucrative offices of the State, the establishments founded to extend to them the blessings of academical educations must be placed on a level with the best of those already existing.

On every ground, then, whether of policy or justice, we see that the founders of the Irish Colleges were justified in their magnanimous resolution of making these institutions the means of diffusing the very highest culture; and, further, that circumstances which have since occurred have supplied the strongest reasons for upholding that resolution. It would not, however, be any derogation from the principle involved to admit students

* *Essay upon Oxford Studies*, by Rev. M. Pattison, B.D. ("Oxford Essays," 1856). We wish to acknowledge our obligations to this valuable essay for several thoughts in the preceding paragraph.

who, from want of means or other causes, were debarred from the full measure of an university education, to instruction in particular branches of knowledge. Such a secondary object might be entertained, with great advantage to the commercial and manufacturing classes, in a country where industrial education is in so backward a state as it is in Ireland. Nor would the concession be attended with any danger, so long as the teaching body were true to their proper mission. It might be expected that the associates thus admitted to the College lecture-rooms, instead of vulgarizing the studies, would themselves catch a liberal air from the genius of the place.

Having thus briefly sketched what may be called the historic conception of the Queen's Colleges, we proceed now briefly to trace how far this conception has been realized in action.

The first criterion of the success of the Colleges is, of course, the number of students who have entered them. On referring to the Calendar of the Queen's University, we find that the total number of students who had entered the Queen's Colleges from the first session in 1849-50 to March 1859 amounted to 1786, of whom 1265 were matriculated, 521 non-matriculated—that is, students who have not passed the matriculation examination, and do not pursue all the subjects included in the university curriculum, but particular courses of instruction which they may select.*

In ascertaining the significance of these numbers, the expectations of the public give us no assistance. They are so vague, and so little based upon reflection, that their satisfaction and disappointment are alike valueless. The only sure method of determining the question of failure or success is by comparison with some institution, the position of which is unchallenged. We will take Trinity College, Dublin. The number of students who entered in Dublin during the ten years mentioned above was 2745. Hence the ratio of the average annual entrances of the institutions compared over a period of ten years is as 178 to 274. Such an average, however, would do injustice to the Queen's Colleges, the numbers of which are steadily increasing. Thus in

* We are informed by a Belfast Professor, to whose college the great majority of the non-matriculated students belong, that a large proportion of this class are medical students attending *all* the classes required in the medical curriculum—a curriculum embracing such subjects as modern languages, chemistry, natural philosophy, natural history, botany, &c. It would be obviously unjust to the Queen's Colleges to ignore this class of students in the comparisons we are instituting. On the other hand, we have no desire to place them on a level with the matriculated students. The fairest course seems to be, to give in each instance the sum total of the Queen's Colleges' students, adding the proportion which the two classes of which they are made up bear to one another.

the year 1858-59, 196 new students entered, while in the present year the number amounts to 207.*

If we left the matter here,—if we had ascertained simply the fact that the number of annual entrances in the Queen's Colleges was to that in Trinity College, Dublin, in the proportion of 207 to 274, we should be justified in saying that, looking to mere numbers, there is no reason to complain of the success of the new foundations. But this is very far from being the whole of the case. There are circumstances which render such a result not a little remarkable.

In the first place, the Queen's Colleges, if we make allowance for a small number of students preparing for the Presbyterian Church, are exclusively lay establishments, while Trinity College is the great seminary of the Irish branch of the Established Church. We do not know the proportion of students who enter Dublin with a view to the Church; but it is very large—far more than equal to the excess over the entrances at the Queen's Colleges.

Secondly, there are few private schools in Ireland at which a classical education can be obtained, while the endowed schools, being intimately connected with Dublin by exhibitions tenable alone in that University, send but a small fraction of their pupils to the Queen's Colleges. Thus we find that of 694 students entered at Queen's College, Belfast, up to 1856, only twenty-six had been educated at endowed schools.

But, thirdly, it is of still greater moment to bear in mind, that while in the Queen's Colleges residence and attendance on lectures are enforced, a student may, and the great majority of students do, obtain a degree in Dublin without residing or attending lectures, simply by passing two examinations in the course of each academic year. The facility thus afforded of obtaining degrees naturally attracts to the University of Dublin many who would otherwise never go to a university at all. Thus, we may presume, that this is the main inducement to the fifty English, Scotch, and Welsh students who, we are informed, annually seek admission in Dublin.† It is obvious, therefore, that in estimating by the experience of Dublin the number of students which may reasonably be expected in the Queen's Colleges, we should leave out of view not only this class—which might fairly be omitted upon other grounds in a question relating to *Irish* education—but all those who, like them, are influenced by the condition of non-residence. Without this we can have no common measure between the terms of our comparison. It would be preposterous

Of these, 158 are matriculated; 49 non-matriculated.

† Report of Dublin University Commissioners, p. 56.

to place on the same footing the loose tie of attendance on examinations, and the intimate connexion involved in continued residence.

Now, if on these grounds we limit our comparison to the students *attending lectures* in the institutions we are comparing, we find that in the year preceding that in which the Dublin University Commissioners reported (1851-52),* the total number of undergraduates in Trinity College was, in the first term, 411; in the second, 361; and in the third, 196, of whom, however, only 93 got credit for attendance: while the number of students on the rolls of the Queen's Colleges at the present moment is 546†, the great mass of whom will attend throughout all three terms, the minimum requirement of the College Council from those who wish to get credit for their academic year being attendance during two terms. Hence it appears, that unless the numbers in residence at Dublin have very much increased since 1852, the Queen's Colleges have, on the most moderate computation, at least as many students in that relation to them which is alone recognised by the Universities of England and Scotland, as that university.

Now, when we consider all these circumstances,—that these Colleges are lay establishments, cut off from the profession which has hitherto in Ireland made the largest demand for academical education; that in many districts it is difficult, in some impossible, to obtain the rudiments of a classical education, while the few good schools that exist are for the most part practically severed from the Queen's Colleges by their connexion with Trinity College, Dublin; that these institutions, for the first time in the history of academical education in Ireland, enforce residence on their students, though the Dublin University Commission; after mature consideration, deliberately declined to recommend that residence should be made indispensable for students of a far

* We have been unable to obtain returns for later years.

† Of these 452 are matriculated, 94 non-matriculated. In the above comparison some deduction must be made for a small number of graduates who reside at the colleges. The following table shows that in every year since the colleges settled into their normal state, with one exception, the number of students has shown an increase. Thus,

Session, 1852-3	379
" 1853-4	410
" 1854-5	438
" 1855-6	454
" 1856-7	445
" 1857-8	490
" 1858-9	

While, as we have said, there are 546 students attending lectures in the present session.

higher social standing; when we add that the youth who, at great sacrifice, leave their homes to reside near the Colleges, cannot compensate themselves with the prospect of those brilliant prizes which the older universities have it in their power to bestow,*

* The entire sum placed at the disposal of each College for prizes to undergraduates is 1100*l.* Of this sum 100*l.* is distributed at the end of each session in book premiums of from 1*l.* to 2*l.* each; the remaining 1000*l.* is divided into scholarships tenable for one year, varying in amount from 24*l.* to 15*l.*, according to the faculty or school to which the scholarship belongs. There are besides ten scholarships in each College, limited to graduates, and likewise tenable for one year, of the value of 40*l.* each. It thus appears that these so-called scholarships are small exhibitions to assist students in keeping themselves at college. Any one acquainted with the helps and rewards held out to students at the old universities will perceive at a glance their insignificance. Their aggregate amount is in fact less than that of the prizes open to Roman Catholics in Dublin, although it is familiarly said that Roman Catholics are excluded from the emoluments of that University. • When this is borne in mind, and it is further remembered that the Queen's Colleges, unlike Dublin, insist on residence with its attendant expense, the futility of the assertion which is sometimes made—that it is solely by these scholarships that students are attracted to the colleges—will be abundantly manifest.

The statements on this and other subjects connected with the colleges made by Mr. Hennessy and endorsed by Mr. Maguire, are so instructive as to the manner in which the opposition to the Queen's Colleges has been conducted that we may be excused for noticing them. It is only necessary to premise that, as Mr. Hennessy received his education at one of the Queen's Colleges, his allegations must have been made with a full knowledge of the facts of the case. Mr. Hennessy says, that "the Commissioners (for inquiring into the state of the Queen's Colleges) state, that the total number of those who entered the Colleges since their opening in 1849 to 1858, is 1209;" that "the total number of scholarships offered to these students in the same period is 1326;" adding, "it thus appears, assuming that every student was presented with a scholarship, that there were still left, in this case, twenty-nine scholarships which could not be filled up simply for want of persons to take them." Now, first, the Commissioners do not state that the number of students who had entered the colleges previous to 1858 was 1209. This is the number of *matriculated* students: the total number of students as given in the Commissioners' Report, is 1686. But, secondly, Mr. Hennessy is perfectly aware that these scholarships are vacated at the end of each year, and that, as former scholars are re-eligible, the same person holds, in the ordinary case, three, in many instances, four or more of them in succession. Indeed, we have no doubt that Mr. H. has himself been the holder of several of these valuable prizes. In what language, then, shall we characterize the representation which more than implies that only one of the specified scholarships had been held by each student, and thence deduces the conclusion that the number of students has fallen short of the number of prizes? At the time Mr. Hennessy made this statement, the number of students in the three Colleges was 493, while the total number of scholarships was 169, and it was by no means necessary that they should all have been filled up.

Taking the same basis for his calculations, and wishing to present "the failure of the Queen's Colleges" from another point of view, Mr. Maguire, in an interview with the late Chancellor of the Exchequer upon the subject of granting a charter to the Catholic University, stated the average number of students since the opening of the colleges as "40 in each college in each year." A reference

any more than they can maintain themselves by tuition—a resource so largely turned to account by the resident students of Dublin; when we remember, lastly, that the Colleges have since their opening been exposed to the most unscrupulous opposition on the part of the zealots of all parties; and yet find that, despite all these adverse circumstances, their lecture-rooms

to official returns would have shown Mr. Maguire that the average number of students in each College had been 135, and that at the time he spoke it was, as may be seen from the number given above, 164. A conclusion so glaringly in conflict with fact, might have led Mr. Maguire to suspect his premises. But this gentleman is obviously not familiar with the *reductio ad absurdum*. If facts did not square with his theory—*tant pis pour les faits*. As it was, his statement passed unrebutted, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer charitably acquiesced in his statement that he was actuated by no feeling of hostility to the Queen's Colleges.

To return to Mr. Hennessy. This gentleman accuses the Queen's College Commissioners of misstating the number of students who have entered. The Commissioners give the number of entrances, matriculated and non-matriculated, since the opening of the colleges as 1768; adding, "that this number represents only 1686 individuals, 82 non-matriculated students having subsequently entered as matriculated students." Mr. H. supports his charge by representing as included in the smaller number 1686, the twice-counted names, by the elimination of which the larger number was reduced! Mr. Hennessy professes to have discovered some curious properties in numbers. His manipulation of statistics is certainly somewhat singular. One other specimen of his manner, and we close this too protracted note. Commenting, in his place in Parliament, on the lavish manner in which the Queen's University bestowed its gold medals, Mr. Hennessy pointed his observations with a contrast of the wise parsimony of the University of Dublin in bestowing the same distinction. "In the University of Dublin," he said, "four gold medals could not be awarded unless there were 160 candidates, one never being awarded unless there were 40 competitors for it." Now, with reference to the award of gold medals, the difference between the Queen's University and the University of Dublin is simply this, that while in the former only one is awarded in each department—and even this is occasionally withheld—in the latter the number is practically unlimited. In confirmation, the writer may mention two cases which fell within his own knowledge, and he has no reason to think them exceptional. In 1844, there were *four* candidates for classical moderatorship—they all obtained gold medals; and in the preceding year *six* gold medals were awarded to the only *six* candidates who presented themselves for moderatorship in mathematics and physics. This last statement displays, indeed, a reckless negligence in making assertions upon matters of which the speaker was wholly ignorant—a negligence most culpable, looking to the audience he was addressing and the importance of the subject, but it is of an entirely different order from the representations of Mr. Hennessy, to which we have before referred. These are of a nature to preclude ordinary criticism. It is lamentable to think that the exigencies of Irish faction should have driven persons naming themselves Conservative to combine with the Ultramontanes in placing in the representation of an important Irish county an obscure young man, whose sole distinction has been derived from such futile attempts to injure the place in which he has received any education he may possess. We have only to hope that the legislature will judge any future contributions he may make to the collective wisdom in the light of those we have here exposed.

are as much frequented as those of the ancient University of Dublin with all its prestige and well-earned fame,—we confess we are wholly at a loss to conceive how the most exigent can bring the objection of failure on the score of numbers. To us the numbers seem far beyond what reason and experience would have warranted us in anticipating before the event.

If failure cannot be predicated of the Queen's Colleges on the score of numbers, no more can it be said that they have failed in their great object of giving united education to the youth of the various religious persuasions. In the ten years, 1849–59, the three great religious communities, which make up the bulk of the population, are thus represented among the matriculated* students:—

Established Church . . .	426
Roman Catholics	445
Presbyterians	348

While the 207 students, who have entered this year, are thus distributed:—

Established Church . . .	60
Roman Catholics	69
Presbyterians	59
Other denominations . . .	19

The first thing that strikes us in reading these numbers is, that the Roman Catholics in each case head the list. This is a novelty in the higher education of Ireland, the full importance of which we cannot appreciate without entering a little into detail.

In the year 1850, Mr. Napier, then member for the University of Dublin, stated the number of Roman Catholic students in that University as one-tenth of the whole, and this proportion he justified by saying that it almost exactly corresponded with the comparative wealth of Protestants and Roman Catholics throughout the country (*Hansard*, 110, 737). We have reason to think Mr. Napier's statement rather in excess of the actual number. The total number of Roman Catholics who have entered Dublin during the last ten years is 137, giving an average annual entrance of 13·7, or less than one-twentieth of the whole number of students.† And, though the Queen's Colleges have doubtless caused some diminution in the Roman Catholic entrances in Dublin, we are persuaded that they have not fallen to less than half what they were before the opening of these institutions. We may, therefore, perhaps safely assume that the number of Roman Catholics who annually entered Trinity College before the establishment of the

* The same proportion, we understand, prevailed among the non-matriculated students.

† We have been favoured with these numbers by the courtesy of the Senior Lecturer of Trinity College, Dublin.

Queen's Colleges was from 20 to 25, giving a total of from 200 to 250 for ten years.

Now, during the first decade of their existence, which has just expired, nearly 500 Roman Catholics, if we include non-matriculated students, have been members of the Colleges of Cork and Galway alone—a number, if the above estimate be correct, at least double that of those who entered the University of Dublin, during a corresponding period, at a time when that University had exclusive possession of the higher education of the country. At the present moment, of the 171 students in Cork, 84, or 49 per cent., are Roman Catholics; and at Galway, of 118 students, 69, or 58 per cent., profess the same faith; the proportion in the case of the latter College being an increase of 6 per cent. on the preceding year. Taking the three Colleges, Roman Catholics make up about one-third, while in Dublin, judging from an average of ten years, they amount to one-twentieth, of the entire number of students.

Now, we do not wish to endorse the dictum of Mr. Napier, but we are at least entitled to claim his assent and that of all who do, to the complete success of the Queen's Colleges in diffusing academic education among the Roman Catholics. The results attained, must be indeed surprising to all who, like Mr. Napier, were disposed to regard the distribution of education among Roman Catholics and Protestants as a question of comparative wealth. This was a consideration not to be overlooked indeed, but it was far from being a full account of the matter. To those who have considered the virtue which resides in a just principle, it will not seem strange that it should burst not merely the trammels of poverty, but the far more tenacious fetters of ecclesiastical despotism. That this has been achieved, we may now confidently hope. When in the stronghold of Roman Catholicism, under the immediate eye of Dr. MacHale, the only fruit of the recent pastoral has been an increase of 6 per cent. in the relative proportion of the Roman Catholic students of the Western College, we may reasonably conclude that the confidence of the Roman Catholic laity has been effectually gained, and that the only obstacle to the indefinite expansion of the College is the difficulty of the means of obtaining preparatory education.

Before leaving this topic, we would add, that the policy of the Government in selecting the sites of the colleges has been fully justified by the event. The colleges in the west and south have chiefly benefited the Roman Catholics, who, as we have seen, at present supply 53 per cent. of the entire number of students—a very large proportion looking to the relative wealth of the different denominations; and the northern college has been mainly advantageous to the Presbyterians, who make up more than

three-fifths of its students; while in all the Colleges the youth of the less numerous religious communities have not failed to mix with the majority in the generous rivalry of academic contests.*

Passing to the quality of the education given in the Queen's Colleges, on this score but little needs be said on their behalf. The competence of the professors has, we believe, never been questioned, any more than their zeal, not only in maintaining the existing standard of education, but in elevating it to the highest point which the circumstances of the country admit. Nor have their exertions been unrewarded. Fortunately, on this subject, we are not left to conjecture. We have seen that the competitive examinations for the Indian Civil Service were designed to be a test of "the best, the most liberal, the most finished education, which the country provides;" and a careful study of the papers set will show that the examiners have not willingly let them fall below this standard. The examinations are in effect framed on the model of those to which in the universities candidates for the highest honours at the close of their undergraduate course are subjected. They supply, therefore, a fair criterion of the comparative efficiency of our educational institutions. As the universities bring into concourse the youth of their affiliated colleges, so these examinations introduce into a still wider arena the youth of the several Universities. It is, then, with just pride that the Queen's University appeals to the fact that, in this competition, looking merely to

* It has of late been a favourite device of the opponents of the Colleges to gain credit for candour by admitting the success of the College of Belfast, in order that they may assail with more effect the sister Colleges. We have before shown how little a single college at Belfast would have answered the purposes for which the Queen's Colleges were founded; but if this do not suffice, and success, as measured by numbers, be appealed to, the Colleges of Cork and Galway have no reason to shrink from comparison with that of Belfast. The following table gives the number of students attending lectures in the Queen's Colleges in the current session, and the population of the towns and provinces to which they belong. It shows that the Colleges of Cork and Galway, in the aggregate, have a larger number in attendance, in proportion to the town populations, than the College of Belfast, and almost as large, in proportion to the population of the provinces, notwithstanding the great superiority of Ulster in wealth and in the means of procuring education.

	Population of the town.	Population of the province.	Students matriculated.	Students non- matriculated.	Total.
Belfast	100,801	2,011,756	197	60	257
Cork	83,745	1,857,412	144	27	171
Galway	23,605	1,010,211	111	7	118

It will be further observed that the main superiority of Belfast rests on its non-matriculated students. This is only what might be expected. As this class of students comes, for the most part, from the surrounding district, it will be proportionate to the number of its inhabitants. The total number of matriculated students from the opening of the colleges to March, 1859, is thus distributed:—Belfast, 506; Cork, 473; Galway, 337.

the number of places obtained, it stands next in order to the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin. If, however, we regard the quality of the answering, the result is still more in favour of the Queen's University. In the only years in which the Universities we have named came into conflict, the average answering of the successful candidates from each stood as follows :—

	1856.		1857.		1859.
Oxford . . .	1948	1982	2103.
Cambridge . .	2062	2207	2020.
Dublin . . .	2473	2082	2139.
Queen's University	1955	2261	2160.*

It thus appears that in the last two years the candidates from the Queen's University stood first, in the preceding year third, in the list. This is sufficiently striking, but we cannot forbear commemorating a signal instance of success obtained by one of the Colleges. It will be ever memorable in the annals of the College of Belfast, that, while numbering not 200 students, it bore away, at this examination, from all our highest seats of learning, the first, fourth, and ninth of twelve vacant places.†

So much for the direct action of the Queen's Colleges upon the country: no less important has been their indirect influence. We shall endeavour to point out some instances in which it may be clearly traced.

1. It is surely more than a chance coincidence that, within the

* We have excluded the subjects of Arabic and Sanscrit, which are not taught in the Queen's University. If included, they would turn the scale slightly in favour of Dublin in the last year.

† Of the 113 East Indian writerships which have hitherto been given away by open competition,

The University of Oxford obtained	38
" Cambridge	26
" Dublin	18
" Queen's University	9
" University of London . . .	7
" Scotland (five Universities)	10
Other Institutions	5

We are far from wishing to convey the impression that the general standard of attainment amongst the students of the Queen's Colleges is as high as is desirable. The deplorable state of intermediate education renders it impossible to make the matriculation examination very rigorous; and thus, while the scholarship of the vast majority of those who enter is extremely slender, there are amongst them few or none of those highly trained youths who go up to compete for honours in the old Universities. The professors have striven hard to remedy this evil, by minute subdivision of classes, and the adaptation of their teaching to the varying wants of the students, but they are deeply sensible how much their efficiency is impaired by the waste of power which this involves. It is obvious that a consideration of these circumstances greatly enhances the merit of the successes which have been achieved.

last ten years, nearly the whole curriculum of the University of Dublin has been changed; all the leading changes being approximations to the curriculum of the Queen's University. Nor is it merely the courses of study which have been revolutionized; the efficiency of the teaching has, in the same period, been vastly increased. Professorial chairs, which had become almost sinecures, have been rehabilitated, and raised by their occupants to a position of dignity and usefulness. Thus the chair of rhetoric has, by the present able professor, been developed into an admirable school of English literature, which has reflected the highest distinction on the University; while the chair of Greek, which used to be an incident of a senior fellowship, has, with the happiest results, been conferred on an accomplished scholar, whose claim was his fitness for the post. And these are but specimens of an activity, which, penetrating into every department of the University, has resulted in changes so radical, that Dublin, far from being obnoxious to the old obloquy of Universities—"morosa retentio morum,"—may, in the opinion of some, seem liable to the opposite charge of over-sensitiveness to public opinion. Can we be mistaken in attributing this reforming spirit to the emulation of the Queen's Colleges, or in discerning the same influence in the liberality, which has recently endowed scholarships in the same University (some of them of great value), open to candidates of all religious persuasions?

2. Such has been the silent recognition which the ancient University of Ireland has given to her youthful sister. Elsewhere the recognition has been, if not more obvious, more avowed. We have already ventured to say that new universities possess peculiar facilities for making those experiments, by which alone it can be determined what position the modern studies are to occupy in our university system; and that it is the wisdom of ancient institutions which possess less flexibility to profit by their experience in the way of encouragement or warning. We have lately had a pleasing example of the acknowledgment of this relativity of function in the case of the University of Cambridge. In the year 1855, the Secretary of the Queen's University received a letter from the Regius Professor of Law in the University of Cambridge, in which, after requesting copies of the University Examination Papers, and stating that he is a member of a committee appointed for the purpose of entirely remodelling the course of lectures for the faculty of law in the University to which he belongs, that gentleman goes on to say, "the questions in the Queen's Colleges for the degree of LL.B., as well as those on jurisprudence, strike me as being so admirably adapted to students of the principles of law, that I should wish to make use of them as much as I can." And again, in reply to a

letter from the Secretary, with which had been transmitted to him some copies of the University and College Examination Papers, Dr. Abdey says,—

“ I sincerely trust that in many points we shall imitate the system adopted in the Queen’s Colleges in our proposed new classes in this University, as I feel no doubt of the benefit we shall derive by so doing. I speak with more boldness on the subject of the questions in jurisprudence and civil law, as that is my own department here But it is not only in their law papers that your colleges show their merit and utility. The whole system of education pursued by you is, in my humble opinion, so good, and so well suited to the times, that I sincerely trust that it may defy all opposition.”

That a Cambridge professor, acting on behalf of his University, should thus have condescended to seek suggestions from a new University, having nothing but its merits to recommend it, is no less honourable to himself than to the institution which he consulted. But what we wish to direct particular attention to is this, that we have here distinct proof that the Queen’s University has exercised an influence beyond its immediate sphere—that it has rendered important service in defining the position of at least a portion of those subjects which modern reformers have introduced into our University curriculum.

3. We have reserved for the last what may perhaps be regarded as the most important of the services rendered to education by the Queen’s Colleges. Through them was first discovered the wretched condition of intermediate education in Ireland. The University of Dublin deriving its students from every part of the United Kingdom, and connected by exhibitions with the few good schools existing in Ireland, did not feel, at least did not complain of, an evil which yet was effectually arresting the development of liberal education throughout the country. On the other hand, when the Queen’s Colleges were called into existence, being cut off from these resources, and compelled by the rule enforcing residence to rely for support on the districts in which they were placed, they were not long in discovering that their usefulness was indefinitely diminished by the insufficiency, and, in many cases, the total absence of the means of procuring preparatory education. The dearth of schools, apparent in every province, reached in Connaught its utmost intensity, where, in a population of upwards of a million, 625 pupils were attending schools called classical, but the great majority of which were utterly inefficient. Taking the whole country, it was estimated that the means of acquiring the rudiments of a classical education were denied to three-fourths of the people. To remedy this state of things was a question of life and death with the Queen’s

Colleges. It was clear they could never, in any adequate sense, fulfil their purpose, if they had to look for students to a narrow area, within which they were further embarrassed by the competition of a privileged institution which offered education on far casier terms. This, it was felt, and not the religious difficulty, was the true obstacle to their growth. Accordingly, those interested in their well-being have never ceased to urge upon the Government the necessity of completing the good work they have begun, by bringing within the people's reach the blessings which now, in too many instances, mock their grasp. These exertions, we rejoice to think, have at the last a fair prospect of being crowned with success; Mr. Cardwell having recently intimated, that it is the intention of the Government to introduce a measure on the subject of intermediate education during the present session of Parliament.

We have said that the palmary service rendered by the Queen's Colleges is the detection of this chasm in our educational system; and we think we were warranted in the statement, because the filling up of the void is the one condition on which depends the extension of university education in Ireland. Universities without schools are but castles in the air. And perhaps we may be permitted further to observe, that the history of this discovery abundantly justifies the wisdom of the new foundations. The University of Dublin, from its cosmopolitan character and the speciality of its object, could live, and even maintain a brilliant career, while practically secluded from three-fourths of the people; but so soon as truly national institutions were erected, destined to no other end than with missionary spirit to bear the light of knowledge into the dark places of the land, the logic of facts at once revealed the want, and demanded for the new establishments, if their purpose was not to be in a great measure frustrated, that it should be forthwith supplied.

It was our intention to have considered, in conclusion, the scheme of higher education which the Roman Catholic hierarchy have set up in opposition to the united system, and to have discussed the policy of granting a charter to the University they have established. But we have already exceeded our limits, and do not much regret that we cannot enter on these topics. We have stated, as clearly as we could within the space allowed us, the case of the Queen's Colleges, and we gladly remit to the reader's candour the claims of an institution based on the antagonistic principle, and the question how far it is deserving of the recognition and encouragement of the State. If we may judge from the success, which the Catholic University has hitherto achieved, the Irish people seem to have formed a tolerably decided opinion on these matters for themselves.

ART. VII.—GERMANY: ITS STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS.

1. *Geschichte der Preussisch-deutschen Unionsbestrebungen.* Von W. A. Schmidt. 1851.
2. *Die Deutsche Union.* Von — Bloemer. Berlin: 1860.
3. *Pro domo et pro patria.* Gegen K. Vogt. Von I. Venedey. Berlin: 1860.
4. *Ungehaltene Rede des Abgeordneten Heinrich von Arnim.* Berlin: 1860.
5. *Die Savoyer Frage.* Denkschrift an Preussische Staats-männer. Berlin: 1860.
6. *Hohenzollern und Habsburg.* Berlin: 1860.
7. *Der Preussische Landbote.* Berlin: 1860.
8. *Wochenschrift des Nationalvereins.* Coburg: 1860.
9. *Geschichte der Deutschen Politik unter dem Einfluss des Italiänischen Krieges.* Berlin: 1860.
10. *Deutsche Federn in Oestreiches Doppeladler.* Berlin: 1860.

IN Frankfort-on-the-Maine they show the sightseer two remarkable buildings, the *Roemer*, and the palace of the Princes of Thurn and Taxis. The former, now the town-hall, was of yore the banqueting-hall of the German Emperors and the conclave of the Electors. The latter is the seat of the Diet of the German Confederation, the heir or successor of the Emperors. The name *Roemer*, Roman, may or may not be derived from the habit of Italian, especially Roman, merchants of exposing their goods for sale in that capacious hall, yet the very sound of the word makes the mind turn towards Italy, the stranger's with curiosity, the German's with sadness—towards Italy, which gave the Emperor his crown, the empire its name; which during centuries drank the best blood of Germany, shed in bootless struggles, which saw the head of young Conradine, the last scion of the Hohenstaufens, fall under the axe of the cowardly Neapolitan—towards Italy which has propounded to Germany a riddle she must solve or run the risk of her own dissolution. Callous, indeed, or frivolous, that German must be who, having wandered through that building and mused over its past, did not find a drop of bitterness in that other *roemer*—the green glass from which he likes to sip his wine. But ten times callous and frivolous is he who could look at the palace of the Diet and not feel his cheek glow with shame

and scorn. Well may a German father take his sons to those two edifices and to the *Paulskirche*, the seat of the shadow empire of 1848, and teach them the history of their country more impressively than from a hundred volumes.

From Rome was derived that solemn title *Heiliges Roemisches Reich Deutscher Nation*, Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, of which it was said, long before its fall, in bitter self-irony, that it was neither *heilig*, nor *roemisch*, nor *reich*. On Christmas-day, 800, while Charlemagne, King of the Franks, was attending divine service in St. Peter's Church, Pope Leo took a crown from the altar, put it on the head of the King, and all the people shouted "Life and victory to Charles Augustus, the Emperor of Rome, crowned by God, the pious, the great, the harbinger of peace!" There are controversies about the management of this strange solemnity; about its consequences there can be none. When the Goth Odoacer kicked poor Romulus Augustulus from the throne of the Cæsars, he did not think it worth while to pick up his crown. Now, some German writers, distinguished alike by their book-learning, amiable simplicity, and ignorance of human affairs maintain that a priest dragged it forth from under the wrecks and lumber of four hundred years of fighting, of setting up and pulling down, and put it on the head of the Frank—in order to create an agreeable surprise to his mighty guest, by way of a Christmas-box! No; the wily and mysterious King was not the man to be surprised by such a present; nor the priest the man to give it away just to see a cheerful face. Whatever Eginhard, the King's (now Emperor's) friend, secretary, and biographer, may tell us, there must have been a bargain, or an approach to it. True, the Roman empire could not but be an object of contempt to those hardy races who fell upon it like an avalanche. But if the remnants of its material civilization, if its highways and aqueducts, its temples and theatres, strike wonder and awe into the heart of a generation that is twining a web of rails and wires around the globe, if its code of laws still reigns over the larger part of Europe, if its system of polity is still the school of the wisest of us, how powerful must have been the effect of a contact so much closer in space and time? To Charles, the founder of the first vast and settled empire after the fall of that of Rome, the mighty edifice of Roman power must have appeared from over that surging sea—the great migration of nations, both a model to be imitated and an inheritance to be reclaimed. The more forcibly so when he had obtained sway over the very seat of that empire. The Roman was the master of Europe; so was Charles. And if the eastern world still continued a branch establishment of Rome, if the Emperors of Constantinople still claimed priority in all Christendom, Charles could not better assert a claim to

equality, nay, pre-eminence, than by reviving that dignity, part of which Constantine had transferred to the shores of the Bosphorus. Nor is there wanting evidence that he fully understood and appreciated the despotic principle of the Roman monarchy, and was anxious to enlist it against the sense and practice of individual liberty inherent in the Teutonic races under his rule. Two years after his coronation he required of every male a new oath of fidelity, an Emperor's oath instead of the King's oath, reminding those who had to administer it, that those who swore had to swear "like a man to his lord," and that, "besides fidelity, great and various things, *magna et multa*, were comprised in the oath." To the Pope, on the other hand, being little more than a bishop, residing within the republican municipality of Rome, and asserting claims, alike disputed, to independence of the patriarchal see of Constantinople, and to superiority over the rest of the bishops of the Latin church, the conditions and advantages of a bargain were equally obvious. He did what no other bishop of the Western Church had done, and what, when done, none of his successors could do again. By giving away what was not his, the Imperial crown, he established a precedent, easily capable in future, of sustaining the pretence, that the crown was in his gift. For any possible contest between the religious and political systems of the East and the West, he had linked his fortune to the most powerful rival of Byzantium. Lastly, he had secured a strong arm to help him into the possession of the present kindly made to him by St. Peter, viz., the temporal power over the City of Rome, and a slice of territory around, the larger the better. It is strange that the people who saw the Pope put the crown on the King's head, did not hail the Emperor as crowned by the Pope but crowned by God. It looks uncommonly as if a previous understanding had been arrived at on this point, public opinion being instructed accordingly. This Christmas-day in St. Peter's church, is like an acorn out of which the history of these thousand years has grown. It has borne fruit according to time and season, those of the present season being the French in Rome, Austrians, concealed under Papal uniform, in Ancona, distracted Germany, and, most wondrous fruit of all, 'the eldest son of the Church,'—Louis Napoleon.

When the grandsons of Charlemagne divided his vast inheritance, extending from the Ebro to the Elbe, and from the Eider to the Tiber, the crown of Rome together with the guardianship of the Pope fell to the lot of Louis, King of the Germans, and with his successors it remained till 1806. But that concentration of power which was symbolized in the Imperial crown it was their fatality never to attain. In the western part of the great Frankish empire, in France, a series of princes and ministers,

firm of purpose and unscrupulous in means, succeeded in establishing a hereditary monarchy, in reducing the great feudal lords from a position of *pairs*, that is to say equals to the King, to that of courtiers, and their territories, the possible *nuclei* of independent states, to the level of private estates, and in crushing by the same process, municipal privileges and individual liberty. In England two revolutions preserved and realized the original idea of the Teutonic state; concentration of power and action in contact with the outer world, division of power and full scope to individual life within. Germany was never blessed with a prince strong enough himself, and sufficiently favoured by circumstances, to overcome the centrifugal force of that love of individual liberty which distinguishes the German race from the gregarious Slave. On the other hand that love neither proved strong enough, nor did it meet with opportunities to secure its display by guarantees common to all. Around the King, and between him and the people, arose a nobility which encroached upon both; and which, while constantly narrowing its own circle, finally reduced the rights of crown and nation to mere names, eating out the substance of the empire, not only in power and privileges, but also in land and men, and leaving little more than an empty shell, which was necessarily crushed in the terrible conflicts subsequent to the French revolution. The Emperors themselves, after a certain epoch, joined in this work, and with a success corresponding to their greater opportunities. They plundered the empire for the benefit of their families, and resisted, in their hereditary states, that authority they were bound to uphold as heads of the nation. The pretensions and the aims of the princes are distinctly traceable, not in the mind of every one of them—the minds of many being empty enough—but in a general current of ideas, to that coronation in St. Peter's church. It is, as far as Germany is concerned, the source of right divine.

Neither Charlemagne himself, nor his worthless and hapless descendants had been able to supersede, by their Roman notions, the law of freemen, firmly rooted in the habits and customs of the German tribes. After the extinction of the Carolingian race, a vigorous and healthy reaction ensued, throwing off the foreign importation and restoring for some time the original institutions such as they are described by Tacitus. Local self-government, in which aristocratic and popular elements happily blended, superseded again the *missi regii*, the Royal Commissioners of the Frankish system of government; and an active participation of the people in the administration of justice, "in the finding of the law," to use the language of the time, left little scope for making laws. In 911, the kingly power was made elective and remained so. For several centuries the suffrage was exercised by a great number of princes

and other estates of the realm, in fact by all who found it convenient to attend ; even the people on the spot taking part by show of hands or acclamation. By degrees the more powerful princes managed to get the decision into their hands, and in 1356 they felt strong enough to convert practice into right. The Golden Bull, a covenant between the Emperor and the Estates of the empire, conferred the exclusive privilege of electing the king emperor, on seven princes, afterwards increased to nine, since and for that reason styled electors. This document has frequently been called the *Magna Charta* of Germany, one should think by persons who knew no more of what passed at Runnymede than the title of the record. A comparison of the two parchments affords, indeed, one of the most valuable clues for the understanding of German history, past and present. *Magna Charta* records the rights and privileges not only of the nobility but of all classes of society, the most humble not excepted. It secures proper administration of justice, provides facilities for trade and commerce, cancels illegal judgments and forfeitures, orders the removal of guilty officials, and restores the disturbed relations with foreign powers. The whole of the twenty-seven chapters of the Golden Bull treat of the privileges of the electors, confirming those that were founded in law and custom, establishing some that were disputed, and introducing others that had never been heard of. It begins by describing how and by whom the electors are to be safely conducted to the place of election ; settles their precedence among themselves and before all the other princes ; adjudges them the right of taking all the metals and taxing all the Jews in their territories ; forbids any appeal from their courts to the courts of the Emperor, the case of denial of hearing excepted ; prescribes that their lands shall descend undivided after the order of primogeniture, and that the heir apparent "at seven years of age shall learn the Latin, Italian, and Slavonian tongues." The spirit of this singular *Magna Charta* cannot be fully appreciated without a few quotations.

"We, by this present edict, do declare that all the privileges granted by us or by our predecessors to any body of what quality soever, cities, towns, &c., or to be granted hereafter, shall in no way prejudice to the liberties and jurisdictions of the Electors, though it be expressed in grants of those privileges that they shall not be dissolved.

"If any person shall attempt, or by oath promise and engage in any conspiracy against the life of any electors of the empire, he shall be put to death and all his goods and estates forfeited, as in cases of high treason ; for the Electors being part of our own body that will shall be punished with the same severity as if the fact had been committed."

There is the law of the Cæsars with a vengeance ! In return

for such prerogatives, the electors take upon themselves onerous and beneficent duties.

“Every time the Emperor shall keep a solemn court the Electors shall perform their offices after the following manner. The Emperor sitting on his throne, the Duke of Saxony being on horseback before the gate of the palace, a heap of oats shall be prepared as high as the horse’s breast, and the duke having his silver staff and a measure of silver, both weighing twelve marks, shall fill the measure with oats and give it to the next groom of the stable; then planting his staff in the oats he retires, and the Vice-Marshal approaching, they leave the oats as plunder to all that can take them. The Emperor sitting down, the ecclesiastical Electors shall bless the dinner, then the Archbishops, or one of them, bearing the seals on the top of the silver staff, shall put them upon the table, and the Archbishop, in whose diocese the court is held, shall take the broadest seal and hang it about his neck during dinner time.”

As a sort of counterpoise to these encroachments of the electors upon the community, it might appear that the Imperial crown, although, *de jure*, elective to the last, became, in fact, hereditary in the family of the Hapsburgs. But the electors quickly hit upon an effectual means of further reducing the authority of the Emperor over the empire, how powerful soever he might be in his hereditary dominions. They made him sign certain articles, called capitulations, before they recorded their votes. It was with difficulty that the Emperor succeeded in eliminating from the capitulations of 1658, the clause, that “the Emperor, if he were to transgress any one point, should, *ipso facto*, lose his crown.” In rapidly tracing the decline of the central authority of the German Empire, it is foreign to our purpose to touch upon the political considerations that might have justified increased precautions against the increasing power which the House of Hapsburg was enabled to draw from its extra-German possessions. Suffice it to say that the restrictions imposed by the capitulations, while preventing the Emperor from doing wrong to the electors, with almost equal efficiency prevented him from doing right to the people. After the death of Charles VI., the last male descendant in the male line of Rodolph of Hapsburg, the electors, for the last time, seriously asserted their right of choosing a successor, the majority of them giving their suffrages to Charles, Elector of Bavaria, called Charles VII. in the line of Emperors, the minority to Francis Stephen of Lorraine, the husband of Maria Theresa, daughter of Charles VI. After the death of Charles, VII., 1775, Francis Stephen prevailed, and the election of his descendants never seriously contested, degenerated into that hollow, overgrown, and dreary pageantry, which is familiar to the readers of Goethe’s autobiography.

The nature of the supreme authority, whether elective or hereditary, of any body politic, must necessarily to a considerable extent prejudice the attributes and functions belonging to such authority. According to the common law of Germany, the King, besides having his share in legislation, was the supreme judge of the nation, her first captain in war, her sole representative in international transactions. It is self-evident that without a vigorous exercise of these functions, either by the chief of the State himself, or by others in his name, the existence of a *State*, in that sense of the word which is designated alike by logic and by history, becomes an impossibility. It is equally evident that, in Germany, the circumstances we have detailed necessarily had the effect of hampering and crippling these attributes of Imperial power. With a correct appreciation of the peculiarity and defect of the German Empire, English writers of the eighteenth century avoided calling it a State, by designating it as the "Germanic Body."

A strenuous effort was made in the reign of Maximilian I., (1495) to preserve a centre and fountain head of jurisdiction, by the creation of the *Reichskammergericht*, a high court of the Empire, filled by appointment of the estates with learned judges, to decide between the members of the Empire, and between any of them and his subjects, and to hear appeals from any inferior court; together with an admirable organization for carrying the sentences into effect, no easy matter with defendants so powerful. Various causes interfered with the development of this institution. Many of the princes were as unwilling to contribute their shares towards defraying the expenses, as highwaymen and housebreakers would be to levy a police rate. Funds running short, the number of judges was reduced; and arrears accumulating, parties turned to the Aulic Court, established and maintained by the Emperors with concurrent jurisdiction at Vienna, prompter in despatching business, but naturally suspected of partiality. The Electors and others of the more considerable princes obtained *privilegium de non appellando*, the right of forbidding their subjects to appeal from their territorial courts to the *Kammergericht*, a right destructive of the uniformity of justice and the growth and preservation of a common law. The execution of judgment was difficult when, as in the case of powerful members of the Empire, it might assume the shape of a campaign. The last attempt of this court to try a party not belonging to the small fry of immediate counts, cities or villages (instance that *reichsunmittelbare Marktflecken Kulschnappel*, depicted with infinite humour by Jean Paul) was directed against Frederic II. of Prussia. The notary who came to present the summons to the Prussian ambassador, descended the stairs quicker than he had ascended them; and

the *Reichsexecutionsarmee*, entrusted with the execution of the sentence of outlawry, was ignominiously dispersed in the battle of Roszbach.

In a body tending to disruption into a cluster of independent little monarchies, concentration of will and power in dealing with foreign states, and the adoption of a really national policy, had but a poor chance. It was still more diminished, and ultimately destroyed by two adverse influences, one the acquisition by the Hapsburg Emperors, and subsequently by other princes of considerable possessions not belonging to the Empire, the other the religious schism. The descendants of needy Count Rodolph successively acquired Bohemia, Moravia, Hungary, Croatia, Transylvania, Slavonia, not to speak of their latest, least honourable, and most fatal acquisitions, Galitia and Venice. They united, respectively in 1708 and 1714, to their hereditary dominions the two Italian Duchies, Mantua and Milan, originally, and since the Middle Ages, fiefs of the Empire, to which, in a state of semi-independence, they had been the source of infinite trouble and disaster. It has been, and is to the present day, the theme of violent incriminations, but it was in fact only the natural result of circumstances, that the Hapsburgers, in international politics, should have made the Imperial function and power subservient to their dynastic interests, dragged the Empire into wars not its own, and bought, in making peace, advantages for their outlying possessions at the cost of the German nation. The succession of the Electors of Brandenburg to the sovereign duchy of Prussia, created a similar double position for the ancestors of the royal house of Prussia. These distracting agencies, however, might have been overcome, a consolidated German Empire might have subjected those extra-German territories, especially towards the east, to its interests, as they were subjected to the action of its higher civilization, if the whole of Germany had either remained Roman Catholic, or, what at one time was within a hair's breadth, thrown off the allegiance to the Papal See. But the treaty of Westphalia, 1648, terminating a century of religious struggles, sanctioned the division of Germany in two camps, if not hostile, yet not friendly. With a view, or under colour of affording an additional security to the Protestant princes, the right of concluding alliances with foreign powers was formally conceded to every member of the Empire, an innovation perfectly incompatible with the principle, nominally preserved to the end, that they were "subjects" of the Emperor and Empire, and in practice very little mitigated by the proviso, that no alliance should be directed against the Emperor and Empire. Since that time the activity of the "Germanic Body" in international transactions, more particularly in treaties of peace, was in

fact reduced to ratifying what had been done and settled by the Emperor and the more powerful members. A secondary but not less important feature of the treaty of Westphalia was the guaranty of France and Sweden, securing to the ambition of the former power a ready avenue.

Little remains to be said of the third kingly function, the captainship in war. Those mighty hosts led by the Hohenstaufens, whether to Rome to settle the quarrels between the Pope and the Italians, or to the East, to rescue the Holy Land, had dwindled down to the motley crowd that fled at Rossbach, a collection of the contingents of free towns, princes of every magnitude or parvitude, abbots, abbesses, down to microscopic Serenities liable to furnish "one piper in every alternate war." It is true that, besides the Emperor, also Prussia, Saxony, Hanover, Bavaria, all maintaining considerable and well-trained standing armies, had to furnish their contingents; but they were not likely to do so, unless their dynastic interests coincided with those of the Empire. The legislative and administrative business of the Empire was in keeping with the state of its military organization. The greater princes arrogated to themselves the right of legislating in their territories, and would not easily give their assent, indispensable for the completion of a law or resolution of the Empire, to any order or enactment interfering with their own arrangements. The Diet, composed of three houses, that of the electors, that of the princes, and that of the free towns, from being convoked when the occasion arose for the despatch of certain specified business, became permanent in 1668. The princes, instead of repairing thereto in person, kept resident ambassadors, who spilled oceans of ink in writing home for instructions. Those imposing assemblies which stood around a Barbarossa in his camp before Milan, and listened to the confession of a Luther, had shrunk about the year 1788, to a conclave of twenty-nine gentlemen, each holding a number of proxies, busying themselves in dreary discussions of the affairs of those diminutive territories along the Rhine, which were the nursery of the *Reichsexecutionsarmee*. The German Empire had degenerated from a monarchy to a monstrous republic of 300 princes and corporations, from a stately dome to a political curiosity shop.

History knows of four attempts to restore the unity of Germany by restoring a real Central authority, the Peasants' War, the scheme known as the *Fürstenbund* of Frederic II. of Prussia, the establishment of the Confederation in 1815, and the abortive revolution of 1848.

Referring to the tremendous upheaving of the sixteenth century, the combined effect of aristocratic usurpation, manorial oppression, and ecclesiastical corruption, it was the opinion of the late Alex-

ander von Humboldt, expressed many years ago, in confidential conversation, that "all the woe of Germany dates from the fact that victory did not remain with the peasants." In that movement were blended dim traditions of the rights of the German man and the duties of the German king, both of which were effaced by aristocratical encroachment, and the democratic doctrines of the Bible, then for the first time unsealed to the masses. On the constitution of the Empire it left no trace. The original grievances, viz., that the peasants were deprived, by force and fraudulent administration of justice, of their freeholds and hereditary tenures, and ground down by taxes and services, have been redressed by three hundred years of slow and reluctant ameliorations, wrung from a selfish nobility by enlightened statesmen, by the terrors of the revolution of 1789, by the transitory domination of the French, and finally by the revolution of 1848. The peasantry are now a conservative element in German society. They are freeholders once more, personal service is commuted into rent-charges; the last remnant of usurpation, the police authority of the lord of the manor, where it still exists, would have fallen long ago but for the question who is to succeed the squire—self-government or bureaucracy. The peasantry proper will not take the initiative, nor even become the zealous supporters of any political or religious movement. The endeavours of the Prussian Government to reduce, by the instrumentality of police constables, certain mystic sects amongst the Protestant peasantry of its northern provinces, to the precise standard of mysticism approved and enjoyed by themselves, used for years to contribute a share to the emigration to America and the Cape. The change of administration subsequent to the establishment of the Regency has removed also this sporadic cause of discontent. In Austria the question of religious toleration is passing just now through a crisis; but it does not affect individual classes of society. Another element of agricultural population, the labourers, who stand in social opposition to the gentry and the peasants, much as the latter used to stand to the former, may for the present safely be left out of calculation.

In making use of the term *Fürstenbund* of Frederic II., we adopt for convenience' sake a designation which gives but a very imperfect idea of a variety of schemes originating with different princes, and extending over a period of more than forty years, from 1742 to 1786. There had always been temporary leagues and "associations of circles," intended for specific and transitory purposes. The Treaty of Westphalia while it afforded, by sanctioning the right of making alliances, a greater opportunity, created at the same time a more urgent want of lasting confederations between the Estates of the Empire. The common bond

was slackened and weakened. The Hapsburg Emperors saw in a multitude of loosely connected States an inviting field for that policy which most recent times have tried to legalise by coining a technical term for it, the policy of annexation to their hereditary possessions, either directly or by implanting junior branches of their family. Their eyes were particularly directed to a dismemberment of Bavaria. On the other hand, since the days of the Great Elector, and more so since the erection of the Electorate of Brandenburg into a kingdom of Prussia, this new power would look out for permanent alliances; to support her rivalry with Austria. The extinction of the male line of the Hapsburgers in 1740 brought the relative force of these conflicting tendencies to the test. It was Frederick II. who set up the Elector of Bavaria as a candidate for the Imperial crown. In order to back the new Emperor in his struggle with Maria Theresa and to secure his future position, he exerted himself to create a permanent league; this first attempt failed, the princes to whom he addressed himself, making subsidies a preliminary condition. *Point d'argent, point de prince d'Allemagne*, he angrily exclaimed. In 1744 he succeeded in founding, for the same purpose, the Frankfort League, but the Emperor dying soon afterwards, it fell to the ground. The Imperial crown remained with the dynasty which sprang from the union of the heiress of the Hapsburgers with the house of Lorraine. While Frederick, nearly to the end of his life, confined himself to purely Prussian policy; the struggles which in the pursuit of that policy he had to sustain with Austria, suggested to a number of minor princes the plan of protecting themselves by a kind of armed neutrality from any forced participation in the calamities of war; but they did not arrive at any definite result. A new and powerful impulse to federative tendencies was given by Joseph II., by his annexations of ecclesiastical territories, confiscation of Church lands, his intrigues for acquiring Bavaria by exchange, and his reckless disregard of established rights in the Belgian provinces. All the minor princes, no matter what religion they professed, were alarmed; and their fears coincided with the interests of Prussia. Frederic stated his opinion that "it was the time for concluding a league similar to that of Schmalkalden." This was in 1783. Count Hertzberg, the king's confidential minister, was still silently maturing the plan of his master, when, independently, two or three similar schemes were started and reciprocally communicated in other quarters. The Markgraf Charles Frederic of Baden proposed a union of electors and minor princes for the purpose of reviving the action of the Diet and the *Reichskammergericht*, and setting on foot a common military organization. Prussia not to be invited to become a member of the union but to lend it, together

with France, perhaps with Russia, her protection. In answer to this proposal, the Court of Zweibrücken, probably with the privity of Frederic, communicated an elaborate memorandum approving of the idea, but objecting to certain details. A union of a limited number of princes, it was said, so far from coercing the Emperor would serve him as a pretext for further encroachments; and instead of deriving strength from foreign protectors would only increase their influence. The union ought to comprise all the German States except Austria, and rely on its own power. It would be inconvenient and impossible to realize the scheme at one stroke. Better draw a few leading powers into the secret, lay successively the foundations of the union, and for its completion await some opportunity, say the entanglement of the Emperor in a Turkish war. A third series of negotiations was carried on amongst the ecclesiastical members of the Empire, little of which has transpired, except the tendency to seek support from Catholic France against the secularizing propensities of Catholic Austria. All these projects had certain features in common; they were intended to preserve the integrity and existing independence of the numerous princes of the Empire; they embodied consequences drawn from the Treaty of Westphalia; they tended to the exclusion of Austria, and they sought a unity of purpose and action, not in the creation of some personal head and centre, but in the revival and development of federal institutions. They were drawn from the same vein of thought which, at a later period, owing to the writings of Sismondi, pervaded the liberal minds of Italy.

It is not likely that any one of them would have taken a practical shape but for the active initiative of the aged King of Prussia. Throughout the year 1787, he did not cease to urge on his too cautious ministers by written orders and by word of mouth: "We are without allies; it is of the utmost importance to strive after a league similar to that of Schmalkalden. You must not idle in the business; convince the princes that their own interest peremptorily demands a union. If we remain idle, nobody will take the thing upon himself. Strike while the iron is hot. No doubt it would be more convenient to wait until the devil has taken the old Elector Palatine; but it may be a long while, for evil weeds never wither. You must not cross your arms while the enemy works." More than by his exhortations his ministers were spurred by the revelation, that Joseph had nearly completed an arrangement for acquiring Bavaria. Well might Frederic cry out, "Fire! fire!" The realization of that transaction would have made Austria the mistress of the basin of the Danube, from the watershed of the Rhine to the iron gate of Orsowa — admirably flanked by the mountain-bastions of Bohemia, the Tyrol and Transylvania, irresistibly commanding

Theology and Philosophy.

would have been at least equally valuable without the addition of commonplaces about "designing priesthoods" and "pious frauds." That there are traces of priestly craft in portions of the Pentateuch we fully admit, but the bulk of it is of spontaneous growth. That the principle of pious fraud is not extinct in our own day we are most fully persuaded; but it is a very unfortunate instance which our author produces of the ill-faith of the translators of the English Bible in 1611. It becomes his "duty to demonstrate" a "spurious interpolation" in the authorized translation of John viii. 59, where "a pious fraud is committed." Referring to Bagster's "English Hexapla," he shows that according to the translations of Wickliff (1380), Tyndale (1534), Cranmer (1539), Geneva (1557), Rheims [Romish] (1582), the verse would run thus, "Then took they up stones to cast at him: but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the Temple;" and he attributes the addition by the translators of 1611 of the words "*going through the midst of them, and so passed by,*" to a wilful falsification, for the purpose of exhibiting in the person of the Son of Man another miracle in addition to the many recorded of him in the Gospels. Whether the additional words imply of necessity a miraculous passing through may well be doubted, but the unfortunate thing is, that so far from interpolating, the translators were only doing their duty in rendering what they found in the best Greek original of their day, although it had not been rendered in the Vulgate and the English versions more immediately founded upon it. The clause itself may be spurious, or at least doubtful, and it is not in the Vatican MS., but there is so much at least to be said for it that it is retained by Scholz, and given in the very text which stands at the head of the English versions in the Hexapla. So that we are almost driven to think our Biblical critic ventured to say, "Now the Greek original does not make mention of any such miracle," either without casting his eye to the top of the page he was consulting, or without being qualified to read the Greek which is there printed. The translators of 1611 undoubtedly committed many faults, but they accomplished for their day a version superior to any European vernacular, and are not to be blamed if things known to be errors by us are now continued, which were not known to be errors by them. And nothing can be more puerile than the conclusion that the insertion of a (supposed) spurious passage in the English version "justifies the assertion that the introduction of similar passages in the original Scriptures are not unfrequent." The recoil from ill-founded criticism and inconclusive argument is very damaging to the cause of religious reform. In the same interest it is also our duty to point out, that such an offensive and inaccurate statement as the following should have been avoided—"From the *profundity of ignorance which distinguishes, and has always distinguished, the Hebrew people, the master-mind of Moses stands out in bold relief*" (p. 12); and we hope the author will bear in mind in the sequel of his work, that to say things irritating to the feelings, whether of Jew or of Evangelical Christian, is the most effectual bar to their enlightenment.

Entirely free from all which can reasonably be considered offensive

United Provinces, and lastly, the shock of the French revolution by changing the relative position of the two rival powers, and creating new and more pressing interests for the whole of Germany, condemned the league to an obscure and lingering extinction.

It was in vain that two princes, Charles Augustus, of Weimar, and Dahlberg, the coadjutor, afterwards the successor, of the Archbishop of Mayence, animated by the spirit of that young literature, of which the former was the much praised patron, disquieted and braced at the same time by that breath which preceded the impending hurricane, were unremitting in their endeavours to develop the *Fürstenbund*, to make it the business and interest of the nation, instead of an oligarchy, to convert it from the prop of a petrified present into the shell of a germinating future. A Prussian minister sneered at the "politico-sentimental balderdash of dear Dahlberg;" and Charles Augustus, who had flattered himself by means of the union "to rouse the national spirit from the slumber that befel it with the peace of Westphalia," met with equal disappointment in the egotism of the few and the apathy of the many. Slumbering indeed and night had followed the frenzy and glare of the religious war. The position, even the pretension of Germany as a leading power, was destroyed, and the paralysis of national life and deed reacted upon individual energy and aspiration. Commerce had fled from Augsburg and the Hanse towns to Venice and Holland. Enterprise was dead, industry shrinking to puny proportions. Men were like the citizen in Faust who enjoys his Easter holyday. They took wives, begot children, and died; working through the day their little field, narrow shop, or dingy office, and talking in the evening of what other nations did "far away;" looking all the week long to a fair, a wedding, a christening on Sunday, and looking all the life long to an eternal fair hereafter. No doubt they were dissatisfied sometimes. Frederic II., towards the close of his career, was "sick of ruling over slaves;" and so were his subjects of being ruled by a despot. In Austria no wrong was safe from Joseph's revenge, but also no right from his attack. In the little territories they certainly did not like to have their crops trampled upon by *Serenissimus*, their sons sold to England to fight the Americans, their daughters honoured by a noble snob with seduction. They might seek redress with dogged pertinacity from courts ruled by the mandates of the princely huntsman, and, mayhap, filled with cousins of the seducer. Now and then a man would take the law into his own hand, or long-nourished discontent would break out in hopeless riot. The idea of going to the root of the evil, of remodelling the fabric of the Empire, either by clearing away the concrete of "historical" privileges

from the more "historical" foundations of common liberty, or by raising a new edifice after some ideal model, was foreign to the masses. But over this night of actual existence was hovering, the reflection of a few individual minds, a twilight of intellectual life, of thought, and dream. In the East they say that there are two elements in dawn, the raven-twilight, and the dove-twilight: one skirting the approaching day, the other, clinging to departing night. So it was with German literature in the last decades of the eighteenth century, glorying in the name of the "philosophical." No writer of eminence who was not disgusted, alarmed with the state of his fatherland. But while one school of authors, being men learned in positive law and versed in the business of government, founded their plans, or, in more desponding mood of mind, like Justus Müsser, their "fantasies" of reform on a more vigorous use of the existing constitutional means of change; another class of writers, composed of philosophers and poets, foremost amongst them Fichte and Schiller, rose to an idealistic conception of human things, between which and everything that existed there could be no compromise, there was no bridge. The philosophers' lecture-halls were crowded, and the poets' writings were in everybody's hands; but men fled to the realm of ideas, to learn how to forget, not how to amend the dreariness and misery of life. The teaching was too cosmopolitan to be national, too metaphysical for practice. There was much worship of liberty, but the goddess was too delicate to lend a hand in work and battle. Schiller, in that terrible picture of German society, of the conflict between vested interests and rights of humanity, between "cabal" and "love," does not make his hero rush to a barricade, or fall on a field of battle; he makes him drink poisoned lemonade. Writers were, indeed, not wholly wanting who combined high aspirations with a practical turn. One of them, Johannes von Müller, at that time not converted yet into a special pleader for aristocratic and priestly misrule, found the means of reforming the constitution of the Empire "in its forms to which you may impart any degree of life according to the warmth of your will, and in its original spirit of freedom." On the *Fürstenbund* his opinion was this:—

"If the league is to serve no better purpose than to preserve the actual state of possessions, it would appear of the various operations to which Germany has been subjected, perhaps, as the least interesting. It would be contrary to the eternal order of God and nature, according to which neither the physical nor the moral world is to rest for a moment *in statu quo*, but everything to be a life of orderly movement and progress. Without law, without justice, without security from arbitrary taxation; not sure for a single day of our sons, our honour, our rights and liberties, nay, our lives; the helpless prey of superior

force ; without beneficial coherence, without national spirit—to exist as well as existence is possible, under such circumstances, that is the *status quo* of our nation. And to confirm that should be the purpose of the league? That much praised union would after all be reduced to two points ; to secure to the Bavarians the happiness of getting, instead of Joseph II., the Duke of Bipont for the father of their country, to preserve any abuse that Joseph, without spending a lifetime in deliberating about formalities, might lay his hand on. What ought to be done would be this : to take at last a leap over centuries of pedantry to a downright visitation of the *Reichskammergericht* and the Aulic Court,—to well established procedure and a subsidiary code of law,—to a reasonable, fair and permanent capitulation, a more active Diet, an efficient executive of the Empire, a proportionate system of defence, a real coherence of the Empire, and, after all that, to a common patriotism ; so that we also at last might say : *we are a nation !*”

Such was the state of Germany when she entered the lists with revolutionary France. Her soldiers were equal in bravery to the French, the officers superior in military education ; but the councils were distracted by the rivalry of Prussia and Austria, and the minds of men divided between the love of a country hardly worth loving, and sympathy with a foe who proclaimed war to the palace and peace to the cottage. Austria, then Prussia, succumbed singly, successively the left bank of the Rhine was annexed to France ; Bavaria, Würtemberg, Baden, Saxony, and other states were forced to resign their connexion with the German Empire, and to enter a Rhenish confederation under the protection of Napoleon ; and at last the frontier of France was pushed forward to the Elbe. Each of these changes involved extensive “mediatisations” of free towns and little principalities. The Emperor laid down his crown, and assumed the title and style as Emperor of Austria. Twenty years after the first encounter, the German soil was cleared of the intruder, but it was still covered with the ruins of his edifice. Towards Vienna, where the work of reconstruction was to be done, the heart of the nation turned throbbing with exertion and hope. There was once more a heart of the nation. Sufferings and shame, struggle and victory, had broken the slumber, dire experience had taught what was needful, common danger and common toil created a sense and claim of common reward, solemn promise sanctioned the aspiration after a free, united fatherland. The will of the nation was unmistakeable, it demanded the restoration of the Empire on its ancient foundations, of an Emperor with effective attributes. It spoke in the press, in pamphlets, petitions, protestations. It cheered the representation addressed in a more solemn form by twenty-nine princes and towns to the Congress :—

“The German constitution,” they said, “requires for its stability a single head to secure to the body the first rank amongst the powers of Europe, to watch over the execution of its resolutions, to force any negligent or obstinate member to fulfil the obligations imposed by the social compact, to carry out, promptly and fully, the decree of the federal tribunals, to direct the military forces of the whole, and to appear, both within and without, as the protector of every member, no matter how great or how small, as the first representative of the German nation, as the object of general respect, the depository of the constitution, the shield of German liberty.”

The motive of the petitioners was no doubt the anxiety of preserving or having restored their particular political existence, but the prayer was in harmony with the unselfish instinct of the people. The Princess Elizabeth of Fürstenberg, at the head of the deputation, in an interview with the Emperor Francis of Austria, implored him “to seize for the benefit of Germany, what in the hands of others would necessarily become a germ of disruption, nay, a weapon against himself.” Francis, in answer, declared it to be “his wish to resume the German crown, if compatible with the interests of his hereditary possessions.”

But this question, agitating the length and breadth of Germany, discussed in the brilliant gathering at Vienna, and kept in suspense by ambiguous declarations, had been quietly settled long ago by four gentlemen, two of them not even Germans, in some out of the way town in France. After the failure of the negotiations of Chatillon, Prince Metternich, Lord Castlereagh, Prince Hardenberg, and Count Nesselrode, renewed the offensive and defensive alliance of their masters by the Treaty of Chaumont, signed the 1st of March, 1814. To the public document three secret articles were appended: these stipulated that the imperial dignity should not be restored, that the Empire should be superseded by a confederation; and that Italy, united by Napoleon, should receive back her former sovereigns. The details of this transaction, the pith of which was afterwards inserted in an enigmatical phrase of the first Treaty of Paris, are not known; but may easily be supplied from the circumstances of the case. The mutual jealousy of Prussia and Austria would naturally suggest mutual abnegation. Whatever may have been the policy of England, there is no doubt of the existence of direct and abundant evidence that Russia disliked and feared the formation of a State so powerful as a united Germany. Nay more, even the interests of France, being identical in this respect with those of Russia, were probably not without influence upon the secret stipulations of Chaumont. For the proposals of peace previously made to Napoleon and rejected by him, because of some momentary success of arms, indicate already the fate of Germany and Italy.

Apart from the question of the revival of the Imperial dignity, never seriously entertained by the Great Powers, the task which devolved upon the Congress, of drawing up the fundamental law of the confederation, was one of extraordinary, of unparalleled difficulty. The thing itself, a confederation of princes, not republics, permanent, interfering with sovereign rights, was without example in history. Add to this, the necessity of composing the rivalry of the larger states; of dealing in some way or other with that crowd of little princes mediatised by Napoleon; of defining the relation between Germany and the non-German possessions of some of the members; of deciding on the international attributes of the confederation, of creating some controlling authority and organ of common action; of reconciling the existence of such an authority with the pretensions of sovereignty, derived by the members either from the fact of the extinction of the Empire, of which they had been subjects, or from titles conferred by Bonaparte; of regulating the *status* of the Roman Church, unsettled by him; lastly, of doing something to fulfil the promises held out in 1813, of defining and securing the rights of the nation, of providing for improvement of justice, administration, intercourse, commerce and traffic, and it may be easily understood how the winter was spent in proposing schemes and rejecting them. The whole of the questions at issue were admirably set forth, and the popular claims energetically vindicated, in a memoir presented to the Congress by the representatives of Hanover.

“H. R. H. the Prince Regent of Great Britain and Hanover cannot acknowledge the principle that the German princes, even after the changes which have taken place in Germany, are entitled to unlimited or despotic rights over their subjects. The principle that the decay of the constitution of the German Empire should have brought about the overthrow of the territorial constitutions of any German State, except in so far as they were linked with the constitution of the Empire, cannot by any means be conceded. A representative system has been the law of Germany from the earliest times. In many States it was defined by solemn treaties between the prince and his lieges, and even in territories where no estates survived, the lieges were in the enjoyment of specific and important rights, which were both defined and maintained by the laws of the Empire. If it is impossible to allow that the decay of the constitution of the Empire should have, by necessity, destroyed in the territories the existence of material rights and duties between princes and subjects; the assertion is equally untenable, that the rights of the subjects could be prejudiced by treaties concluded between the princes and Bonaparte; the princes having no legal power to dispose of those rights. No prince would like to appear in the light of having concluded a treaty with a foreign potentate against his own subjects; and even the confederation of the

Rhine, so far from making the rights of the princes despotic, limited them in essential points. Moreover, the general principles laid down in the fundamental act of that confederation have never been worked out in special enactments. Equally unfounded would be the argument that any acknowledgment of sovereign rights that may be found in treaties concluded at a later period, between the princes and the allied powers, should have been intended, or prove sufficient to confer upon the princes rights not already legally acquired over their subjects. On the one hand, those rights were no subject of the transaction; on the other hand, the notion of sovereign rights does not by any means include that of despotism. The King of Great Britain and Ireland is without doubt as sovereign as any prince in Europe; and the liberties of his people are strengthening instead of undermining his throne.

“Starting from these principles, the undersigned are bound to insist that in future in Germany—

“1. It should be defined to what rights German subjects have been entitled *ab antiquo*;

“2. The maintenance of any territorial constitution founded on law or compact should be proclaimed, saving modifications which may have become necessary.

“3. That also in those territories where the estates had disappeared anterior to the extinction of the Empire, they should be revived and invested with the following privileges: the granting of taxes; a voice in the promulgation of new laws; a joint control over the appropriation of taxes; the right of impeaching dishonest officials.

“Lastly, it is not the desire of Hanover to make it a rule that civil litigations, in ordinary cases, should be carried, by way of appeal, before the tribunal of the confederation, or that the princes should be prevented from appearing as plaintiffs or defendants before their own courts; but it is to be claimed as an indispensable security that in cases of that kind the judges should be released from their personal allegiance, and ordered to give their judgment solely according to the existing law, and irrespective of any specific commands of the prince. In cases of misuse of sovereign rights, redress should be given, on the application of the estates, by the confederation.

“It is only by liberal principles like these, that we, considering the temper of the present time and the fair and moderate demands of the German nation, can nourish the hope of restoring tranquillity and contentment.”

Intertwined as the reconstruction of Germany was with questions of general policy, especially that of Poland, which already arrayed in secret alliance (February 8, 1815) Austria, France, England, and Sweden, against Russia and Prussia, there is no saying how long the wrangling would have gone on, and to what results it might ultimately have led, but for the return of Napoleon from Elba, March 1, 1815. Between the manifest impossibility of arriving, on the spur of the moment, at some final settlement, and the equally manifest danger of confronting in a state of chaos

the concentrated power and the well-trying cunning of the enemy, a general understanding was come to, in the words of Prince Metternich, to restrict the work at present to "the laying down of the general features of a political confederation." This was achieved in eleven sittings, from May 23 to June 11. Those words of Prince Metternich, himself the most conservative of statesmen, are a conclusive refutation of that cheap conservative wisdom that would teach the Germans not to stir. The political state of Germany, by the confession of its founders, is merely provisional. The *Bundesacte*, the Federal Act, dated June 8, 1815, is not a house built on a well-considered plan for permanent residence; it is a shed run up to weather a rising storm. A supplementary act was added May 15, 1820, pretending, by its title *Schlussacte*, and by a distinct announcement in the preamble, to finality. But to continue the simile, it did not perfect the shed to a mansion, but converted it into a barracoon, a dungeon. Its numerous and elaborate provisions are almost exclusively intended to stifle the complaints, and repress the resentment of a twice-cheated nation.

Several powers signed the Federal Act under protest, the most explicit being again Hanover—

"The Hanoverian ambassadors in declaring their readiness to sign a Federal Act, which in their opinion will but imperfectly fulfil the expectations of the German nation, and leaves various important points, insisted upon by Hanover, totally unprovided for, feel in duty bound to make the following declaration in order to prevent any misapprehension, as if their Court had renounced the principles of which it has proved a faithful adherent. They declare that, since the desire of his Royal Highness the Regent to have the old constitution of the Empire restored, with suitable modifications, has become impracticable, owing to notorious political conjunctures, the endeavours of Hanover have been directed towards the establishment of a confederation, constituting not only a political bond between the several *States*, but also, in the sense of older constitutions, a union of the *whole people* of Germany. With this view the undersigned have recorded their votes in favour of the privileges of the estates, and their being secured by the guaranty of the Confederation, and in favour of a Federal Court of Justice with extensive powers. In signing to-day an instrument which contains no provisions of that kind, they are actuated by the conviction that these points are at present unattainable, and that it is more desirable to arrive at an imperfect Confederation than at none at all. Besides the Confederation, as adopted, does not exclude any improvement."

Prussia, Mecklenburg, Nassau, Luxemburg, expressed similar, though more general, reservations. One after the other those institutions and functions of supreme, central authority, pro-

pounded in the various schemes, and insisted upon most perseveringly by Prussia and Hanover, had been curtailed, or totally given up in the face of an obstinate resistance of some minor Courts, especially that of Bavaria, prompted and backed no doubt by external influences. There was to be no individual head, nor even a directory either. No Diet, in the traditional sense of the word, no representatives of the people, no executive, but simply a conclave of ambassadors with that of Austria in the chair. No federal tribunal, no amphictyons, but only a provision for arbitration—the difference, and a vital one, being this, that any party may drag his adversary before a court, while arbitration presupposes the consent of both parties to submit to the award. Whenever, in after times, the Estates or the people of some German State sought judicial redress against wrongs, how glaring soever, suffered at the hands of their Government, the latter was, of course, invariably of opinion, that there was no case for arbitration. The right, established by the Treaty of Westphalia, of concluding alliances with each other and with foreign powers, was not taken from the members of the confederation; but only limited by the proviso that such alliances should not be directed against the security of the confederation, or any of its members. A like progressive curtailment, but more glaring and more faithless, is observable in the history of Art. XIII., of unsavoury notoriety. The people demanded, and had been promised, previously to the “War of Liberation,” by more than one of the German sovereigns, a representative system, accepted in the modern sense of the word, assemblies returned by the people, and having a decisive voice in matters of legislation and taxation. Whatever from a legal point of view might be argued in favour of feudal estates, representing not the people, but certain privileged classes, where they existed at the time of the dissolution of the Empire, the claim of a modern representation was unexceptionable, even before the most pedantic legal punctilio, in those territories the sovereigns of which had destroyed, ages ago, every vestige of mediæval estates, and corporate independence, as was the case in Prussia. Yet the proclamation of the principle of representative government dwindled down successively, first to the obligation of preserving or creating feudal estates, then to an announcement, so vague, that in order to express it, violence had to be done to the German language. “In all States of the confederation a constitution of estates *will take place.*” Side by side with more than fifty lines concerning the privileges of the mediatised nobility, this single line, this grammatical blunder, constituted the principal reward bestowed by the Federal Act for that score of pitched battles which had restored the German Sovereigns. It enabled the King of Prussia to tell his subjects in 1819, that he had promised them a constitution,

but that the choosing of the proper time was his. It was considered by the same monarch and the Emperor of Austria as redeemed, when they had established in each province a board more exclusively composed of squires than in the worst times of the Middle Ages, and endowed with functions considerably inferior to those of the quarter sessions in this country. The sketch, traced in the preceding pages, of the growth and decay of the German Empire will have helped the reader to a more vivid conception of the miserable issue of the work of restoration undertaken by the diplomatists at Vienna, than any amount of criticism could afford.

The following are the principal dispositions of the Federal Act :

The Confederation, declared to be indissoluble by the Final Act of 1820, is composed of the Emperor of Austria, the King of Prussia, the King of Denmark, *qua* Duke of Holstein, the King of the Netherlands, *qua* Grand Duke of Limburg, some thirty purely German sovereigns and four tiny republics, Lubeck, Frankfurt, Bremen, Hamburg. The 300 territories of the Empire are by mediatisation, reduced to 38; but the business was done so hurriedly, and so intricate was the legal *status* of some members of the Empire, that one little principality Tun-und-Knyphausen, adjoining Oldenburg, was overlooked, and, being neither mediatized nor acknowledged as a member of the Confederation, is ever since, like an unladen spirit, hovering in empty space. The members, varying in territorial extension from 12,183 to 2½ German square miles, are declared by Art. III., "to have equal rights." The business of the confederation is carried on by a permanent congress of ambassadors, declared to be "the representative of the Confederation and the permanent legal organ of its will and action." In this *Bundesversammlung*, misnamed Diet in English, there is one ambassador for each of the eleven largest States and for each of six groups, composed of the smaller ones, making seventeen voices in the whole. The members being all of equal rights, Austria would, in theory, be counterbalanced by a knot of little potentates, not easy to discover, on the slopes of the Thuringian Wood. The solecism appears more glaring still in a modified computation of voices intended to diminish it. In the so-called *plenum*, the formation of which is prescribed for every more important object of discussion, Austria, Prussia, Saxony, Bavaria, Hanover, Wurtemberg have four voices each, eight of the smaller States from two to three, and every one of the rest one, making sixty-nine voices altogether. On the change and adoption of federal laws, the establishment of federal institutions, the admission of new members; on matters of religion and *jura singulorum*, but not on peace and war, no resolution can be arrived at except by unanimity.

It would be futile to descant upon the high ethical principle of acknowledging equality of rights without regard to material power. Whenever the world shall have arrived at a state to make that maxim a reality, there will be no need of elaborate contrivances to secure justice and check the abuse of force. Even between independent states, in international relations, it generally gives way, at least in modern times, the moment it is brought to the test. Much more so in a hybrid state between international contact and municipal connexion, like that of the German countries. It is not in the nature of things that Austria or Prussia should allow herself, in any vital question, to be outvoted, or, as the newly coined German phrase runs, "majoritised," by the Hanse towns. The table of voices, then, is a sham, together with the whole of the proceedings that are professedly founded upon it.

The resolutions of the assembly are not produced, its actions not directed, by counting sixty-nine imaginary noses. The motion of the Diet is the result of the acting forces of Austria and Prussia. It moves in the direct line, and with wonderful velocity, when both powers agree; it proceeds, sometimes, in a diagonal line, when they act in divergent; it rests, more frequently, motionless, when they pull in opposite directions. The States of second magnitude may increase the force of either of the two great powers, or obstruct and neutralize both of them; for any effectual initiative they are powerless. The little territories count for nothing either way. Individual eminence is of little avail. A prince with a small domain and a great mind might turn the scales in an assembly of his competitors, as the Diets of the Empire were of old; in the machinery of the modern Diet he will be manacled by red tape, and buried under protocols. No wonder that the catalogue of achievements of the Diet should be of the most paltry description. Of the numerous organic laws announced by the Federal Act in forty-five years one or two have appeared. Of the various improvements introduced during that period in Germany respecting customs, the monetary system, post, traffic, mercantile law, and other institutions of common interest, none are the work of the Diet, all the result of negotiations between the several States, carried on with an incredible waste of time and labour, and, but too frequently, thwarted and marred by the selfishness or caprice of a single Government. By far the greatest part of the resolutions of the Diet are intended to repress and destroy whatever remained, or was growing up, of popular liberty and public law. A string of sixty decrees, part of which was kept secret, but revealed by some accident, referred to the Estates and Chambers successively established in the minor States. Governments will never allow the Estates to exercise privileges

incompatible with the sovereign rights of the princes, nor to discuss the validity of resolutions of the Diet, nor to refuse the taxes deemed necessary by the respective Governments, nor to disallow any part of the budget, nor to publish their debates in full. No. 26 is worth being quoted textually: "Any Estate or Chamber, the majority of which does approve, or not prevent speeches injurious to order, or hostile to the Diet, are to be pro-rogued or dissolved." Publicity of courts of law to be restricted. The press to be gagged and mutilated by an elaborate system of censorship. The Universities to be subjected to a surveillance as tyrannical as it was ridiculous, embracing everything, from the lectures of the professors to the tassels of the student's tobacco-pipe. Lastly, "any obstacle to the execution of these decrees that may exist in the constitution of any particular State is to be removed." This in the teeth of Art. LVI. of the Final Act: "Any constitution existing in acknowledged validity cannot be modified except in the way prescribed by that constitution."

The sixty gagging acts of 1834—just ten times as many as Castlereagh had shaken out of the "green bag"—being directed against every manifestation of intellectual life, affected more immediately the educated classes, and destroyed with them every trace of confidence and hope. Amongst the common people, long afterwards, a dim impression appears to have lingered that the Diet, being the successor of the Emperors, was competent and bound to administer the law where every other tribunal failed, the highest dispenser of justice on earth. So firmly rooted is the claim and the trust that in a polity justice must be attainable somewhere and somehow; so much is required to thrust upon man the sad conviction that he must either suffer or do what is wrong before the law. There are instances reported of this belief that are touching though they raise a smile. One day two peasants arrived in the *Eschenheimer Gasse* pie-powdered, having walked many hundred miles from the Polish backwoods of Prussia, to bring an action against the King. Estates, and individual subjects, applying for redress under clear provisions of the Federal Act did not fare better than those poor clowns. The Diet, the flagrant case of the Duke of Brunswick excepted, always pronounced itself "incompetent" to do anything. The complaint of the Hanoverians of the arbitrary and forcible subversion of their constitution by the Duke of Cumberland, was rejected on the ground worthy of a pettifogging attorney, that, as the Chambers were the injured party, only the Chambers—which did not exist any longer—would have a *locus standi* to complain! In short, the Diet was a standing conspiracy against right and law, of which it had been constituted the supreme guardian. There was for the German people a clear case of armed resistance, even ac-

ording to authorities like Vattel and Haller. The latter, on the Continent frequently cited, but, as it would appear, seldom read by partisans of arbitrary government, says: "As to armed resistance or war against the oppression of princes? Law of nature, experience, and universal judgment, forbid to maintain that such a war is unjust in any case; but it is seldom possible, and most frequently imprudent and conducive to greater evils." In another passage, he calls the right, in case of hopeless denial of justice, to take the law in one's own hand "a right divine."

In 1832, a handful of enthusiasts, most of them being students or literary men, acted upon the theoretical admission of Haller, without paying due regard to the practical qualification which is tacked to it. They stormed the guard-houses of the goodly town of Frankfort preparatory to seizing the palace of the Diet, but were, of course, not joined by the population, and overpowered by the military force. In the trial of the rioters the question was raised as to the legal character of the confederation, the lawyers maintaining, and justly so, that, as it was no State, it could not be the object of treason. The Diet lost no time in promulgating a decree to the effect that, since every State was part and parcel of the Confederation, crimes committed against the Confederation should be punished as treason against every particular State. The counterpart to the enactment of the Golden Bull that, Electors being part and parcel of the Emperor, any conspiracy against an Elector should be punished as treason against the Emperor.

The Diet, being an anonymous body, working in secret, standing above and outside every individual State, might naturally appear as the spirit of evil; and it is quite pardonable in a hot-headed youth that he should hope to deliver his country by running his rapier through the phantom. But one cannot help thinking that the delusion of the students was shared then and afterwards, and is being shared by people who ought to know better. There seems to be wanting in Germany at the present day a clear perception of the simple and obvious truth, that the ambassadors gathered at Frankfort were but the servants of the different Governments, the Diet nothing but a mask under cover of which the Governments perpetrated what they would not dare with open face; that they paid obedience to the decrees of the Diet, simply because these decrees were the effects of their orders; and that the destruction of the Diet would do away with one of the forms which the mischief had assumed, not dry up the source from which it flowed. The mistake of ignoring this fact, instead of deducing its logical consequences, is observable in the declamations directed against the Diet by the press, and in the various German chambers prior to 1848, in the proceedings of that memorable year, and most

startling after so dire and recent experience, in the speeches delivered in the Prussian Landtag in the course of the present year.

In March, 1848, the Diet, the representatives of the princes, bowing before the storm, dissolved itself, after having begotten an heir by summoning representatives of the people, not of the populations of the individual States, but of the inhabitants of the territory of the confederation, taken as a whole. So powerful was the impulse, so decided the unitarian tendency, so guilty the conscience of the Governments. When assembled, the representatives proceeded forthwith to elect an Archduke of the House of Hapsburg "Vicar of the Empire." The vicar appoints his cabinet. There is a minister of finances with no exchequer, except a rate contributed by the different States to defray the expences of the assembly; a minister of war and no army; a minister of justice and no circuit; ambassadors who represent neither Austria, nor Prussia, nor any other of the German States, but nominally a supernatural compound and unity of them, in fact, nothing. Leaving aside the fact, that from the beginning an understanding existed between some of the leaders of the assembly and the princes, putting ourselves on the ground taken up by the majority, when they choose to derive from their ambiguous letters of convocation the power of issuing on their own and sole authority a constitution of Germany, there is in their proceedings an unreality, hollowness, and delusion, which but for the intolerable tediousness of the debates would make us believe the Empire of the Paulskirche an act out of *Milsummer Night's Dream*. Like its predecessor, the Diet, it stood above and outside every individual state. Like the Diet, it claimed submission from people and governments. But while the Diet drew its power of oppressing the people from the governments which were in possession of an enormous machinery of administration; the Empire of 1848 had to draw its power of coercing the governments from the people, which had yet to receive its organization by the instrumentality of that Empire. It was evident that the princes would make a show of submission only so long as they were paralysed by the revolutionary excitement. What other course the Frankfort Assembly could have taken is difficult to say, that it failed in taking the first steps towards correct action, in looking straight in the face of realities, is impossible to deny. In the south-west of Germany, with a twenty years' experience of sham constitutionalism, the balance was trembling previously to the meeting of the assembly, for some days, perhaps some hours, between monarchy and republic; in the north monarchical habits were yet so firmly rooted, political education so backward, that the proclamation of a "responsible" ministry together with

the self-sacrifice of the King's brother, the actual Regent, who, whether he had or had not directed the resistance of the troops, was utterly innocent of that system of government which had provoked the collision, sufficed to save the dynasty and arrest the Revolution. In the Frankfort Assembly, with its copious alloy of professors, any republican initiative was out of the question. And, no doubt, the sons of the present generation will congratulate themselves that a republican attempt did fail, which must have led to a schism, probably a permanent disruption of Germany.

The labours of the National Assembly were founded on a sketch of a constitution drawn up by Professor Dahlmann. It is and ought to be remembered as a striking proof that historical research, and critical contemplation of the doings of other times and other nations are far from fitting a man for practical political work. All but one of the leading features of this paper constitution were unexceptional, unfortunately that one was the most important. Taking a lesson from the original constitution of the Empire, the causes of its decay and the various attempts made to strengthen it, he proposed to concentrate the diplomatic and military action in one individual head ; to deprive the princes of the right of sending and receiving ambassadors ; to establish a supreme tribunal with extensive jurisdiction between government and subject, and government and government ; to create a legislating body for what we should call in this country Imperial interests, adding an elaborate bill of rights. But who was to be the head ? Some Emperor, without territory of his own, residing in Frankfort, having a respectable allowance of pocket-money, and drawing his force for making the princes obey the constitution solely from the sanctity of that constitution ! Alas ! there is no mystic power in sheepskin, how beautifully so ever emblazoned, how solemnly so ever sworn to. Within the domain of municipal law a deed binds a man to future performances because there is a court to give judgment on it, and the whole physical force of the community to back the judge. But if there is one axiom deducible from the political history of Europe, it is this, that a constitution will not stand, unless it is either the recorded recognition of certain pre-existing rights and duties, being the ancient foundations of society, and incapable of disturbance without endangering the whole structure, or articles of peace, signed by parties who have measured their strength. There must be in case of non-performance, the dread of some evil likely to occur, and a power likely to inflict it. To say this, or to design a contrivance for tying down a prince is not to depreciate ethics. How long would the Emperor of Austria, the King of Prussia, have obeyed the behests of Professor Dahlmann's Dalai Lama ?

The invaluable time, extending to almost a twelvemonth, that

was spent by the National Assembly in elaborating the constitution by thousands of amendments, was replete with events calculated to make an impression even on the serenity of a debating society. Martial law was reigning or impending over every country of Germany; the very dome of the Paulskirche had reverberated the thunder of artillery. No times for a King René to hold a court of love. The members returned by the minor states conquered their dislike of the system or no-system prevalent in Berlin since 1848. A large majority of the National Assembly voted the King of Prussia into the Imperial chair, leaving the settlement of the relations between the Empire about to be, and the Austrian monarchy to future negotiations. The King refused to receive the crown without the free consent of the other sovereigns, and sent his guards to reduce the people of Dresden, who had risen to force their recalcitrant King into submission to the constitution and the King of Prussia. The National Assembly was dissolved, the Vicar resigned; a few months later nothing remained of the German Empire but the constitution, and even that parchment had to take refuge in this country, the empty shell of an exploded rocket. Night again settled down on Germany. There was a royal afterplay to the popular performance of the Paulskirche, a plagiarism of it, with the vital part left out, and another plagiarism from the Fürstentum struck in. Future times will find it difficult to believe the records of the "German Union," so christened by its authors in seriousness, by the spectators in derision. What in a popular assembly might be excused by unselfish enthusiasm and guileless confidence in princes; appears farcical in a prince and his counsellors who had quenched that enthusiasm in blood, and by their own acts had proved that confidence groundless. Having destroyed the assembly, the only authority, legal or not, over the princes, having suppressed the revolutionary agitation, the only power that could enforce that authority, the King of Prussia and Baron Radonitz conceived the plan of coaxing the princes, by well-turned despatches and fine speeches, into accepting from their hands the constitution stripped of its most radical features, and involving submission to the Imperial dignity, with its extensive attributes preserved. The scheme was published in May 1849. A large number of late members of the Frankfort Assembly, meeting at Gotha, and since therefore called the Gotha party, pledged themselves to support it. Bavaria and Wurtemberg kept aloof. Of some twenty other states, a preliminary adhesion was obtained, but in proportion as the different governments recovered from their subjects the ground lost in 1848, they withdrew from under the ambiguous protection of the Prussian eagle. Before the Union got into working order, the Unionists had dwindled

down to a handful of petty serenities. Meantime Austria recovered from her prostration, and did not mean to acquiesce in a thing, the obvious tendency of which was to push her out of Germany. She first drove the statesmen of her rival from the pseudo-legal ground they had taken, the right of making alliances secured to the German states by the Federal Act of 1815; then the generals, from a position which they had occupied in Hesse, without being able to say what they were fighting for. At Olmütz, November 29, 1850, Prince Schwartzenberg presented to the Prussian minister the alternative of war, or giving up the union. The choice, however mortifying, could not be doubtful. Prussia had forsaken legality, and was forsaken by the revolution; she had to give in. As late as May, 1850, her minister, Baron Schleinitz, who is again holding the seals of the Foreign Office, declared, in answer to an invitation of Austria to send out a representative to the revived Diet, that the Diet was "legally dissolved," that the right of Austria to take the chair was "extinct," and that any meeting of states, convened by Austria at Frankfort, would be "a free conference of sovereign states for specific purposes, devoid of any right of acting in the name of the Confederation." In May following, the ambassadors, that of Prussia included, had crept back to the palace of Thorn and Taxis in the *Eschenheimer Gasse*, and were at their usual work again. If the dignitaries of the Vicar had been like elves disappearing in moonlight, and drinking the dew of a coming day which they were not destined to see, the members of the resuscitated Diet are ghouls feasting on whatever gain of freedom, whatever approach towards unity the year 1848 had achieved; their first meal being the Bill of Rights, which, in anticipation of the constitution, had been legally proclaimed law in the majority of states. In sober prose, a body politic, subjected to a supreme authority, legally extinct and illegally revived, is in a frightful condition, yet there is no saying how long things might have hung on this fragile hinge, but for the strain of the Italian war, which produced this unfortunate antinomy, no doubt counted upon by the cunning mover of the game, of rousing at the same time the national, unitarian feeling of the nation, and the latent antagonism of the two principal governments of Germany.

To Prussia, in the eyes of her newly established ministry, closely connected with the Gotha party, an opportunity was offered not only of retrieving what she had lost at Olmütz, but of extending her ambition over a field far wider than was ever embraced before by the views of her traditional policy. In a secret State paper, bearing the date of 1822, and subsequently purloined at Frankfort, the policy pursued by Prussia at that time is fully revealed:—

“As far as the different states of Germany are concerned, it would appear that in the interest of Prussia the river Maine might be admitted as the boundary line of her influence, in accordance with the remarks of Prince Metternich, at the Congress of Vienna; for it is only by loudly denying any idea of exercising some distinct action on the states beyond that line that we can succeed in preserving the means of exercising it some day.”

In 1849 she had tried to unite the whole of Germany, with the exception of the Austrian provinces, under her protectorate. Now she aimed higher. The intentions of the Berlin Cabinet, during the earlier part of last summer, are, we believe, indicated by the following heads of a secret programme: To supplant France in the liberation of Italy; to constitute Italy as a confederation of states with liberal institutions; to break the system of Austria by asserting the rights of her Protestant subjects, and supporting the constitutional struggle of Hungary; to unite Germany under Prussia; and, in pursuit of these ends, to avoid taking an active part in the war until France and Austria should be entangled in the attack and defence of the quadrilateral. The sudden peace of Villafranca, forming also, no doubt, part of the original calculation of Louis Napoleon, thwarted these designs.

The German people, meantime, were doubly distracted, first by the antagonism of the two leading powers, then by the painful dilemma between a generous sympathy with Italy, which suffered what Germany suffered, and seemed about to obtain what Germany desired, and the true instinct that the interference of Louis Napoleon in the affairs of Italy would prove the prelude to an aggression on Germany. In the midst of such perplexity voices were heard to preach confidence in him, to expect from him what Germany had been unable to work out herself, nay, to recommend the left bank of the Rhine as not too high a price for the unity of the remainder. Some undoubtedly prompted and paid by France; some misled by want of judgment, or cowed by despair. We wish that Professor Vogt, at Geneva, one of the fugitive members of the National Assembly, the honoured guest of the *Palais Royal*, may disprove the accumulating evidence tending to fasten upon him the authorship of some advice of that kind; for to rank in the first category a man of his knowledge and sagacity would be impossible.

The conjuncture of last summer has passed away. There is no question any longer of fighting the French beyond the Alps. Venice would follow the irresistible attraction of a united Italy. But we fully understand that German patriots should refuse to discuss whether or not Trieste should be given up. The rule and right, and duty, of self-preservation holds good for nations more

eminently than for individuals ; and that access to the waters of the Mediterranean is a vital condition of the development of Germany, is one of those things which must be seen at a glance or cannot be seen at all. Another conjuncture has risen ; another act of the drama opened ; and in it three interests are tied into a knot more fatal than any that has ever paralysed the strength and puzzled the brains of Germany—the reform of the Confederation, the connexion between Austria and the rest of the German states, the prospect of another conflict with France.

It may be taken for an axiom, that Austria will never consent to an organization which would exclude her from the Confederation, and would unite the rest of Germany in a consolidated State. The question, then, with impatient unitarians is, in plain English, the destruction of Austria. A satisfactory solution of that question cannot be arrived at by weighing how much or how little Germany is benefited by the existence, but by calculating how much she would be injured by the dissolution of the Austrian monarchy. A host of writers who are swaying liberal readers in Germany by continuous repetition of their own views, and by consistently ignoring contrary arguments, seem to hold that calculation as undeserving their attention. They dispense with it by the very simple syllogism : Austria is composed of various nationalities, ergo, she is to be destroyed. The fallacy springs, as most fallacies do, from a confusion of terms, the terms *race*, *state*, *nation*. There is no state in Europe, nor probably in the world, the population of which is not a compound, an amalgamation of races. The state is the mould in which the elements melt and mix, the shell in which a nation grows and matures. That mould is always essentially a work of nature, of a certain configuration of the soil, as most strikingly in the case of England, but may be modified, enlarged, reduced, destroyed by human agency. That melting and mixing are always a work of time—a work influenced by circumstances, and by the innate qualities of the blending races, and which may be accelerated or retarded by violence or persuasion. These being truisms so trite that one feels almost ashamed of affirming them, can there be any absurdity greater than to maintain that at a given time, say 1860, A. D., on the first of July, 10 A. M., that process of casting and growing is everywhere in Europe to stop, the shell to be burst, the mould to be broken ? Yes, there is ; it is to maintain that any tribe with a dialect of its own, or a peculiar shape of the cheek-bone, acquires a right to independence, as soon as, and because, it conceives the desire of it. People may easily be inspired with the desire of becoming a little *grande nation* ; so may children of riding on big horses. The fallacy is, indeed, thoroughly exploded, and reduced *ad absurdum* in the case of Austria herself.

When some of the Hungarian leaders choose to take their stand on their nationality instead of their state, Baron Bach at once accepted the doctrine, and applied it to the various races which, besides the Magyars, dwell on the soil of Hungary, and in those non-Hungarian countries which the nationalists, with strange inconsistency, claim as former conquests, or as indispensable complements of the Hungarian kingdom. The result was first distrust and jealousy; at last an internecine struggle between Magyars, Saxons, Szecklers, Romans, Croats, Slovans, and some other nationalities discovered for the occasion by Austrian statesmen. Nay, the united monarchy scheme, subsequently adopted by Prince Schwarzenberg, and wisely abandoned under the pressing exigencies of the present day, was, although violently denounced by the votaries of nationality, in fact, but a logical sequel and fearless development of their doctrine. It meant this: if different nations are not to live within the confines of a single state, well then, let us pound and cast the inhabitants of the monarchy into one Austrian nation! The like inconsistency is observable in the modern Polish emigration. They do not complain, as their fathers did, of the assassination of their state, but of the oppression of their nationality. Yet they claim the possession of all the vast plains "between the Baltic and the Black Sea," between Dantzic and Odessa, the abode of a score of races. They claim, indeed, the dominion over those populations for the purpose of educating, of protecting them from Russia.* But why should the like mission be denied to other nations? By what other criterion could the competition be decided, but by the power and fitness of the protector and educator? And are the Poles and Hungarians so sure of beating every other competitor?

The independence of race may coincide with the achievement of civil and political liberty; to suppose in any case this coincidence is a mistake that makes fiends grin and the genius of humanity weep.

We are probably not wrong in supposing that the metaphysical worship of the dogma of "nationalities," more dangerous for the Germans, because they are more single-minded or less clever in handling it, than the Poles, is but the thoughtless application of the teachings of Mazzini to a state of things utterly different from that of Italy. The present unitarian feeling of the Italians, superseding the doctrines of the federalists, is entirely his work; and strange enough it is that ministers, diplomatists, and able

* Declaration of Worcell, Duraz, Podolecki, in *Le Proscrit*, 1850. Also the medal struck to the memory of Lord Dudley Stuart, by the aristocratic party of the emigration in 1859.

editors, should hold up in favourable contrast to his "detestable doctrines" those very men who are his ungrateful proselytes. From him German patriots may learn what success a single man may achieve by putting to himself a problem, and working it out irrespectively of rampant and intolerant doctrines of the day, by adapting his means of action to the individual circumstances of the case, and by pursuing his aim with ardour and perseverance. To apply what he teaches of the Italian provinces of Austria, to the other competent parts of that motley conglomeration, to put on the same level Italy, the cradle of arts, learning, commerce, of every achievement of modern Europe, and the nameless, half-savage races, mingled in the basin of the Danube, is an inference which nobody would be more justified peremptorily in repelling than Mazzini himself.

It is futile to imagine that after the dissolution of Austria, after the destruction or expulsion of the dominating German element, those races would achieve and maintain any political, national independence. They would be taken care of by Russia, first "protected," then swallowed up, or, if young Russia should be in power by that time, rescued from the "marasmus of old Europe," and physicked with the elixir of "youthful" Muscovy, we suppose. It is puerile to answer this argument by saying, "but they won't become Russian." Neither did the Poles, the Finlanders, the Cossacks, the Tartars. There is much tyranny in Austria, quite as much as in Russia and Imperial France; but the interests of Germany, as well as those of Europe, imperatively demand that in any future organization of Germany, the non-German provinces of Austria should remain by some permanent link connected with Germany.

The renewed agitation for reform of the federal constitution, commenced under the impulse of the Italian war, about this time last year, had assumed the shape of a struggle for the "hegemony" of Prussia. The fact that a term coined more than two thousand years ago, for the purpose of designating a relation between the little republics of Greece, a certain preeminence of one of them, consisting more in fact than founded in law, has been chosen to express the object and aim of that agitation, does not augur well for clearness of perception and earnestness of work. The *Nationalverein*, the centre and engine of the movement, is evidently copied from that Italian association which paved the way for the successes of Piedmont. It has produced a prodigious amount of talk. It has alarmed the minor states, provoked a threat from the Hanoverian minister of seeking security in alliances amongst themselves and with foreign powers, caused that minister to be created a count by his King, and has earned for the latter the *Grand cordon de la Legion d'honneur* from

L. Napoleon. It has called forth the expression of sneering doubts, if the accession of the Regent, coupled with the removal of a dozen ministers and other high officials, has actually destroyed the police system of Government, which had prevailed during the last ten years in Prussia, and the loathsome details of which are being revealed incidentally by a series of criminal trials. But in a flood of pamphlets and Parliamentary eloquence, one looks in vain for a syllable of answer to the obvious and paramount question: who is to be the Cavour? who the Victor Emanuel? Fortunately for the chronicler, the whole cloud has been precipitated as it were by a few words dropped by the Regent on closing the session: that Prussia found the best safeguard of her own rights in her respect for the rights of others. Unfortunately for Germany, this declaration, although obviating a great evil, the intrusion of Louis Napoleon into her internal quarrels, is not productive, nor even suggestive, of the smallest positive improvement. It is easy of fulfilment as far as the princes are concerned, but how are the rights of the people passively to be respected in a body politic subjected to a supreme authority, the very existence of which is a flagrant wrong? The question comes to the test in the case of Hesse-Cassel. In 1850, the Diet, with the active cooperation of Prussia, suspended by a stroke of arbitrary power the constitution of that state, though "existing in recognised validity;" in 1860 it improves upon its crime by imposing, spite of the protest of Prussia and a few other members, a new constitution. How is Prussia to make good her respect for the rights of the people of Hesse?

While we write, the Regent of Prussia and the Emperor of the French are meeting at Baden-Baden, surrounded by the princes of Germany, and when these lines come under the reader's eye, some of the details, nay, of the effects of that interview, may be known. Thus much is patent to-day, that Louis Napoleon, the self-constituted heir of Charlemagne, the tempter and deceiver, is bent upon pushing the frontier of France to the Rhine. Whether he succeeds in introducing the wedge, in instilling the poison, whether he be foiled by the blunt honesty of the Regent,—in any case the hour is pregnant with the fate of Germany. There are moments with a nation, as there are with the individual,—which concentrate to a scorching focus the story of their lives, moments, the result, not to be escaped, of a whole past, the source, not to be destroyed, of a whole future. There is the successor of those sovereigns who tore from Germany Metz, Toul, Verdun, Alsatia, Strasburg, and ten Imperial cities, Lorraine, the French Comté, and Burgundy. There the Regent of Prussia, carrying the weight of all her deeds, the load of all her misdeeds. There the descendants of the framers of the Golden Bull, solicitous

above everything for their sovereignty, as were the Electors for their privileges, as anxious to preserve as their ancestors were to create the distraction of Germany. There the German people, without a man to lead them, without tried and cherished institutions to rely upon. There is but one hope, safety, and advice: it behoves every German to act as if everything depended upon him.

ART. VIII.—THOUGHTS IN AID OF FAITH.

Thoughts in Aid of Faith: gathered chiefly from recent works in Theology and Philosophy. By SARA S. HENNELL. London: George Manwaring. 1860.

THE soul, it has been said, is larger than logic; an aphorism which may perhaps be absolutely true, but which is certainly relatively so, since we at present possess no means of analysing or interpreting those mysterious combinations of feeling which have a kind of transcendent and prophetic character. Material nature may be explained by scientific investigation; intellectual processes may be examined and defined; but the realm of emotion is one which, however carefully explored, seems destined to be never finally exhausted. From every successive coast line in this world of wonder which we reach, we stand, still regardant, as it were, of an untravelled continent, as once, Humboldt tells us, new lands in the far West might be seen from the shores of the Canaries and the Azores; images owing not to any extraordinary refraction of the rays of light, but produced by an eager longing for the distant and the unattained. This transcendental character of emotion is in itself an important psychological fact, susceptible it may be of some positive explanation, or purely irresolvable, ultimate, and divine. Philosophers may succeed hereafter in demonstrating its terrestrial nature and imposing on it secular limitations; but, at present, it seems to defy analysis and to evade apprehension. Even so severe and stoical a thinker as we conceive Mr. Herbert Spencer to be regards "those vague feelings of inexperienced felicity which music arouses, those indefinite impressions of an unknown ideal life which it calls up, as a prophecy to the fulfilment of which music is itself partly instrumental." These impressions, it is true, may refer to a temporal and not to an eternal future; they may predict felicity for the race, not for the individual; they may announce the development of an esthetic natural piety, not the advent of a superhuman religion. But whatever be their significance, their general ten-

gency admits of little dispute. They are prospective ; they relate to the future ; they indicate an ideal. In our own day, and with some of the more sceptical class of thinkers, they still, in some sense, proclaim the existence of a religious element in man ; retard the final process of a despairing negative criticism ; and half seem to promise a revival of a sufficiently definite faith in the Divine life and Providence of the world.

Any attempt to construct speculatively such a philosophical religion is always welcome. We may not accept the constructor's methods, but we may possibly acknowledge that his conclusions more nearly represent the ultimate truth than those of his predecessors, precisely because he occupies, as a result of the general advance, a more commanding elevation than all previous explorers. Of recent investigators, none seems more deserving of critical recognition than the author of "Thoughts in Aid of Faith." Recommended by her literary antecedents, her acknowledged impartiality, and her acquaintance with the more permanent literature of the age, we consider her fairly entitled to be heard at the bar of public opinion. We do not say that her arguments convince ; we do not affirm that her exposition is always lucid ; much less do we assert that her favourite ideas are novel and unknown. Originality, in any but a secondary degree, indeed, can scarcely be anticipated. Such originality, however, Miss Sara Hennell does appear to us to possess ; originality in the employment of material, and restatement of doctrine ; in the attempted investigation of all the separate elements which modern research has furnished, and their final incorporation into one system of religious thought. The value of her method, or of its result, is at least disputable ; but that she has produced a fearless, thoughtful, pious work, which embodies some of the principal lucubrations of modern philosophy, and fairly represents the religious tendencies of the "emancipated intellect," may be admitted without hesitation.

In estimating Miss Hennell's mental characteristics, we should say that she possessed in an eminent degree that sympathetic sense of *universality* which is the great requisite to the composition of such a book. Her mind is one that evidently revels in abstract or general ideas ; that does not willingly employ itself on the concrete or limited ; that is impatient of bounds ; that luxuriates in feeling ; has affinities with every form and manifestation of artistic emotion ; or to refer once more to Humboldt's splendid illustration, we would say, that "at the limits of circumscribed knowledge, as from some lofty island shore, her eye delights to penetrate to the distant regions" of ideal creation. Primarily instructing us that "when hypothesis and art of any and of every kind are brought to perfection, have been thoroughly tested and finally

admitted, they fall into the train of Nature's doings, and lose the partial character under which they appeared during their initiatory stage of preparation," Miss Hennell insists on regarding man's oldest art, the art of theology, as the nurse of all arts beside, in such a sense that "the perfect consummation of its genesis being accomplished, it will assume its place, indisputable henceforth, amid the dispensations of Nature's own Revelation." With her the influences of art, of music, painting, poetry, architecture, or sculpture, are not figuratively, but literally, the visitations of the living God, of a primal love and beauty, causative and providential. For her out of old theology proceed divine poetry and human morality. For her metaphysical theories have been "nursing-cells for all the philosophical truths that have been born."

Having thus briefly indicated the "main haunt and region" of Miss Hennell's speculative muse, we will examine more closely her critical and constructive elaboration. Her "Thoughts in Aid of Faith" are professedly gathered chiefly from recent works in theology and philosophy. The treatise thus assumes an autobiographical aspect. She traces the decay and growth of opinion in her own mind, destroying, transforming, and reproducing dogma; so that, accommodating the wild fancy of Ariel's song, we might almost say of ancient creeds, "nothing of them that doth fade, but doth suffer a *mind-change* into something rich and strange." Impressed from the commencement with a sense of the value of religious sentiment, which she regards as the original inheritance of the race; finding in Christianity the highest embodiment of this sentiment, Miss Hennell proceeds to seek in history, or the life of man in time, those facts only which are expressive of divine intention. To ascertain the origin of Christianity thus becomes an imperative duty. In the prosecution of her perhaps unconscious purpose she was assisted by a work, of a kind rare in England in its day, the "Inquiry concerning the Origin of Christianity," by the late Charles C. Hennell, who encouraged, and in our own time and country may almost be said to have revived, that freedom of theological investigation which is now so prevailing a characteristic of modern intellect. Under the guidance of her brother's clear-thoughted and courageous work Miss Hennell learned to see in Jesus of Nazareth, not an Ideal Christ, but an Actual Messiah, the intended and accepted deliverer of his race, an enthusiast and a hero, who showed himself throughout as the representative of his people. She learned to see also that

"The cause of the supremacy of the Man Jesus lies in a long course of events which had swelled to a crisis at the time of his appearance, and bore him aloft to a height whence his personal qualities told with

a power derived from the accumulated force of many generations of men;—when, therefore, the work he did was truly 'not his own,' but that of the divine hand which had guided the ages, and made a frail mortal its minister just as its angels are the winds and the flaming fire."

From the objective and historical view of Christianity thus presented in the "Inquiry," Miss Hennell proceeds to a consideration of its subjective character or "psychical essence," as exhibited in the second palmary book in her autobiographical library, the distinctive analytical essay of the famous Feuerbach. Feuerbach showed her how the idea of God is formed out of the instinctive notions of the human being. As a concept the Infinite is the affirmation of the endlessness of the power of Thought; as a sentiment the Infinite is an affirmation of the endlessness of the power of Feeling. "The object of the intellect is Intellect objective to itself; the object of feeling is Feeling objective to itself," or we cannot conceive God otherwise than by attributing to him without limit all the real qualities which we find in ourselves, and that which withdraws the limits from the real qualities is the understanding.* Thus religion becomes human nature reflected in itself. "Feeling and reason debate and struggle with the contending notions—Man is divine, God is human after all;—and in the course of the progress towards the attaining of a permanent reconciling balance, the theory of the God-man is an inevitable stage." Hence historical Christianity became inevitable, when, in our authoress's emphatic language, the Hellenic "God so long kept by the forcible restraint of logic in the solution of pure intelligence suddenly came into casual contact with the passionate humanism of the Hebrew mind."

In Feuerbach's scheme of religion everything comes from within. Theological ideas originate with the human mind, and are its self-generated products. This theory of a purely mental derivation, however, apparently contradicts the theory of historical derivation. Is the contradiction real or apparent only? The real independence of the physical order of things and the spiritual is certainly proclaimed by the author of the "Unity of Worlds," as also by Mr. Martineau and Mr. Newman. Yet the very notion of isolation, disconnexion, or independence is, thinks Miss Hennell, "an inherent infraction of the spirit of the great principle of the Unity of Composition which is growing and gaining upon us with every extension of investigation." If, however, this theorized independence does exist, it follows that there exists also, "some special faculty in the mind distinct from

* See Feuerbach's "Essence of Christianity." Translated by Marian Evans. 1854. George Manwaring.

all the rest, divinely bestowed in order to the reception of divinely communicated truth." The determination of this point must be referred to psychological investigation. We thus revert to the same sphere of inquiry to which Feuerbach had previously conducted us, while we advance, under the guidance of Mr. H. Spencer, to find the general law which lies at the basis of psychology.

Life, according to Mr. Spencer, is the "continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations," and all "mental action whatever is definable as the continuous differentiation and integration of states of consciousness." Consciousness begins to exist with the amalgamation of the multifarious sensations which constitute bodily life into one single sensation, superinducing, as the sole new phenomenon, an uninterrupted succession of impressions. Thus is instituted the true psychical life, as contradistinguished from the physical life: thus intelligence begins. From successive complications in the groups of co-ordinated psychical states results the entire genesis of all the various faculties and feelings of the mind. This continuous evolution implies the operation of three active principles: the co-ordination of impressions; the registration of experience; and the hereditary transmission of the acquired organization.

The psychological principle advanced by Mr. Spencer is, we may state, fortified by analogical illustrations. In the mechanism of the heavens, in human arts, in social polity, "the same constant plan" is supposed to be equally traceable, suggesting a comprehensive theory of the universal method of nature's operation.

Between Mr. Spencer's Psychological scheme and Feuerbach's analysis of the nature of Religion Miss Hennell discovers an immediate harmony, and in their juxtaposition detects a reciprocally elucidating and perfecting action, as if each had found its needed counterpart. Feuerbach has shown how the religious emotions, springing by natural impulse out of the human heart, "have created for themselves a magnified image above them." *Deification*, depending on the personifying instinct of the human mind, "constituted the natural and proper means of attaining to the conception of abstract ideas of any kind, whatsoever." *Personification*, in its turn, formed "the necessary embodiment of appreciable substance under which alone the feeble intellect could hold the ideal essence." Our religious apprehension here ceases to be exclusive; the formation of our religious conceptions seems reducible into one common category with the formation of all human ideas. Here then Mr. Spencer's psychological principles fall in with historical facts. Through his inventive power man "begins the work of creation himself." He origin-

ates a new world outside of himself, establishing in that new world a system of relations with his own mind, and effecting a "continuous adjustment" of those now conceptions to his own already organized thought. Finally, we have man's art or creation as a correspondent with all art or creation. "And the one act of human art which appears to be universal and essential to the species, is that which must contain the fullest revelation." This one universal and essential act is the construction by the collective intelligence of the image of Deity. The mythological worship of humanity will in its turn subside into the common ground of science. "As Science is the rightful result out of all theologies, so the theological theory of religion has had its proper fruit when it has produced a Science of Religion. And this science consists in recognising the Theory in the new character of Imagination and Poetry,—now seen to be intrinsically and scientifically the highest organ of the Divine inspiration, which is the Life of the world."

Hitherto psychology has had a purely subjective character. In attaining a real external point of observation, and contemplating the changes effected by *Time* in the human consciousness, it assumes an objective character, and associates itself with history, on which it "always depends for continual substantiation."

The "Biographical History of Philosophy," by Mr. G. H. Lewes, is selected by Miss Hennell as a sort of mental telescopic appliance for a rapid survey of its progress as "comprehended in the generalized construction of one united series, showing it as an individual growth, with that organic life of its own which first gives a proper character of it." Reproving what she conceives to be Mr. Lewes's contemptuous disparagement of the metaphysical method; upbraiding Positivism for its arbitrary limitations and its rejection of the essential element of history;* censuring Mr. Buckle for his technical use of the word "scepticism," Miss Hennell yet recognises in the speculations of these philosophical heretics either materials susceptible of incorporation in her enlarged scheme of science, or illustrative and corroborative of her theory of development. Passing over an ingenious, and

* What does Miss Hennell mean by the assertion, p. 275, that Positivism has "not yet admitted the essential element of history into its consideration?" To say nothing of his historical law of human evolution, Comte has devoted an entire volume of the "*Système de Philosophie Positive*" to the construction of a Philosophy of History. In the very commencement of the introduction to this volume, we are told: "Cette universelle suprématie du point de vue historique constitue à la fois le principe essentiel du positivisme et son résultat général." It is possible, however, that Miss Hennell refers to the history of that remote period which "preceded human existence," whose recovery she desiderates, p. 226. Positivism is undoubtedly open to the reproach of not having admitted that "essential element" into its consideration.

in some respects admirable chapter, on the "Present Indications of an Unfolding Science of Morality," we shall now attempt to exhibit briefly Miss Hennell's method of speculation, to record its result and ascertain its value.

In opposition to Mr. Lewes and others who, while asserting the priceless services of metaphysical philosophy, pronounce that its part is played out, Miss Hennell teaches that the ontological principle is destined to accomplish yet farther and nobler work. Not contented with its recognition as an initiative and educational agent, during the intellectual nonage of the race, she declares its indefinite and indefeasible validity. She regards it as a mode of the Divine action in the world. Admitting that the magnificent theory of God the Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier, was constructed by a "superstitious imagery," she emphatically asserts that "the Theory has given to our nature its Religiousness; stamped and sealed upon our constitution by that Invisible and Inconceivable Spirit of Nature, which tries, as it originated, all our works." An unknown power has, in her view, impelled and guided our minds to the instinctive building up of their beautiful faith. This subjective process, if we rightly apprehend our theorist, divine because of its origin, divine because of its result, would in itself be illusory, or at least nugatory, since it is unable to demonstrate the reality of its own conclusions. Unconsciously inspired by the Supreme Wisdom, man has been blindly educated and conducted to the knowledge of the sublimest truth. Almost at the moment when he begins to doubt of its reality, and suspect the validity of the process that has generated it, he discovers that the operation was originated by the evolving and guiding principles of nature. Hitherto subjective, the idea now is shown to have an objective correspondent. Heretofore an hypothesis, the theological speculation is promoted to the rank of an established theory. Experience has verified it. Psychology and history have furnished the external facts which give it scientific substantiation. The necessity of the "infinite cause of the whole" is demonstrated, to Miss Hennell's conviction, "in a way that henceforth makes it impossible for the human mind, even in its weakest moods of morbid scepticism, to fancy that it doubts of it." This conviction is due, directly or indirectly, to Mr. Spencer, who by setting forth, or at least aiming to set forth, "the true causal connexion between one and another of the immediate links of creation that lie within our own reach of observation," seems to have directed our authoress to this belief.*

* See page 270. Mr. Herbert Spencer, however, seems scarcely responsible for his convictions. Miss Hennell remarks that she herself regards his speculative construction as an hypothesis, and is careful to inform her readers that

To a first cause, as much transcending the mechanical God of Paley as this does the fetish of the savage, to an invisible power working after the method of evolution, not of creation,* must, contends Miss Hennell, be referred all life, physical or psychological. "In all we are, and all we do, it is God that is the real life and the real action." By material demonstration, as well as by spiritual provision, he is truly the all in all. While Miss Hennell, whose statements in general we reproduce, but with the necessary abridgments, distinctly regards materialism as the required complement of metaphysical thought which restores the interrupted source of Deity, she appears thoroughly impressed with the belief that the God whom her method reveals is no unintelligent first cause, but an "everlasting mind," the objective reality of our mental ideal of an infinite humanity. This conception she acknowledges to be no less anthropomorphic than the sensible representation; but affirms that through ampler knowledge of nature, and through the generic progression of man, it tends continually towards the realization of absolute truth. In some sort "man-deification" is inevitable and perpetual; but its character changes, as our knowledge of man changes; as man ascends in the scale of existence, his consciousness acquires increased purity; and his continuous idealization of his better self, "another yet the same," is an ever-improving reflex of that divine essence which will not and cannot be revealed. Thus in his savage state man invests God with bodily attributes; in a more civilized state he withdraws the bodily attributes, but imposes the limitations of his own mental nature; in his philosophic elevation he recognises in God intelligence only, though still with anthropomorphic conditions; and in his future seraphic (?) ascension he will behold in his own "magnified image" a still less imperfect representation of the Divine inaccessible reality. The practical results of this new pantheism are, faith in an evolutionary deity, whose production and instrument man is; faith in art as a mode of the Divine action; in science as an interpretation of the Divine action; in "the pervading spirit of providence or of universal nature;" and in an eternal progression, material, moral, and intellectual. With all this splendid promise or performance of the new creed, it offers no perfect satisfaction or consolation. For sorrow, failure, and defect on earth it proposes no celestial recompense. Rather would an external personal existence seem to be an arrest of the Divine flow of being. Conquest of the dread which the thought of death inspires; the acquisition of that "victorious largeness" of mind

he "has yet made, or at least published, no investigation" into the department of human religion.

* See Article on the Nebular Hypothesis in the *Westminster Review*, July, 1858.

which implies self-forgetfulness and heroic sympathy; and perhaps the faint hope afforded by a "genuine analogous probability," are the pantheistic substitutes for the assurance of individual immortality, the hope of an eternal self-development, in a "world whose course is equable and pure."

This, we trust, will be found a correct exposition of Miss Hennell's philosophical method, as well as an adequate statement of its practical results. We will now attempt to ascertain the value of her intellectual process.

It is observable that Miss Hennell's religious theory is represented as dependent (we do not say necessarily so) on Mr. Spencer's psychological hypothesis, and his real or alleged demonstration of a first cause. The theory, therefore, is itself only possibly or conditionally true. Admitting, however, the validity of Mr. Spencer's psychological conception; merely questioning whether his supposed proof of a metaphysical first cause is more than a proof of a remote physical antecedent, even when we consider the nebular hypothesis verified; and allowing Miss Hennell, who, if inconsistent here, is, we believe, not alone in her inconsistency, to condemn the barren resort to final causes (p. 209), and to reproduce the teleological argument "to learn the general intention, will, or character of Divine providence" (p. 316), we pass at once to the consideration, on its own merits, of her evolutionary theology, or more specifically of her peculiar ontological theory.

It is contended that the metaphysical method was divinely originated and divinely prosecuted. An argument adduced in favour of this proposition is the continuous action of the ontological principle in the human world. But *all* continuous action will scarcely be claimed as divine. We have, then, in the first place, to determine what degree of longevity justifies the pretension of divine origination. In the philosophical evolution of thought some of its tentative processes are calculated to endure longer than others. Such naturally *will* endure longer. With the indefinitely extending background and foreground of Time now opened out to us, is it possible to decide what length of duration implies divine purpose or divine energy? what natural origin or human frailty? It would seem clear, then, that unless we can procure a philosophical chronometer, which indicates celestial time, we can hardly decide when a mental epoch is of divine or human origination.

Although in her exposition of it, the Neo-pantheistic system sometimes appears to deny and exclude all activity in man and matter, yet we believe Miss Hennell, whether consistently or not, to distinguish Divine intentions from consequences not divine. Of the many results, then, ultimately referrible to transcendental

existence, some at least must be undesigned. Is there reason to think that the metaphysical method is one of them ?

The operation which is asserted to be a direct ordinance of infinite intelligence, is allowed by our authoress to be an "illusion ended in scepticism," and we are called on to "rejoice at nature's strong determination to put a stop to that of which she evidently did not approve, and chide the learners into the better thinking that she had in store for them." Here Nature is represented as an antagonist principle to God, discountenancing what he sanctions, or as a synonym of God ; and in this last case we have a deity, growing wise by experience, and deliberately terminating his own defeated procedure. A perplexing, bewildering mode of philosophical cogitation, fruitful indeed in general results, but useless as an instrument of conclusive discovery, is pronounced divine, because of its long continuance and its one valuable elaboration, the ideal conception of the most perfect Being: a result which it is itself impotent to prove, and which positive science is invoked to establish. Surely it is easier to believe that this protracted idealization is a natural consequence of the independent operation of the human mind, bringing with it its inevitable good and evil, than to believe that the Supreme Intelligence keeps a sort of Circumlocution Office of philosophy, in which the human race is taught how *not* to think ; in which the Divine educator discovers his errors and chides his pupils for his own mistake ; and which he finally closes, after having led us through the intricate mazes of speculation, as described, for example, with unprecedented distractions, in that metaphysical *Bradshaw*, "The Limits of Religious Thought,"—to end, as it were, with Martinus Scriblerus, in framing the idea of a "universal man !"*

Not that we assert, following Martin's paternal and prosaic instructor, that Miss Hennell's *Universale* is merely an object of imagination. We contend only that she has not established its reality. It may be regulative of faith ; and religious feeling may some day justify the acceptance of its sublime suggestion. To

* "Martin supposed a *universal* man to be like a knight of a shire, or a burgess of a corporation, that represented a great many individuals. His father asked him if he could not frame the idea of an universal lord mayor. Martin told him that never having seen but one lord mayor, the idea of that lord mayor always returned to his mind ; that he had great difficulty to abstract a lord mayor from his fur gown and gold chain ; nay, that the horse he saw the lord mayor ride upon a little disturbed his imagination. On the other hand, Crambe, to show himself of a more penetrating genius, swore that he could frame a conception of a lord mayor, not only without his horse, gown, and gold chain, but even without stature, feature, colour, hands, feet, or any body, which he supposed was the abstract of a lord mayor !"

us, meanwhile, one thing is clear. Positive science has not yet demonstrated the objective existence of either an infinite humanity or of the ideal being of the intellect.

With all its scientific and philosophical resources, the new Pantheistic theory solves no difficulties. Is the soul immortal? It cannot certainly affirm that it is *mortal*. Is there a creative principle? It knows only of an evolving intelligence. Is matter eternal and self-existent, or produced in time and dependent? Whence came the first homogeneous germ, the primeval egg, which potentially included all forms and varieties of life? To these, and other kindred questions—as the *rationale* of the existence of moral and physical evil—no answer is returned, none we believe attempted.

With all her talent and all her enthusiasm, Miss Hennell then has not, in our opinion, succeeded in discovering, to modify her own image, a north-west passage through the dim icy region of speculation into the genial clime of a satisfying philosophic belief. She leaves expectant minds lingering still on the “limits of circumscribed knowledge,” longing for the distant and the unattained, and awaiting the great Discoverer that shall prove the new lands seen in the far west to be no “illusive images,” but part of “the domain of reality.”

ART. IX.—GRIEVANCES OF HUNGARIAN CATHOLICS.

IT was on the 28th of October, in the memorable year 1848,—just before the battle of Schwechat brought Austrian and Hungarian forces into avowed collision,—that the Catholic bishops of Hungary signed at Pesth their humble, earnest, touching address to the late Emperor Ferdinand, then at Olmutz. They avowed their certain conviction that he did not know the misery with which Hungary was afflicted under his government, in his name. In the midst of profound peace flourishing towns were bombarded, sacked, destroyed; villages had been burnt by night; their inhabitants by thousands wandering abroad without food or shelter, or subjected to frightful cruelties too bad to describe. The men who let loose the flood of murder, incendiarism, and pillage, actually bore the commission of the King of Hungary, having been sent by his perfidious cabinet to lead the Serbs, Croats, and Wallacks against the unarmed and unsuspecting Magyars and Germans.

“How is it possible” (ask the Bishops) “to make people who have been inspired with the most frightful thirst,—that of blood,—return

within the limits of order, justice, and moderation? Who will restore to the king's majesty its primitive brilliancy, after dragging it through the mire of the most evil passions? Who will restore faith and confidence in the royal word and oath? Who will render account to the tribunal of the living God, of the thousands who have fallen and are every day falling victims to the fury of civil war?"

Bishop Fogarassy, who presented this address at Olmutz, was dismissed ungraciously: of that the ministers took care. Yet it is probable that the solemn appeal of the bishops against the wicked deeds of which the emperor bore the responsibility, was not without its effect on the mind of the imbecile Ferdinand. The battle of Schwechat was fought simultaneously, and after it Vienna was reconquered by Windischgrütz. But Ferdinand would no longer sign any papers tending to authorize an invasion of Hungary: hence his deposition was determined and effected by a palace-conspiracy. His nephew Francis Joseph, then an ignorant youth of eighteen, was placed on the throne to be a pliant tool of his mother and her favourite ministers; who laid down the principle, that compacts between a people and its sovereign bind only the individual monarch who signs them; and that the new prince having taken no coronation oath, had all the rights of royalty and none of its obligations.

Prince Schwartzenberg and Dr. Bach, on whom with Latour rests the worst guilt of these hateful transactions, were not likely to cherish any kind sentiment to the Hungarian prelates, when by the Russian invasion the rights of Hungary were laid prostrate. They immediately imprisoned and deposed many ecclesiastics for having in one way or other acknowledged the *de facto* national government of the Diet. We have not space to dilate on their separate cases, which are numerous, nor to speak of those who went into voluntary exile. Two examples of men whom the Hungarian Church regards merely to have done their lawful political duties, will suffice to typify the Austrian proceedings.

The first is Baron Ladislas Bómer, Bishop of Nagyvárad (or *Grosswarden* of the German maps). After his arrest, violences were used, at the nature of which we can only guess, to extort from him an abdication of his bishopric;—after which he was released. He immediately wrote a letter to the Pope, declaring his abdication to have been wrung from him by force, and to be on that account void. But he had the folly to intrust his letter to the post-office, where it was opened: he was himself arrested anew and led back to prison. At a few hours' notice he was sentenced to the gallows; but the next day the public papers in announcing the sentence, added, that it had been *mitigated* to twenty years' imprisonment *in irons*. Such treatment of an eminent and irreproachable bishop, by an "apostolic" government, cannot be

forgotten, and is not likely to be forgiven, by the Hungarian hierarchy.

Joseph Rudniánszky, Bishop of Besztercebánya (*Neusohl*), was shut up in one room with ten common persons, political prisoners, where all privacy was forbidden him. Overcome at last by the unendurable indecencies to which such circumstances constrained him, he consented to abdicate; but even then, he was not forthwith liberated. He was put upon the deck of a steamer, and, with other political prisoners, encircled with a rope-pence, was exposed to the inclemency of the weather and to the gaze of the populace. This, in itself, among Austrian barbarities is a trifle; yet it is bitterly remembered by the Catholic bishops. Joseph died of broken heart last year at Posony (*Presburg*), where he had been allowed to linger in the prison of a monastery. When his body was brought to Esztergom (*Gran*) to be buried in the vault of the cathedral, the chief magistrate of the county refused permission, which was at last obtained only by the energetic remonstrances of the primate archbishop.

The severity against ecclesiastics who had shown any sense of national right, appears to have been proportioned to their eminence; not from any love of cruelty, but from a stupid belief (too common in violent conquerors) that severity is politic, in repressing conduct which has been dictated by a sense of duty, and cannot be felt as crime. The object of the Austrian dynasty has plainly been to *terrify* the Hungarian Catholic clergy into subservience. As by the execution of Louis Bathiany, so by the cruel sentence on the bishop Baron Ladislas Bémer, it desires to show that neither birth nor virtue, nor eminence in State or Church, can palliate the offence of esteeming the laws of the nation higher than the will of a usurping prince.

To those who judge of the Catholic Church everywhere by that which we know of it now in Western and Central Europe, it perhaps seems an axiom that it has the same interests as the Pope; but this is undoubtedly not the case in Hungary now, any more than it was in England during the reign of our Plantagenets, or even in the old Gallican Church. In old England the local bishops and archbishops desired to continue in a certain dutiful relation to the Pope, but not to forfeit their own organic powers or yield up English appointments to his will. Being strong enough not to need the Pope's aid against the king or Parliament, they often sided with the latter in opposing the encroachments of the Pope. The Hungarian hierarchy has retained, almost to the present day, its mediæval wealth unimpaired. Its proud and splendid position is due to the fact, that in the long efforts of the Hapsburg dynasty to destroy the rights of Hungary, which it had sworn to maintain, the Catholics and Protestants of Hungary systemati-

cally contended, side by side, very often against a king odious for cruel persecution of the Protestant faith. Since the Catholic Church of Hungary has on the whole avoided and resisted the spirit of persecution, and has maintained the political rights of dissenters, the Protestants see the wealth and greatness of the hierarchy without displeasure. In this state of things, it is natural for the Hungarian Catholics to expect the See of Rome to look with a certain pride and satisfaction on the splendour and internal freedom of so extensive a Catholic Church, when almost everywhere else the ecclesiastical wealth has been immensely curtailed. Has not Hungary (they argue) deserved well of the Papacy? When the long struggle of her people, as the bulwark of Europe against Islamism, was ended—when their brave rescue of the religious Empress-Queen Maria Teresa had been successful, they presently opposed themselves to her ungrateful son, the Emperor Joseph II., who, among his other violent reforms, would have made short work with ecclesiastical wealth and power. They stood up on the side of Pope Pius VI.; they rejected the propositions of the Gallican Church, and finally preserved the Roman Catholic establishment of Hungary in all its ancient dignity. For these merits, they have had the simplicity to imagine that the Papacy would feel bound in turn to defend them against the encroachments of their king; and, even if the Pope unavoidably sympathized with Austria during the political struggle of 1849, still they expected that, as soon as that struggle was over, he would deprecate any permanent weakening of Hungarian ecclesiasticism. That the Austrians, triumphant at length by aid of Russia, in the worst of causes, against a noble people which had conquered them, should dismember the kingdom of Hungary politically, was natural; nor could the Pope interfere in this; but that the Austrian monarch should proceed (as after the pause of a very few years it did) to dismember the territorial jurisdiction of the Catholic hierarchy, to despoil their wealth, and appropriate to himself their ecclesiastical appointments; that the Pope should not only not protest against this, but should consent to it, be a party to it, and receive power and patronage for himself by it, has given a deep wound to the feelings of Hungarian Catholics. To understand all this the better, the reader may need some closer details.

The entire kingdom of Hungary, with all its appanages, was, until very lately, comprised in a single hierarchical organization, of which the central personage was the Primate Archbishop of Esztergom (*Gran*),—no mere titular existence, but a real ecclesiastical potentate. At the Holy See—at the side of the monarch—in the Diet of the realm, the primate stood forth as *representative* of the Hungarian Church in all its collective rights and duties. As such he had his seat in the Diet, and was the spokes-

man of the Church to king or Pope. Under his authority, the Government edicts, the Papal bulls and briefs, and any new laws relating to the entire Church, were published: to all these he added his own instructions or (when needful) his explanations. More important still was his power of ecclesiastical patronage. When a bishopric was vacant, the primate *presented* to the king the names of several ecclesiastical candidates, out of whom the king was bound to select one for the office. Moreover to secure the interests of the Church at the highest courts of justice and the highest boards of political administration (Cancellaria Aulica, Consilium Regium, Tabula Regia, Tabula Septemviralis), the primate here also *presented* to the king the names of prelates, out of whom the new members of these important bodies should be nominated. He also reviewed and controlled the administration of the very large public funds and endowments for Catholic churches and schools. These funds had accumulated by gift and bequest in the course of many centuries, in great measure by the liberality of the Catholic hierarchy itself out of its great and superfluous wealth: insomuch that the hierarchy regards the funds of the schools and universities as in some sense its own contribution to the national culture. The Protestants indeed tell us that the fund has been also fed from other sources. During the reign of Maria Theresa the order of Jesuits was abolished, as were many other religious orders in the reign of her son Joseph II. The vast landed property of these orders reverted to the crown, and was applied, not to swell the wealth of the ecclesiastics, but for excellent purposes of education; as *fundus studiorum*, *fundus religionis*, *fundus universitatis*: yet, as no part of these funds went to the Protestants, the entire fell under the administration of the primate, in the interests of the Catholic Church. The secular branches of public education were superintended by the Royal Board at Buda, (Consilium Regium Locumtenentiale Hungaricum,) but of religious instruction, the supreme control belonged to the primate. He was at the same time in ecclesiastical relations with a portion of the Greek Church, which has reconciled itself to Rome; for he was Metropolitan or Archbishop of the United *Greek-Catholic* Wallacks, Ruthenes, and Serbs. Lastly, he presided over the Ecclesiastical Court of Appeal, to which cases were referred from the courts of the other archbishops in the second instance, and from the diocesan or episcopal courts in the third instance. All these rights were ratified, on the one side, by two bulls of Pope Nicolas V., issued in 1451 and 1452, and by a bull of Pope Leo X. in 1513 ("Decret Romanum Pontificem"): on the other side, they were sanctioned by numerous laws embodied in the statute book of Hungary, and by constant usage up to the year 1850.

That the Austrian crown should desire to lessen the centralization of ecclesiastical power in the hands of the primate, we, as Protestants, cannot abstractedly reprove; but in the mode and time chosen for doing it the dynasty may perhaps prove to have made a mistake still greater than that of Joseph II.: nor will the Papacy gain by the part which it has played in the transaction.

Transylvania had been separated from the kingdom of Hungary by the intrigue and management of Austria, and was only momentarily re-united in 1848-9. After the fall of freedom, the political dismemberment of the Hungarian royalty was decreed. Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia, the Littorale of Fiume, the Banat, the county of Baes, and the Border, were politically severed from Hungary; but the ecclesiastical organization was not at first touched, and the hierarchy fondly imagined they should find a protector in the Pope.

As soon as whispers were heard of a new "Concordat," they were naturally very anxious to know at what it aimed; and on applying to the apostolic nuncio at Vienna, they were encouraged to trust that in no case should it make any difference in their internal ecclesiastical relations. The words of the nuncio are reported to have been, *Manebitis sicut estis*. But the jealous suspicions of the Hungarian Catholics were not so easily quieted: the prelates acceded to the Concordat, only under the express condition, that the liberties and privileges of their Church should be left intact by it. The rumour indeed obtains,—which we must not pretend to have absolutely verified, but would not state unless we believed,—that during the deliberations concerning the "Immaculata," when the primate spent a whole month in Rome to discuss these delicate questions of theology (while Rauscher, Archbishop of Vienna, was negotiating the Concordat under cover of the religious question), the primate, suspecting what was going on, expressly reserved his rights both in word and in writing. "Our country" (he is said to have urged) "enjoys her normal canonical standing: hence to enter into a new compact under the name of Concordat is gratuitous, unless the effort be, to sweep away the privileges of the Hungarian Church, and place her *de facto* under the sway of the Archbishop of Vienna." And now, in the retrospect, Hungarian Catholics bitterly feel that they have been betrayed by the Pope. They had hoped another result from the traditional spirit of the Holy See,—from the Holy Father's sense of duty emanating from his high vocation,—that he would not break the bruised reed, or lend himself to aid the hand which had proved itself so faithless and so murderous. The Roman See (say they), in signing the Concordat, has in truth laid bare a deliberate scheme to annihilate the legal powers of the Primate of Hungary, and to degrade his sphere of action to that of a simple

archbishop. But let us see how this scheme is carried out in detail.

The city of Zagrab (*Agram*) until 1852, had only a bishop, subject to the archbishop, and ultimately to the primate. In that year the See of Rome took upon itself to convert the bishopric into an *archbishopric*, the jurisdiction of which should extend over Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia, and the Littorale; and expressly to exempt the archbishop from all ecclesiastical superiority except that of the Pope. The bull exempts the new archbishop from the jurisdiction of the metropolitan and of the Archbishop of Kalocsa, by name, but to avoid mentioning the primate, it adds—*and from all other jurisdiction whatsoever.** The next step was in 1853, when, by a like process, the Hungarian hierarchy was stripped of its organic relation to the Wallacks by founding two new episcopal sees, at Lugos and at Szamosuyvár, and raising the former bishop of the United Greek Catholics at Fogaras into an independent archbishop.†

Again, after the Concordat had been signed, the primate's supreme court of appeal was attacked by the Papacy. It was intimated to the primate by the apostolic nuncio at Vienna, that cases of appeal must in future be decided by *Apostolic Judiciary Delegations*, and in a remarkably new manner. Any appeal from the court of the Archbishop of Kalocsa, instead of coming before the primate, was to go to the new Archbishop of Zagrab: and in turn, a suit moved in the latter court was to pass in the way of appeal back to Kalocsa; as though the sole object were at any rate to cut off relations with the Primate of Hungary. Still more degradingly was it ordered, that if in the way of appeal a suit came from the Archbishop of Eger (*Erlau*) to the Archbishop of Esztergom (*Gran*),—no longer, we presume, to be called primate,—a new appeal from him to the Archbishop of Kalocsa should be allowed.

The Pope, without the Austrian crown, bore the whole responsibility of these latter measures, inasmuch as they were not comprised in the text of the Concordat; but in the sixth article of that celebrated document, it was manifest to the Hungarian Catholics that the two powers were in conspiracy to weaken the administrative rights of their Church, and put its *patronage* into the hands of the now-despotic crown. We have mentioned that the primate had possessed the right of "presenting" to the king the names of candidates for a vacant bishopric. The Concordat

* The words of the Bull are: "Atque ab alia quavis superioritate ac prerogativa jurisdictionali Apostolica auctoritate perpetuo eximimus."

† "Et quavis alia potestate et prerogativa jurisdictionali in perpetuum pariter exempti sint," says this Bull.

stipulates to change this into the mere power of advising, in which all the other archbishops and bishops are to share* equally with the primate; which virtually gives the choice, and indeed the unlimited choice, to the Crown itself: for out of all the bishops one or two will always be found to recommend the candidates who are hinted to them by the Emperor's minister.

It is notorious in Hungary, that the primate used to the uttermost all his powers of remonstrance and protest to stop the Pope from thus bartering away to the Crown the rights which belonged to a third party. A passage from a letter is circulated in Hungary, which, it is said, the primate wrote to the Pope on the 7th of July, 1855:—

“On my knee I supplicate your Holiness,” (says he) “entreating and conjuring you with all the ardour of piety which I possess. My days, most Holy Sire, are numbered. I am not far from that tomb where all worldly glory reaches its close; and the very thought of this, if any spark of ambition dwelt in my heart, would extinguish it. No personal desire of honour or dignity moves me. I ask no favour for myself. It is for *this illustrious Church and Nation* that with all veneration I lay my most humble prayers before the blessed feet of your Holiness, that you will give us a proof of your paternal affection.”

Already on the 15th of February of the same year, a similar petition had been addressed to the Roman See by the canons of the cathedral of Esztergom; but the Pope turned a deaf ear. Nay, as they indignantly complain, he did not even *deign to return a reply* to the remonstrances of the Primate of Hungary and of his Chapter, when they were pleading for justice. In consequence, it is now muttered in the Hungarian churches:—“The words of that travelling missionary who visited us a few years ago, are fulfilled. He told us to hope nothing from Rome, for Rome was sold to Austria, and would sacrifice every nation and every national church for Austrian support.” The English nation prefers to see the appointments to the bishoprics determined by the civil power (which through the changes of ministry alternately adopts men from various sides of opinion) rather than allow the prelates themselves to administer the patronage in favour too often of their own sons. But in Hungary the case is reversed. The civil power is *foreign*, despotic, and even hostile; aiming to extirpate national institutions, feeling, and language: on the contrary, the prelatial body is national, congenial, remarkably

* *Majestas sua Cæsariensis in seligendis episcopis . . . antistitum imprimis comprovincialium consilio utetur.* The disuse of the old phrase *presentation* in itself suggests that the Government intends to innovate still further; as, by neglecting the recommendations entirely, and appointing some one at its own “mere motion;” if it has not yet actually done this.

free from bigotry, so as to enjoy, to a wonderful extent, the respect and honour of Protestants as well as Catholics. It would seem, therefore, that the Pope has, in an evil hour for himself, effected a *coup d'état* against the Hungarian prelacy to the pleasure of the Hapsburg dynasty.

The Hungarian Catholics are now able to measure the *zeal for religion* which actuated the Emperor Francis Joseph in making the concordat. Under pretence of devotion to Rome, he has used the Papal power as his tool to subject the appointments of the Hungarian Church to his own will. They also are not slow to observe, *that the Pope has broken the canonical law* by his partial orders, issued almost clandestinely, to make the cause of the Church subservient to political aims. If in the eyes of the Holy Father the functions of the Archbishop of Esztergom as Primate of Hungary were too extensive to be beneficial, the canonical law lays down the procedure to be observed. The College of the Cardinals ought to have been assembled, and in their presence all the Pontifical Bulls which have sanctioned the position and functions of the Primate of Hungary should have been solemnly revoked. Thus with full formal responsibility resting upon him, the head of the Church would have abrogated a dignity established by his predecessors. But now he has entered into a proceeding essentially ecclesiastical by private negotiation with a civil power, making over to it the appointments of the most splendid Catholic Church in the world, in spite of its official protests; and has virtually put the Austrian Cabinet into the place of the College of Cardinals.

It is to be expected that Protestants will look on such a quarrel with rather otiose eyes, much as on a question of patronage between the civil and the ecclesiastical ruler of Japan. Nevertheless, the aspect of this schism on the affairs of Hungary and of Europe, gives it a real importance. On the one hand it disables the Papacy from causing a diversion in favour of Austria, if the Austro-Hungarian sedition become an active struggle; on the other, it leaves the Pope unsupported by the good will of Hungary, if ere long (as is possible) he lose nearly all material support in Italy. For these reasons it appears to us well worth our readers' while to give attention, while we go into further details concerning the grievances of which the Hungarian Catholics complain.

The new Concordat, like all other documents of the kind, has many high-sounding provisos about saving the independent rights of the Church; but to every right which it professes thus to guarantee, it invariably adds the clause, that such right is to be exercised "*after comparing opinions with his Cæsarean Majesty,*" or "*with the Imperial Government:*" which the Hunga-

rians find to amount to this, that *the Church is free to do everything which the Government allows her to do.*

The Concordat guaranteed to the bishops the right of free intercourse with their own flocks, and of convoking a synod by their own authority. It would seem that the Imperial Government afterwards pressed on the Holy See to restrict this right. At any rate on the 5th of September, 1855, a *supplement* to the Concordat came forth, in the form of a pontifical order, addressed to the high clergy of the Austrian Empire. It contains the following passage:—

“When ye are about to give to light your pastoral letters and other acts, ye will lay a copy of them, merely by way of information, before the Government of his Cæsarean and Apostolic Majesty. Ye will also indicate to the same Government, at what time ye are about to hold your synods; and for the same reason ye will take care to lay before it a copy of the proceedings at the synod.”

Nothing can appear to an Englishman less unreasonable than this: to a Hungarian Catholic before 1848 it would perhaps have seemed inoffensive. Free nations love publicity. But a Hungarian synod now feels itself in the same position as our Parliaments were, when a jealous and unscrupulous prince tried to deprive them of freedom of speech, by violent procedures towards any individual who exposed malversation of the Government. The English House of Commons then claimed a right to debate with closed doors, and to forbid its own members to reveal the details of a debate. So now, if (for instance) the Church money is illegally applied by the Austrian Government, the synod cannot let it be known who take the lead in upholding the rights of the Church, without exposing its foremost and best members to harassing or dangerous persecution. Hence the Hungarian Catholics denounce this pontifical order as one more step in the process of slavery and confiscation. They complain that they have not half the freedom allowed to them which the French bishops exercise under Napoleon III. The treatment received by the bishops Ladislas Bémer and Joseph Rudniánszky rankles in their heart. They know that this, and much beside that has been endured by other ecclesiastics, was *meant* to terrify, and, in fact, *does* terrify. They have discovered in trial that their Church cannot retain wealth, legality, and freedom under Austrian despotism.

But the same brief continues as follows:—

“If the Government of his Majesty shall indicate to you that it has any wishes as to the *form* and *method* in which the religious school-books are drawn up, ye will take account of such wishes.”

Thus, under pretence of controlling only *form* and *method*, a despotic Government can really interfere with religious teaching itself, or with the Hungarian language, of which we shall further speak.

Finally, the brief contains a still more offensive passage:—

“ Since, *on account of sad and notorious vicissitudes of things*, possibly some ecclesiastics may be found to be less approved by his Cæsarean and Apostolic Majesty; therefore, to remove all difficulty, alike for parishes and for other ecclesiastical posts, ye shall on no account select any ecclesiastic who is *less acceptable* to his Majesty. Who these are, may be learned, whether by the temper and conduct of the ecclesiastics themselves, or *by the previous acts of the Government, or by applying some other suitable methods.* (This phrase is interpreted to mean *espionage.*) For the same reason, *before ye elect the professors or teachers of a seminary, ye must most diligently inquire and ascertain, whether his Cæsarean and Apostolic Majesty has anything against them in regard to political affairs.*”

The Holy See could not more plainly say, that the Hungarian prelates are not to choose as school-teachers, as professors, as parish priests, as dignified clergy, those men who have the mental and spiritual qualifications best suited for such offices; but they are to choose those who will be acceptable to the Austrian dynasty on *political* grounds—in other words, men who will cringe to a yoke which is not only arbitrary and illegal, but is felt by those who bear it to tend to demoralization, pauperism, and stupidity. The Hungarians have been accustomed to legality among themselves and to freedom of speech; and they cannot thank the Pope for directing them to fill all the posts of their Church, high and low, with men who will complacently do the behests of Austria to its moral, intellectual, and pecuniary damage.

Nor is this all. When a bishop recommends any ecclesiastic to the Government for an appointment, the Government sends down to the place where the candidate lives, to inquire concerning his character of the local officials and police. Thus, every clergyman is made to feel that his appointment and promotion may be interfered with by the lowest Government servant—generally a foreigner—and no man who has any self-respect can hope for advancement. Moreover, if the police or the local magistrate whisper anything concerning the *moral* repute of the clerical person (for on this also inquisition is made), then to pass by the evil whisper or to refute it, alike involves degradation to a priestly character. Under the Austrian *spy-system* the Hungarian Catholics feel that an independent priestly order is impossible. Either they must make themselves, and religion with them, con-

temptible to the nation, which nourishes inexhaustible hatred against the present regimen; or they must keep firm to the nation, and make themselves political martyrs. It is characteristic of Austrian blindness, that it drives the Catholic ecclesiastics of Hungary to this terrible alternative.

But we must enter more minutely into the mode in which the Austrian Government now appropriates to itself the rights and privileges of the Catholic Church.

1. In Hungary the *Gymnasia*, or middle schools of the Catholics, are supported out of the religious funds of which we spoke—the gifts and bequests of unnumbered pious donors; for from such came even the funds of the Jesuits and other suppressed orders. The Catholic Hierarchy has hitherto had the right of arranging the plan and discipline of these schools. To deprive them of it the Austrian Government has introduced a system which they call the *Entwurf* (scheme?) a costly, complicated, and unpractical plan, fit (in the judgment of Hungarians) for nothing but to bring up Government clerks. It was drawn up without consulting any bishop or other known ecclesiastics. It was forced upon the schools by an arbitrary edict, pronouncing that no gymnasia which refused to adopt it should bear rank as *public schools*. To lose this rank, destroys their relation to the *colleges* and inflicts exclusion on all their pupils.

2. No fees were formerly paid by the students at the gymnasia; for without it the public funds sufficed. The Austrian Government has now introduced such fees, but not for the benefit of science or of scientific persons. Every half year a Government commissary appears. He is fed and lodged at the expense of the school: he picks up the school fees diligently, and vanishes with the money. No ecclesiastic is allowed to ask what is done with it.

3. The *Entwurf* laid down, that the language used in instruction was to be that of the district itself; according to which the Hungarian language would be used in a majority of the gymnasia. Nevertheless, the Government has gradually overturned its own regulation. At first it gave orders that *certain* subjects should be treated in German; next, *half* the instruction was to be in German; at last it fixed a term, after which *all* was to be in German. The Protestant schools in general positively refused the condition, and preferred to remain as mere private schools. In consequence the Catholics found the odium too great of consenting to abandon the mother-tongue, lest a terrible desertion of their schools, and indeed of the Catholic religion, should ensue. They were saved out of the dilemma only by the stubbornness of the Hungarian youths, who made up their mind not to under-

stand German. The Italian war supervening, the Government at last unwillingly and ungraciously gave way.

4. The University of Pesth was pronounced a Catholic institution by the Austrian Government; yet in the capital of Hungary, not only are the Catholic prelates debarred from all influence in it, but the institution itself is made as little Hungarian as possible. German and Bohemian professors hold most of the chairs, and most of the lectures are delivered in German.

5. To discourage the study of law in Hungary, the Government has suppressed the sections for jurisprudence in the Catholic high schools of Kassa, Posony, Győr, Nagy Varád, Eger, Pecs, Temesvár, Kolosvár; so that the University of Pesth is the only Catholic institution in Hungary where jurisprudence is any longer taught. The rich endowments of Eszterházys, Szepessis, Lányays, made expressly for professorships of law, are illegally and arbitrarily turned to other purposes.

6. In many places private schools had been endowed by liberal founders of past ages, as at Kassa, Nagy Varad, Győr, Marmaros, Szüget, and Szemecz, for the education of children of poor Hungarian "nobles." The funds of these collectively are now very considerable. They have been arbitrarily sequestrated; and in spite of the protests of the Catholic clergy, are turned into stipends to aid the new schools of the Government, in which Polish, Bohemian, and German youths learn the elements of servility, false history, and unjust law.

7. The public *fundus religionis*, of which we spoke above, is not wholly devoted to instruction in schools or colleges. It was also intended largely to keep up the fabric of churches and schools, to eke out the support of parish priests, provide pensions for the superannuated, &c. Before 1848, these funds had been lodged with the Consilium Regium at Buda, under the control of the primate. The Concordat recognised the funds to be the property of the Church; yet, passing by the control of the primate, declared that the *Government* should administer them in the name of the Church, and that the *bishops* should superintend the process, according to a method which would be afterwards concerted between the Emperor and the Pope! It needed no divination to foresee the result. The Government used the funds as it pleased, and gave no account of them to the bishops, except, at the end of each year, a brief summary of receipt and expenditure. But it is not only the revenue which is wasted. The capital money, according to law, was to be invested in real securities. But the Austrian Government partly has appropriated the capitals for unknown uses, partly has compromised them in State-loans. Many millions of the money which was solemnly destined to

religious uses has thus been sunk in the bottomless pit of Austrian finance, with the distinct connivance of the Papal See.

8. The Austrian Government has perverted the Consistories or Episcopal Courts. These were composed of the canons of the chapter, and of a few assistant judges nominated by the bishop, who was (in person or by his surrogate) president of the court. The canons were the independent and irremovable element. They have now been ejected by the Government, and six secular members, its nominees and tenants at will, substituted.

9. With the view of forcing the German language on the country, the Government has not shrunk from interfering in the details of Catholic religious service. In many mixed communities where the Germans had become Magyarized in course of time, the public service has been conducted in Hungarian. The Government is now forcing the incumbents of such parishes to preach in German, a language which they in general understand most imperfectly.

10. The parochial priests are now encumbered with duties not their own, being required to make endless "returns" to the Government; a service for clerks or for the police. They have even to superintend the Jewish schools. In consequence they complain that they have no time for their own appropriate duties.

It is possible that the defenders of the Government will try to catch the ear of the "Liberals" in Europe, by alleging that they are but breaking down the too great power of the hierarchy in order to promote the interests of the lower clergy and the laity. Just so, in their attacks on the political liberties of Hungary, they pretended that they were acting in favour of the lower people against the oppressiveness of the great nobles. But in the first place, no one can reasonably say, that the absorption of educational funds, suppressing of the study of jurisprudence, crippling the mother-tongue of Hungary, imposing new fees (really taxes) on study, are novelties in the interest of the multitude. Next, this same Concordat, which makes away the appointments, the honour, the funds of the Church to a bankrupt and hostile State, also lays the just liberty of the lower clergy prostrate before their bishop. Either the primate and his court, or the courts of civil law, used to be a defence to the lower clergy against an unreasonable or tyrannical bishop; but are so no longer. A man who by cringing has obtained a prelacy from Austria, may be apt to indemnify himself by acting the despot over his own clergy; or, indeed, may wish to reduce all to the level of his own meanness. They are now exposed to his wilfulness and violence as never before; for they are forbidden that defence which, in common with the laity, they had enjoyed in the common civil courts; and are

placed exclusively under the bishop, who has even police-rights and jurisdiction over them : and at the same time they are deprived of appeal to higher ecclesiastical courts.

Such are the results to the common ecclesiastics from the Concordat and the invasions on the older system. In fact, we hardly think the Austrian party will venture to claim that they have any support in the lower, more than in the higher clergy. The nation in all its parts is united against them—Catholics, Protestants, Jews, nobility, townspeople, peasantry—clerical and laical, dignified or ordinary clergy. In such a state of things, Austria has likewise to meditate, that in 1849, Hungary, though taken unawares, ignominiously and thoroughly defeated her, in spite of Serbs, Croats, and Wallacks ; that nothing then saved the dynasty, but the aid of Russia with 190,000 men, and the diplomatic hostility of England and France to Hungary ; while now, Croatia and Servia have repented deeply of their miserable folly, and Bohemia, in any new commotion, will be an anxiety (to say nothing worse), not an aid, to Austria. But (say our wisecracks) —“Austria must make *concessions*.” Nay, say the Hungarians, she must make *restitution*. But without a totally NEW HEART in the dynasty, that is certainly and obviously impossible.

The reader may ask,—What are the practical conclusions suggested to England by a review of the position of Austria in Hungary ? We venture to point to three things.

First, while we fully recognise the great importance of the German dominions of Austria, we cannot regard the dynasty as much firmer than that of Naples : England can only wound herself by trying to save it.

Next, it is of great moment that our diplomacy should do its utmost to dissuade Prussia from giving aid against Hungary. For, if Prussia pursue this course, she will afford to the astute Napoleon exactly the opportunity which he seeks, of attacking Prussia *in the interests of the nationalities*. He will once more appear as the armed champion, not of Italy only, but also of Hungary, and will indemnify himself by the Rhenish provinces of Prussia. Fighting avowedly for French interests alone, he would fail ; fighting *also* for Hungary and Italy, he will probably succeed : for England will be wholly paralysed. It is important to warn Prussia that we can never help her in such a cause.

Thirdly, it is justly axiomatic, that Europe needs a powerful State on the Danube. If Austria could reconcile herself to Hungary and to all her kingdoms, that would satisfy us ; but while the quarrel is so deep as at present, she is utterly incompetent to resist Russia, or fulfil any steady European function. If events should ere long rend the Austrian Empire in pieces,

then will be the moment when the desire of strengthening the real Danubian power, and securing the Principalities against Russia, ought to lead to a practical effort on the part of all other potentates. In our opinion it is not too early for our diplomatists to urge this topic on the Sultan. From the Danubian Principalities he has nothing but responsibility, danger, and very doubtful honour. If he would willingly cede these to (a free) Hungary, he would at once have full safety from Russia on the side of the Danube, and might expend his main efforts to secure Kars and Erzeroum, where he has been proved weakest. The dominions of the Hungarian Crown, increased as of old by Moldavia and Wallachia, would under freedom constitute a Power far more trustworthy to Europe than Austria has ever been; and the Principalities would no longer be in danger of becoming appanages to Russia.

ART. X.—THE FRENCH PRESS.

Histoire Politique et Littéraire de la Presse en France avec une Introduction. Par Eugène Hatin. Vol. I.—IV. Paris: Poulet Malassis et de Broise, 1859, 60.

WHEN on the occasion of a debate of a purely personal nature in the present session of Parliament, Mr. Horsman described the position created for itself by the press in this country as that of a fourth estate, Mr. Disraeli hastened to read him a lecture on the constitutional impropriety of this definition. We entirely concur with him in this opinion. The mediæval term Estate is an anachronism when applied to any integral portions of our living institutions, for that term is expressive of a distinct sectional division, such as we happily have effaced from the structure of our society. The estate is a body called into existence by a pronounced feeling on the part of individuals in behalf of their immediate interests as members of a distinct corporation. As their warden it is therefore by nature inspired with a spirit of isolation identified with feelings of antagonism, jealousy, and, above all, intense individualism. It is the peculiar glory of our political development, that gradually and insensibly, without shock to the groundwork of our political edifice, or without disfiguring the elaborate detail of its parts, we have successfully trained what would seem an assemblage of hopelessly stubborn and conflicting elements, into cheerfully serving as active organs for the nourishment and

constitution of an impersonal whole. Therefore the characteristic feature pervading all our public institutions and all our public manifestations, constituting their eminent distinction from all others in the past history of mankind, is their spontaneous convergence in a common centre of political gravity as efficient although as intangible as the physical one, and yet preserving the freest and fullest vigour of individual independence. There have been and there are examples of as full development of each of these conditions in communities as large and varied as our own, but we have the privilege of boasting that we are the first nation of magnitude to have acquired the united possession of steady self-discipline and absolute individual independence. It is because the characteristics of this remarkable conjuncture are unmistakably conspicuous in the English press, to political students abroad one of the most attractive problems in our system, that we protest against the radical incorrectness of Mr. Horsman's definition. The press of England owes its singular power to its impersonality—not in the mere sense of the anonymous mask indispensable to libel and imposture, because disguise alone can secure impunity for cowardly stabs, and darkness alone can preserve shameless puffs from detection, but in that large and self-absorbing sense in which every act coinciding with the aggregate feeling of England, spontaneously makes itself impersonal in conscious deference to an undefined though supreme influence which is ever felt to be streaming forth from the mass of the country.

The function performed by the press in our political system is perfectly expressed by the term which we commonly apply to it. It is the medium of circulation—that is to say an organ which, drawing up the fluid of instinctive intelligence scattered through the system, diffuses it anew into the system, in the shape of a clear and vigorous stream, that stimulates with an additional impulse the intelligent actions of the whole body. The idea that a conclave of irresponsible writers is in a condition to make the political mind of England the habitual football of its amusement, is an absurd fancy. The honesty and ability of our press, have indeed endowed its leading representatives with a credit which they might successfully misapply for a season. But hitherto the intelligence of the public has never failed to detect the manifestations of such corrupt tendencies. In whatever disguise a personal element and personal interest may have tried to smuggle themselves into the press, they have never hitherto succeeded in making good their hold in public favour. The check which has thus effectively preserved the health of public feeling against the insidious poison of sophistry, consists in those habits of discussion and self-government which

have become co-extensive with our national existence, encircling the central sun of our Parliamentary system with endless lesser Parliamentary planets of all grades and dimensions, from the parish vestry to the monster meeting—partly borrowing light from, and partly reflecting their own back upon the central constellation—resulting in a pervading self-consciousness which has always instinctively repressed any decided manifestations of dangerous suggestions. It is in this manner that the intuitive moral sense of our country has practically performed a task of correction which in other parts has often baffled the extraordinary authority of absolute licensers. A press that stands in the presence of a society so thoroughly conscious, and so firmly organized, necessarily finds itself under the necessity of respecting in its tone certain considerations. This is the inevitable condition on which it can alone hold the position of a national institution. It may seem to some that this constitutes a bondage which must materially impair independence. A press free from any trammels of the kind may indeed abandon itself at times to inspirations which are of a loftier and more abstract nature. The matter may prove more congenial to the tastes of a philosopher. But we must not forget that these excellences will be purchased at the expense of qualities quite as important. A press of this nature must remain confined to a select circle. It must continue to the end an erudite creation. It will never become an integral portion of a popular system, and its existence springing from a more or less individual origin, however fostered, will never flourish into any but an artificial bloom.

We are not however dealing here with the dangers that beset in the abstract a popular press. We are dealing with the press of England in particular, and we maintain that the obligations under which it lies to consider the sense of the country, in order to maintain its peculiar influence, have not had the demoralizing effect of rendering it as yet truckling and servile. The mutual connexion and interchange of influence between public feeling and the press is so intimate, and on so equal a footing, that it is difficult to decide on which side the balance preponderates. For if our press is on the watch, with the acuteness of an experienced ear, for the earliest sound of a settled popular feeling, on the other hand, it returns the hints received in the rough, shaped into lucid definitions that convey conscientious illustrations to the struggling mind of the country, and administer, in the well-turned expression of their practical philosophy, wholesome stimulants to progressive reflection. To affirm that the press is never betrayed into breaches of trust, or a misapplication of its influence, would be to set up for it a claim to unswerving perfection beyond the range of human dealings, but the deep interest with which the

educated classes of other countries consult our press, bears convincing testimony to the uprightness, ability and enlightenment of its general tone. The picture of absolute usurpation and despotism, which Mr. Horsman's description would convey is a distorted representation, such as is easily intelligible from a person smarting under the sting of its pretty general castigation. If, however, all the newspapers in England were to conspire to puff a political aspirant, they would no more be able to maintain him in repute unless his own capacities, tried by the ordeal of public life, confirmed the testimonials, than Mr. Horsman can expect to divert the mind of England from its settled channels of thought even though he spoke himself hoarse.

There was, however, a period of our history before constitutional government became thoroughly understood, before its maxims had sufficiently penetrated the different layers of society, to endow them according to their degree with an articulate consciousness of their interests and their wants, when the press did figure prominently as a direct engine of administration, at the beck of arbitrary dictation. The reign of Queen Anne may be called the golden age of this press, the rankness of which is not the less obnoxious because it happened to be adorned by the glitter of Swift's genius. Then aspiring politicians—the patriot statesman alike with the professional placeman—found it indispensable to retain writers to secure for themselves popular support. Then the fates of Cabinets were often seriously influenced by the judiciousness with which pensions had been distributed in Grubstreet, and a Prime Minister would be more anxious about the wording of some pamphlet—probably in defence of a job—than of the most important statement to be delivered to a House of Commons, by its composition isolated from the mass of the country, and the proceedings of which were not admitted to publication. To this press the term *Estate* might have been not inappropriately applied, for whether its exertions were for good or bad—and it is not to be denied that the press was rich in public spirited productions—it proceeded alike from individual sources of inspiration to be at once identified, and, acting upon the public at large, like a foreign current of electricity, let in upon a torpid frame.

The conclusive demonstration that impersonality, as above defined, is the only sure test of a press having attained the vigour proper to a living institution, rooted in the fibres of a general system, and to an organ naturally fulfilling the double purposes of intelligent expression and wise self-tuition, is afforded by the fact that every press becomes affected with the opposite characteristic, in proportion as it is wanting in these combined qualifications. In some essentially free, but imperfectly constituted,

societies, the press thrives indeed with a wild and indigenous vigour—but there the reckless indulgence of keen passions makes it speak the language alternately of the bully and the flatterer, as may suit the selfish interests of the hour. Again, in other societies, essentially artificial, the press may present an excellent spirit, but as the fruit of individual culture its productions will bear upon their face the sickly complexion of exotics, and never can gather the strength to defy, at need, the assaults of a jealous authority.

A melancholy example of the former case is afforded in the United States. There the newspapers in current circulation are for the most part mere addresses to the people, in its sovereign capacity, by candidates for the favour of its patronage. An aspirant for office in America starts his journal as a pedlar pitches his booth to exhibit his ware. Hence a public print is, in general, as thoroughly identified with an individual as a book with the author mentioned on its title-page. There is no affectation of disguise that the sheet which daily foment the passions of an ardent population is the production of Mr. So and So, who runs for such an office, and that the rival paper is the composition of his opponent. There are indeed prints which take a high and patriotic view of public interest. But these prints are the exception, and do not enter into general circulation. They meet with the same fate, which in England overtakes the organs of special views. Their readers are confined to a curious circle—at most to a local set. It is impossible to be blind to the dangerous effects which must attend the continued application of such unscrupulous incentives to turbulent passions, in a democracy removed from the restraints common to a strong executive, and therefore solely dependent on its own good sense for orderly government.

France, which offers us in its artificial organization so much matter of study, offers us also the most perfect example of the qualities to be found in a press that springs from isolated, however individually genuine, sources of inspiration. This press is not a creation of recent times. It can be traced up to the times of Louis XIV., emerging to sight at all critical moments, and fully entitled to the consideration of a positive institution, precisely because it never expanded beyond that partial form of individuality which seems to be the indelible type of all French action. On one point alone is there to be found a marked exception to circumscribed impulse. The prevailing anti-priestly tone of the French press is the reflection of the one sentiment which has really taken a conscious hold of French intelligence. While it has always been easy—even in the time of constitutional government—to identify the sources and motives that inspired the organs of the

French press in their other views, a tone has pervaded it since the days of the *Encyclopédie*, in regard to the priesthood, that escapes individual identification, because it is the reflection of a steadily prevailing feeling. Of all French journals, those alone that advocate ecclesiastical predilections, have encountered instinctive disfavour from the public, and have been popularly recognised as sectional organs. In all other matters the French press has always obeyed an arbitrary direction—sometimes proceeding from an individual sometimes from a set—but often usurped by a monstrous executive, without the act shocking in any profound degree the feelings of the nation. An organization so weak at heart has, however, been attended by a brilliant productiveness of a piece with the impetuous action of the national character. Hence the press of France, like its revolutions failing of permanent results at home, has nevertheless exerted considerable influence abroad. It may fairly claim to have fulfilled its adequate share in what seems to be the destiny reserved to the lot of the French people, the communication of stirring impulses to the world. This was especially the case during a period which we are apt to forget even to have existed—the century preceding the great revolution. At that time many circumstances conspired to endow it with peculiar interest for the public of Europe. The French language then served on the Continent as the chosen vehicle for polite culture; the might of the great monarchy cemented by Louis XIV., made politicians in every country watch intently for the least indication of what its governors might be meditating, while no one, whose tastes inclined towards letters and philosophy, could refrain from taking some interest in the startling movement that was going on in France, and filling its periodicals with the effusions of bitter controversy. This period of the French press, therefore, well merits attention, and its perpetual guardianship, claimed as a right by a jealous authority, but often virtually wrested from its grasp by a daring set of encroaching spirits, offers the most instructive study of the conditions from which a press, however loaded with symptoms of brilliant success, must disentangle itself, if it wishes to become a living institution, standing by its own strength and acting as the calm and really honest instructor of conscious freedmen.

M. Hatin deserves our best thanks for having afforded us ample materials in the work at the head of this article for a thorough insight into the old French press. To call his book amusing would give an incorrect idea of it. M. Hatin would probably start back at the bare notion that he could have been guilty of desecrating the precious staff of his literary investigations with anything so irreverent as a light remark. He is evidently the very type of an inveterate bookhunter and anti-

quarian, his very essence being palpably imbued with the musty ponderousness akin to folios and long years of literal research. We wager that the ideal of his heart—its conception of delight and supreme enjoyment—is a well-compiled catalogue duly expanded with erudite references; and we must pay him the compliment of saying that he has proved himself a master in such compositions. His history of the French press is a laborious catalogue, abounding in copious illustrations of those minutiae of book-lore, the knowledge of which is invaluable for a collector, to preserve him from the confusion of purchasing a copy with a spurious title-page, or the defect of some rare foot-note. But in addition to a vast amount of such secondary matter, M. Hatin's plodding industry happily supplies his readers with plentiful extracts from the publications he has catalogued, so that we are enabled to form our own judgment of their tone and spirit—points which M. Hatin is much less forcible in elucidating than the obscure date of a forgotten editorship, or the right number of some scarce sheet. Done with a wearisome excess of bibliophic precision, his book is a mine of curious lore, which will well repay the student's perseverance. We only regret that so meritorious a production has not had the advantage of a better arrangement, bringing into relief the interesting and highly amusing matter buried in its tiring pages of needlessly copious extracts.

M. Hatin begins with an introductory inquiry into the origin of the press, extending his researches into the night of classical times where we have no intention of following him. The press is by its nature identified with printing, and there is no genuine analogy between it and the meagre notices of a simply commemorative purpose, like the *Acta Diurna*, which are to be traced in ancient times. If we were inclined to seek for a classical prototype it would be in the direction of the light satirical literature which then was freely current in many societies, and dealt without reserve with men and affairs. The Athenian comedy, from its intimate connexion with popular habits—its public delivery—and its unlimited freedom of remark on the events and politicians of the day, is to our mind more akin to a press than anything that occurs to us in classical literature. But such analogies are the play of fanciful ingenuity. The press sprang into being the moment when a strong desire to have information about contemporary events coincided with the provision of practical means for circulating it through the invention of printing. Therefore, as the result of a prevailing sentiment, we find it starting into life almost simultaneously throughout Europe at the beginning of the seventeenth century, when a great struggle between hostile principles affected the interests of all communities. It is a point

of secondary interest to which nation actually belongs the priority in having established a regular journal. The invention once made, its use spread with contagious rapidity, and the first half of the seventeenth century saw every leading State in possession of periodicals for the dissemination of news. It seems to us, however, that Germany has the best claim to pride itself as the first in the field, and the origin of its periodicals is curious as directly due, not to a movement of intellectual curiosity but to the instincts of trade. That great banking firm of *Augsburg* which attained colossal proportions under the Fuggers,—the same princely merchants who feasted in that city the Emperor Charles V. with such lavish magnificence as to feed the fire in the banquet-hall with logs of cinnamon wood, and to throw into the blaze the bonds he had signed to them—started, for the dissemination of correct information, so requisite for trade operations, a paper compiled from the letters sent them by their numerous correspondents and agents. It would be interesting to know whether the *Augsburg Gazette*, still widely circulated, traces itself directly up to the organ of the Fuggers. M. Hatin only informs us that the Vienna Library possesses a series, of the years 1568–1604, offering “a most valuable source for the history of the time;” and that its issue was daily with few exceptions. As to the claims often advanced in favour of Venice as the place where the first journal was published, it appears to rest on no other ground than the evident Venetian origin of the term gazette. No trace of any Venetian newspaper to justify the tradition has yet been discovered by a lynx-eyed antiquary, and it is probable that the general application to news sheets of this Italian title will be found due to some accident, if it is ever traced to its origin.

In France the press was the offspring of a far less grave parentage, it was, in fact, a foundling born of the idle, gaping, irrepressible passion for something that might have in it the salt of novelty—a passion proverbial in Parisians. This eagerness for news in the metropolitan population, instinctively created in the various quarters certain centres for meeting where newsmongers congregated, with a regularity which soon stamped these spots with the character of fountain-heads for general information. Gradually these meeting-places became distinguished by the nature and walk in life of their frequenters. The Luxemburg garden was then already regarded as the point to meet those especially devoted to learned tastes and the kindred pursuit of literary criticism. The Palais Royal daily saw hustled around an elm tree in its garden, known as l'arbre de Cracovie, a throng of greedy gossips whose business it was to retail tattle in salons haunted by fashion and birth; while on the quay, the now dismantled cloisters of St. Augustin, were the resort of bustling priests,

curious about the doings of the world. To frequent daily at a certain hour the centres of information, and then to run round and retail what had been picked up in fixed quarters, was a regular means of livelihood—the newsman being then as recognised a member of a great man's household as a private secretary is in our time. His calling constituted a conspicuous class in society, as such impressed with a type of its own, which is for ever the subject of remark, not always complimentary, in the literature of the time. “The character of the *nouvelliste*,” we find in Trevoux's Lexicon under that word, “brings ridicule; it is a kind of profession which lowers a man beneath himself. Members of the aristocracy who are ruined or idlers, are in general news-mongers or genealogists.” While such were the only means at the disposal of the eager lovers of news in the metropolis there arrived in Paris a young medical student, with the view of practising his profession, but who, being gifted with an intuitive perception of facilities which others with a blind haste had stumbled past, was essentially one of those shrewd men intended by nature to build up their own fortunes by striking into new paths. This man was Theophraste Renaudot, born at Loudon, 1584, and a Fellow of the medical faculty of Montpellier. No sooner had he set up in the metropolis than his innovating spirit brought him into collision with his professional brethren.

“Chemistry, still in its infancy, began to furnish medicine with new remedies against which the Paris faculty thundered. Renaudot, who everywhere sought progress, showed himself one of the most ardent explorers of this new mine, and, in spite of *routine*, his chemical remedies obtained a success enhanced by the fact that he gave them to the poor gratuitously with his advice. Be it from a feeling of charity, or from calculation, Renaudot made himself in fact the officious, but qualified and licensed, adviser of the poor and the sick who were unwilling to enter hospitals, and preferred being treated at home; for these he undertook to procure gratis doctors and medicines.”—(P. 64, vol. i.)

This brought him in contact with a great number of the lower classes, and his practical application of the fact is in favour of M. Hatin's whispered suggestions of calculation:—

“In his desire to assist the working classes, he established a house for loans or *mont de piété*, where all the needy flocked. This was the first establishment of the kind. Loans were advanced to the amount of a third of the valuation of the object pledged, against three per cent interest, and a small registration fee. The deposits, it is true, became the lender's property if not withdrawn at the stipulated term; but it is not said that Renaudot abused or even put into practice this stringent clause.”—(P. 65, vol. I.)

With all due deference to M. Hatin's lisped protest in behalf of

his client's disinterestedness, we evidently have here a man who was not slow in making philanthropy serve as handmaiden to profit. The next move made by the innovating practitioner exhibited growing confidence in his mercantile skill. On his gratuitous visits to the poor sick, he had not walked the streets of Paris with his eyes shut to what he met in them. Those ever-eager crowds buzzing around the Palais Royal elms—those black knots of absorbed priests by whom, doubtless, he would often be obstructed when thinking to make a hasty cut out of the thronged quay through the cloisters of St. Augustine towards the remoter district of the Luxemburg—had suggested a notion to his quick brain. What if all these scattered sets of busybodies could be brought to one common place of meeting, where they might at their ease exchange their budgets of news, and extend the advantages of intercourse to new purposes? In the Rue Calandre, running out of the Marché Neuf, Renaudot opened, in 1630, an advertising and meeting office, where every one could obtain any address or information for which he might be in search; where vendors could announce their wares, and purchasers advertise their wants, while *nouvellistes*, besides the facilities for picking up news, were offered every convenience for confidential conferences. Complete success attended this happy contrivance. Renaudot and his establishment became the talk of the town. His office was the perpetual resort of a crowd of persons, who, in doing their own business, supplied him with a daily abundance of information, which caused the delight of his patients. The perpetual demands for news which now came to be made on him in every house he visited, inspired the thought of communicating to his friends what he had learnt in circular letters. Having succeeded in attracting the favour of Richelieu, whose quick glance recognised the advantage of an organ capable of influencing opinions in political matters, Renaudot was authorized to publish his relations in print. On the 30th May, there was issued accordingly, from the office in the Rue Calandre, the first number of a journal bearing the title of the *Gazette*, "such being not unfamiliar to the common class with whom one has to deal." It appeared as a weekly publication, which was to convey accounts of what was going on all over the world. Constantinople, Rome, Spain, Portugal, Venice, and the chief towns in the Empire figure as headings of paragraphs in the first number. France alone seems to have been a proscribed subject at the commencement—for it is only in the sixth issue that some domestic topics, gleaned from innocent gossip, are found in the columns of the *Gazette*. Gradually, however, the communications become more ample, and it is evident that the cardinal, before bestowing too much of his confidence, first sought to satisfy himself as to the discretion

of his man. Once convinced that he could rely on him, Richelieu steadily gave him his public countenance. A Royal licence was published, by which "the Sieur Renaudot, one of our physicians in ordinary, and general of the Address Offices in our realms, to the exclusion of all other persons, was alone to enjoy the right to cause to be printed, sold, and distributed, gazettes, relations, and news sheets within the realm or in foreign parts, in his own office or in any other place, as well as through any person he might select, with defence against any one else, and doing the same on pain of any punishment it may please to impose."

Here at its very birth we find the French Press already stamped with the full features of that direct guardianship and official protection which have so steadfastly clung to it. The sensation produced by the *Gazette* was immense. Every one rushed to procure it—every one perused its columns with eager curiosity. But its appearance proved likewise the signal for a yell of abuse and indignation on the part of all who saw themselves injured in their livelihood by this novelty. These classes were eagerly assisted in their frantic vituperation of Renaudot by his private enemies, and especially by the medical faculty. That learned body, with the mad-rage which seems proper to corporations at the sight of what is held to be an interloper or poacher upon privileged domain, was not ashamed to employ the vilest ribaldry and the meanest devices, with a view to overwhelm the object of its hatred in ruin. Its principal organ in this disgraceful attempt to hound down an independent man was the well-known Guy Patin, author of the celebrated Letters, who, with a savage glee, devoted to the cause of his fraternity all the powers of wormwood, stinging malice, and withering sarcasm which he so abundantly possessed. The torrent of revilement let loose upon Renaudot in lampoons, or running through the correspondence of the relentless doctor would, one would have thought, have been sufficient to crush any man. Guy Patin at times seems seized with a frenzy that the powers of language are too weak for the strength of his venom. But Renaudot was not a man to care for paper pellets, which from time to time he would return with interest. Strong in the steady favour of the Court, and practically consoled for impotent abuse by the circulation of his journal, Renaudot continued his work with unruffled composure, and even extended the sphere of his operations. "Ah, if the gazetteer were only not supported by his Eminence in his character of nebulo hebdomadarius," exclaims Guy Patin, in the bitterness of his heart, "then we could bring a criminal action against him, at the close of which there would be a tumbrel and an executioner . . . but one must bow to the times. Meanwhile M. Moreau is making a reply to his plea, which is a downright satire. I fancy the gazetteer

will be horribly mauled in it, according to his deserts, until such time as an executioner can fall on the scoundrel."

But other difficulties secretly beset Renaudot, and caused him serious perplexity at times. They resulted from the nature of his position as Court chronicler, and the obligation he was under, in deference to authority, sometimes to speak of disgraced interests in a tone that exposed him to their resentment on return to power. M. Hatin's industry has brought to light a highly curious instance, the similarity of which to the practice of official injunctions now not uncommon in France adds to its point. The drivelling intellect of Louis XIII. delighted in the amusement afforded by the *Gazette*, which it flattered his vanity to hear was his own. When, therefore, the half-witted monarch, who never dared to confront any one, felt upon him the necessity of giving vent to the feelings of rancour which continually affected him, he would send peremptory orders for the insertion of some paragraph in the *Gazette*, which its editor was obliged to admit. Of course the Queen was often the subject of their matter. On the 4th of June, 1633, there appeared an announcement of the seizure of several state prisoners, and especially Don John of Medici, engaged in a treasonable correspondence for the overthrow of the King's government, and the discredit of his person, by ascribing to him an attempt for the repudiation of the Queen.

When Anne of Austria became regent, it appears that she resolved to wreak vengeance on the luckless editor of the *Gazette* for the utterance of these provocations, and especially of this particular article. On this Renaudot proceeded to draw up a full statement of the facts which led to its publication, presenting it to the Queen as the humble exculpation of his unwilling offence. This curious paper M. Hatin accidentally discovered. It appears from it that the *Gazette* was already in type when the Abbé Le Masles, an officer of Richelieu's household, came to the office between ten and eleven o'clock at night, bringing the article in question with him, and summarily ordering its insertion. The issue was not only already printed, but also partly distributed. Authority was however inflexible, and Renaudot had to transform the types, and by expunging from his columns various bits, find room for the new paragraph; the Abbé carrying away with him all the old copies still in hand. The confirmation of this account is afforded by a collation of the collections of the *Gazette*, in some of which is to be found the original issue already put in circulation before the Abbé's arrival. "This is the crime charged against me," says Renaudot in his memorial, "in reference to which I humbly entreat your Majesty to consider if now, some foreign prince happening to be arrested, your council were to order me

to publish the reasons, with a view to the justification of his prosecution; or if your chief ministers were to command me to inform the public of some other matter of weight, what means would I have to absolve myself from obeying?" And then he adds, in a tone of irresistible insinuation, "Why am I not allowed the room to confute the evil turns which are being wrongfully done me with your Majesty by the encomiums I made on you at a time when I had to go through many evil phases, and when most writers were silent about your Majesty? The discourses I made on the king's illness and death were perpetual panegyrics on your Majesty's piety and conjugal affection. And since your Majesty's happy accession to the regency, have I not on every occasion sought to impress people with a sense of the happiness and contentment which they have, and are bound to expect from such an administration?" This lowly confession pacified the resentment of Anne, with whom the petitioner had a powerful intercessor in Mazarin, who extended to him the same favour as his predecessor.

The storm which, to the delight of his enemies, had for a while so threateningly gathered over the head of Renaudot, vanished into nothing, and they had the mortification to see him confirmed in the direction of the hated journal, which he continued to publish down to his death in 1653. Meagre and trivial as compared even with the imperfect journals of the last century, the importance of the *Gazette* created by Renaudot is not to be denied. He had brought into the world that which society henceforth felt it indispensable to its comfort to preserve. On Renaudot's death, the *Gazette* therefore continued naturally under the direction of his sons. It had, in fact, grown into a necessity; and the idea that it could possibly cease to appear, was out of the range of suggestion. From the first the powerful influence of Richelieu had been successfully exerted to make the *Gazette* of his creation a vehicle of expression for the bright circle of talent which his lofty despotism ever strove to gather around it. Mezeray, Voiture, Bautru, the choicest intellects of the age, had thus become regular writers in its columns; the great Racine even counts amongst the occasional contributors. The journal thus bequeathed by Renaudot attained unparalleled longevity and Court favour. Louis XIV. made it the channel for pompous announcements to the world of his achievements and pageants. In the following reign it was officially decreed the Government organ, a royal brief in August, 1762, having put it under the control of the Foreign department, "that it might gain in interest, acquire greater authenticity, and furnish history with safe and precious memorials." On this occasion, the title was changed into *Gazette*

de France, and the royal arms figured on the heading. Bachaumont, however, supplies us with another reason for the transformation :

“The *Gazette de France* will henceforth be made under the eyes of the Minister for Foreign Affairs (he says), compiled by his clerks, and edited by M. Remond de Sainte Albine. The object is to crush the foreign papers ; unfortunately, the bulk of the public allows itself to be more swayed by the Republican tone than the truthfulness of an editor. In spite, therefore, of the talents of M. Sainte Albine, emphatically a maker of gazettes, there is reason to fear that it will continue always to be considered tiresome—for reasons easily conceived.”

The result proved the correctness of this prediction. Editors were changed, salaries were increased, but still the *Gazette* languished, until the Government thought to revive it by severing it from official dependence. Panckoucke, the great publisher of the day, purchased it in 1787, but his efforts to pour a new spirit into the dowager of journals were thoroughly unavailing, and in 1791 the *Gazette* returned to its old domicile, the Foreign Department, there to remain until the great break-up of the whole traditional system of the press in 1792 flung it abroad again upon its own resources. From that time it shared the vicissitudes of other journals in that troublous period, but its representative still exists in the shape of a print which, with a consistency appropriate to its ancient parentage, is the inveterate champion in France of obsolete traditions.

The political agitation which marked the regency of Anne of Austria, was productive of a literature which, though for the most part in verse, partook somewhat of the character of the press, from its more or less periodical appearance, and its dealing with current events. So immense was the flood of rhymed lampoons and libels which then teemed from the printing presses of Paris, as to have acquired, under the distinctive title of Mazarinades, a recognised position in the history of French literature. On the restoration of the Royal government, the original spirit of these licentious publications was of course suppressed, but their form, so congenial to the bantering humour of Paris, lived in a set of light, humorous periodicals, which in sprightly verse recounted the gossip of the day, and attained immense favour in the highest circles of society. They merit attention as undoubted prototypes of the *Charivaris* and *Figaros* whose satire is so eminently characteristic of modern Paris. The most important of these rhyming journals was the *Muse Historique*, by Loret. It appeared during fifteen years (1650–65) without intermission every Wednesday and Saturday, in the shape of a rhymed letter to the Princess de Longueville, to whom Loret retailed with an unflinching liveli-

ness, entirely proceeding from his own unaided inspiration, all the gossip in politics, literature, and society which he could contrive to gather, intermingling therewith pleasant reflections and amusing sallies. Some extracts will give a better conception of its spirit than any account. His lady protector being deep in the party of the Fronde, Loret never fails to insinuate something against Mazarin. On the 2nd of September, 1650, he announces—

Ce jour on a pris occasion
De faire la translation,
Mais très cachée et très soudaine
Des trois prisonniers de Vinceine.
Plaise à la divine bonté
Que la dure captivité,
Par eux constamment endurée
Ne soit pas de longue durée !

Six months later he has the boldness to publish the following quiz:—

Mardi, messieurs du Parlement,
Examinant exactement
Ceux qui, par arrêt et sentence
Étaient allés en diligence
Sur les pistes du Cardinal
Virent dans le procès-verbal
Quantité de choses atroces
Dont en voici deux des plus grosses ;
(Ce fut de deux clercs d'avocats
Dont à peu près, j'ai lu le cas) :
Savoir qu'un homme de village
A déposé pour témoignage
Que Jules s'étant retiré
Chez un bon homme de curé
Avait quitté cette chaumière
Sans donner à la chambrière.
Autre manant, sur le chemin,
A déclaré que Mazarin
Qui marchait la nuit sans lanterne
Ayant bu dans une taverne
Du vin a seize sous le pot
Quand ce vint à payer l'écot,
Qui ne consistait, pour tous vivres
Qu'à la somme de quatre livres
On ne put tirer de ses mains.
Qu'un ecu léger de trois grains."

In this light vein his verses run on, touching on every possible topic. 'How—

“ Les comediens
Que Monsieur avoue être les siens

have acted

Un sujet plaisant
A rire sans cesse induisant
Par des choses facétieuses
Intitulé les Pretieuses.”

Or recommending a shop where are to be found—

“ Des bottes faites sans couture
Bottes d’hiver ou bien d’été.”

A puff which seems to justify Scarron’s insinuation that “Loret écrit pour qui lui donne.” The little occurrences of the day are also carefully noticed—

“ La pauvre Marion Delorme
De si rare et plaisante forme
A laissé ravir au tombeau
Son corps si charmant et si beau,
Quand la mort avec sa faucille
Assassine une belle fille
J’en ai toujours de la douleur,
Et tiens cela pour grand malheur.”

One last extract we must make, for its matter is in direct connexion with our subject. The 1st November, 1653, brings the news that—

“ Renaudot, le grand Gazetier
Dont le nez n’était presentier
Mais disert historiographe
Et digne d’un bel epitaphe
Dimanche fut mis au tombeau
A la clarté de maint flambeau.”

It is unnecessary to dwell on the many imitators of Loret, who only perpetuated, with various talents, the tone which made his journal so popular. We will but mention that Scarron, attracted by its success, was induced, in 1655, to apply his pungent powers of satire to a similar periodical. But, in spite of his talents, he found it impossible to compete with his rival, and after thirty-five numbers, he abandoned his attempt.

We now come to a publication that has just claims to an important place in the history of the press as the patriarch of magazines. The *Gazette* had the privilege of catering to the public appetite for tidings of political import; the rhymed effusions of Loret and his associates had satisfied the intellectual requirements of the more frivolous classes of society, but as yet no periodical responded to the serious tastes of those daily growing in number,

whose thoughtful sense of curiosity was allied with the critical disposition natural to a literary turn of mind. To make good this sensible deficiency, the *Journal des Savants* was created in 1665, under the direction of M. de Sallo, with the direct countenance of the ruling minister of the day—Colbert; “the design of this journal being to make known whatever is new in the commonwealth of letters.” We read in its opening number, “it will contain—

“1. An accurate catalogue of the chief books printed in Europe Giving an account of what they treat, and to what they can be useful.

“2. The necrology of every person of celebrity for his learning or writings.

“3. Communications of physical and chemical experiments which tend to elucidate the operations of nature: of discoveries in arts and sciences, as for instance, machines, and inventions due to mathematics.

“4. The principal decisions of secular and ecclesiastical tribunals—sentences pronounced by the Sorbonne, and other universities.

“5. It will be an object that nothing should happen in Europe worthy of the notice of men of letters, without being brought to their notice in this journal.”

This comprehensive scheme—sufficiently large to secure attention to a periodical in our days—was not above the powers of Sallo, whom nature had endowed with a range of talents rarely to be found in one man. But these great talents, precisely on account of their excellence, proved his ruin. Sallo’s criticism dealt in the finest and truest point. Wholly free from the vulgar ribaldry generally proper to controversy in that age, his strictures were as neat in their sting as they were correct in their spirit. Sallo was a critic by nature, and his essays would have done honour to any journal in the more advanced ages of the press. He became soon the object of as intense execration as had befallen poor Renaudot, and, by a curious coincidence, amongst his loudest detractors we again meet our old acquaintance Guy Patin. His bile on this occasion was stirred by an unfavourable notice of a numismatic manual by his son Charles. The latter replied to his critic in a virulent letter, which may fairly be ascribed to the father, and a controversy seemed about to ensue, marked with all his characteristic bitterness, when superior authority interposed.

“I send you,” writes Patin to his friend Falconnet, “my Carolus’ answer, which is wise and modest. This new Gazetteer has replied like a dunce and a man beside himself, and as such he would not have been left without answer both sharp and strong, supported by goodly reasonings, had not Carolus been asked to suspend his retort, and threatened with a *lettre de cachet*. The truth is, M. Colbert protects the authors of this journal. . . . We shall see hereafter whether these

pretended censors, sine suffragio Quiritium, will have the credit and authority thus to criticise all who do not write to their tastes. Are we in the days of Juvenal, who says—

‘Dat veniam corvis, vexat censura columbas?’

. . . . The commonwealth of letters is with us, but M. Colbert is with those gentlemen; and if my son defends himself, it is said that he will go to the Bastille.”

Patin’s spite was soon gratified. Sallo was an upright and public-spirited man, as well as a sound critic. He was a staunch Gallican in church matters, and conveyed his opinions on that point distinctly, although never with offensive expressions calculated to wound natural susceptibilities. But the Jesuit party were then on the watch to hunt down the hated spirit in every nook.

It could not be tolerated that so conspicuous a journal, basking in the open sunlight of ministerial favour, should be allowed to rest in the hands of one whom they called an avowed Jansenist. Colbert was beset with clamorous representations, which he found himself unable to neglect without exposing the journal itself to probable destruction. But this he was determined should not be the case. Colbert was, indeed, a statesman of comprehensive and generous genius, but cast in an essentially French type. The spirit of Richelieu’s administrative principles was entire in him, and his encouragement of this periodical had been inspired by the belief that it was the province of a provident Government to assume the direction of every branch of public life. Accordingly, to preserve the *Journal des Savants* from its dangerous assailants, Sallo had to resign his duties into the hands of the Abbé Gallois—a selection which again proved Colbert’s enlightened sense of the qualifications requisite for the post—and the connexion between the periodical and Government was drawn closer. Louis XIV. consented to allow the new series to be dedicated to him, and favours and privileges were showered down upon this cherished object of sovereign solicitude. It was protected against competition by the right to claim heavy fees from rival productions upon their establishment, and finally, under the administration of Pontchartrain, its property was bought by the State—the direction becoming vested in a Board appointed by the Minister, to whose approval the articles inserted had to be first submitted.

Under this system the periodical has continued its existence to our time. Minister supplanted Minister in the old Court, to the apparent transformation of its whole aspect; the Monarchy itself was swept away by the tide of an uncompromising Republic, to be succeeded by an Empire, which again was followed by Governments that professed to rest on constitutional principles;

but all these successive influences, of such conflicting nature in other respects, exhibited in office an unmodified sense of the attributes of sovereign prerogative in regard to the Press, as they had been conceived by Richelieu and Colbert. The Republican Directory exerted itself to revive the periodical, which had almost expired during the Reign of Terror, and confided its management to a committee selected from the Institut. In 1816 the Minister of the day referred the consideration of its fate to M. Guizot, then Secretary in the Ministry of Justice. We find this profound student of constitutional Government, in his report, laying down "the necessity of preserving the patronage of Government to this periodical in order to give it more authority, and draw to it writers of standing who might be sure to be free from a spirit of petty rivalry." What perceptible difference is there between this language and the reason given under Louis XV. for putting the *Gazette de France* under the control of the Foreign Department? The *Journal des Savants* is now managed by a body of writers named and presided over by the Minister of Public Instruction, in whose office they meet once a fortnight to discuss and read the articles for insertion.

We have dwelt at such length upon these two journals on account of their historical importance—testified by the fact of their unparalleled duration, and the permanent influence which their forms have exercised over French habits of thought. They constitute the original mould of that official and personal type out of which the French press has never yet disentangled itself. In other respects, they offer little which can attract a student. Under the jealous despotism of Louis XIV., the keen and criticising spirit proper to journalism could not dare to show itself. It is true that there were other licensed periodicals, but they were all literary and ephemeral. A student will find matter worthy of notice in many, as they were, for the most part, the production of men who, more or less unconsciously, were actuated with a spirit, however subdued, of opposition. But none of these attempts succeeded in maintaining themselves. The press of France, as a positive institution, with a visible existence and a recognised position, is practically confined in the times of Louis XIV. to the harmless dissertations in the *Journal des Savants* and the alternately lying and meagre paragraphs of the *Gazette*. This could not satisfy the increasing curiosity of a people whose natural liveliness was taking a strong turn towards literary inquiry, while stirring events, brought home to their doors, unavoidably excited profound emotions. But to give vent to these emotions in France was impossible. Those who were under their influence had to seek a foreign soil if they wished to give utterance to their feelings. Holland proved then the favourite refuge place for those fugitives

from inquisitorial censorship, and there a French periodical literature sprang up which, from its amount and extent acquiring almost an indigenous character, exercised immense influence on the intellect of the mother country, and proved the cradle for nurturing that infant spirit of French journalism unnaturally expelled from its native home. It is well-known how the wide circulation of the *Holland Gazette*, "that vehicle of all slander," with its stinging diatribes and still more stinging true reports made the majesty of Louis XIV. turn pale with impotent frenzy, and carried sleepless nights to his bewildered ministers. M. Hatin's indefatigable industry has established the fact that there was no one paper bearing this title. It was an appellation generally applied to the journals printed in the Republic, and has been preserved in use by the accident of its figuring on the back of collections in the French libraries, which, on examination, prove to be composed from different journals.

The student who wishes for a detailed account of the flood of writings that proceeded from the Dutch presses, we must refer to M. Hatin's list. What we wish to point out is how the swamps of Holland, through the blessings of freedom, became the chosen abode of the best and noblest minds of France—a happy sanctuary alike for those who sternly refused to sacrifice conscience in submission to fanatical persecution, as for those whose irrepressible independence of temper could not bow deferentially to a prying police. Thither wandered the unswerving Huguenot, who cheerfully forsook home and wealth and honours to possess a temple for his cherished worship; thither emigrated the inoffensive Descartes, to find a retreat where, free from wanton interference, to abandon himself to abstract speculation; and thither proceeded the keen and subtle intellect of a Bayle to indulge without hindrance his love for neat, incisive, and curious criticism. *Les Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, a periodical founded by Bayle in 1684, and conducted by him for several years, is undoubtedly the most important production of the age. What Sallo might perhaps have done for the press was here thoroughly achieved in the calmly keen tone of this periodical; in the sprightly language of its acute criticism French journalism was supplied with a model of its perfect art. Also the interest which it awakened was intense, and the general attention excited by Bayle completes the strong similarity already existing in other respects between him and Voltaire, of whom he may be appropriately called the forerunner. The play of his influence, like an electric current, impalpably shot through every layer of intellectual society, the bright sparkle of his easy dissertation kindling the smothered fire of French thought into the flame of

expression, and exercising the degree of fascination which converts men into unconscious imitators.

Once, however, in spite of his absolute power, Louis XIV. found himself confronted by an opposition of native growth and homespun texture, which for a while made him experience a fire of criticism from within his own dominions. The subject that gave rise to this strong expression of opinion is hardly intelligible to us. Still more difficult is it to comprehend how it ever attained the interest to produce public agitation. It sprang from the perplexing controversy identified with the Jansenists and Molinists, and which culminated in the Bull *Unigenitus* launched by the Papal See against the former with the sanction of the French Court. The provisions of this Bull, the avowed work of the Jesuits, infringed traditions of the Gallican Church to which people in all ranks of society—the aristocracy, the parliament, the literary profession and the middling classes—were largely attached with a fanatical affection. What, therefore, deserves our notice, is how the one occasion on which the domestic policy of Louis XIV. wounded a really national chord in the feeling of the French people, coincides with the one occasion on which we meet a press of a sufficiently impersonal character to represent in its effusions a collective sentiment, and defy the identification of individual origin and authorship.

The *Nouvelles Ecclesiastiques* was the name of a paper issuing from a clandestine press that circulated all over France, and harassed the Jesuits with unflagging perseverance. In vain was every effort made to detect its origin. In vain did the Archbishop of Paris thunder against it in episcopal denunciations—in vain was all the machinery of a hundred-eyed police put in movement to crush its existence. The Jansenist paper still continued to elude detection, and laughed the authorities to scorn by starting to light in some fresh quarter, when they congratulated themselves with at last having got it within their clutches. No clandestine press in any state of our day, however nursed by secret societies, ever attained a more effective organization than these *Nouvelles Ecclesiastiques*. The "Diary" of Barbier abounds with entries instancing the frantic efforts of Government to detect the origin of this audacious publication.

"It would be printed everywhere," says M. Hatin; "sometimes here—sometimes there—to-day in a town, to-morrow in some village, in a cellar or a garret—even in the heart of a forest."

Barbier, who evidently was to some extent in the secret, tells us—

"It is impossible to detect the writers of the *Nouvelles Ecclesiastiques*,

for it passes in fabrication through such a series of persons—all of them, by-the-bye, very honest folks—that the writer himself is never known by those who might be arrested. When the writer has composed his sheet from the materials he has in hand, he throws them into the fire, and gives his draft to another person. This person copies it, and then burns the original. A third person carries it to a printer, and also comes to fetch the copies for distribution in Paris. There are perhaps twenty offices in the different quarters of the town, that is to say, twenty individuals, who each take perhaps a hundred copies. The same person does not carry the hundred copies to all the twenty offices, but twenty different persons; and he who keeps an office pays for his own hundred copies. . . . If, now, one of these office-keepers came to be arrested this morning, all the others would be informed in an instant, and their copies would be at once transferred to another locality; so that, let there be arrested whoever will, the machine still rolls on, and it is hardly possible to stop the circulation.”

This was the case. * Its opposition to the acts of Government made the ecclesiastical paper at that time an object of interest to a set of men who had not yet ventured to appear in public—the “*philosophes*,”—and their assistance secured for it a position that enabled it to drag on an existence for many years after its peculiar views had ceased to engage general interest.

It is upon the conspicuous appearance of this literary sect before the public in the middle of the eighteenth century, that what first may claim to be considered a French Press starts to sight. This claim rests not upon the form given to its productions, but upon their open and avowed spirit of controversy, reflecting a pervading sentiment. This controversy was indeed restricted within the province of literary criticism and philosophical speculation. But that fact does not diminish its importance, for upon the field of these seemingly neutral domains thought and expression found the occasion for ripening into the strength from which was distilled the maddening spirit of political revolution. The form of publication in which the polemics of this school most delighted to diffuse their views was the pamphlet and the squib. An incessant flood of such compositions inundated France, let loose by the brotherhood of freethinkers who ranged themselves under the banner of the Patriarch of Ferney. Their views did undoubtedly find expression in divers periodicals, but it cannot be said that there arose any one journal that figured as the organ of this party. Such a prominent position was only attained by the great work which endowed the party with a permanent name. The *Encyclopedie*, by the fact of its collective origin, its gradual publication, and the startling nature of its scope, at the time of its appearance, acquired the kind of influence proper to a leading journal. But by its nature this publication could not serve as an instrument for the controversy in which its authors

and partisans were perpetually engaged. France therefore was overrun in the course of this hot discussion with an infinity of controversial literature, bulky discourses and stinging replies, witty pamphlets and libellous lampoons. Their importance in reference to the press lies solely in their outspoken language—the first instance of public discussion. It is impossible to review these productions in the limits of this paper. To do so would be tantamount to a review of the whole batch of Encyclopedic writers, especially Diderot and Voltaire. But we will dwell on what may be considered the culminating point of the great debate, the quarrel between Voltaire and Fréron, the great champion of the olden views, for it affords a complete illustration of the spirit in which the contest was carried on, and of the condition in which the Press stood to Government.

Fréron occupies a position in the French literary world of the eighteenth century analogous to the one now held by Louis Veillot; only it would be doing him an injustice to put the literary worth of his writings on a level with those of his successors. Brought up by the Jesuits and imbued with a deep conviction in the principles of their doctrine, Fréron was the ardent and sincere advocate in speculations of orthodoxy, in literature of the great writers of the age of Louis XIV. For these views Fréron gallantly did battle with the constancy of a zealot. But in his untiring animadversions of the new spirit of the age, his criticism contrasts favourably with the coarse vituperation of Veillot and the disgusting personalities too repeatedly indulged in by his Encyclopedic opponents. Fréron was thoroughly old-fashioned, and even bigoted; but his unflinching efforts to the last in behalf of a losing cause, were marked with a rare command of temper, and a degree of literary merit which has generally not been done justice to, under the impression of Voltaire's pungent satire. In 1754, after having already distinguished himself in several publications, Fréron started his periodical *L'Année Littéraire*. "Its object," says M. Hatin, "was the demolition, so to say, of Voltaire and the Encyclopedists; and this object he pursued for five-and-twenty years with a perseverance and an animosity, but also, it must be acknowledged, with an energy and courage, of which the annals of literature offer no other example." It was impossible for the writer of such a publication not to come into direct collision with Voltaire, and Fréron was besides not the man to avoid confronting an antagonist. But although his criticism darted upon the productions of this prolific writer, as in rapid succession they left the press, Voltaire for some years, contrary to his custom, refrained from retorting, until an article in the beginning of 1752 stung his subdued passion into a paroxysm of frenzy. In a re-

view of some recent publication, Fréron inserted the following sketch:—

“If amongst us there existed an author who passionately loved glory, and who yet often mistook the means of acquiring it; sublime in some of his writings, truckling in all his actions; sometimes happy in depicting great, always himself occupied by little passions; who unceasingly would recommend union and equality amongst men of letters, but, coveting himself the sovereignty in Parnassus—would no more than the Grand Turk suffer one of his brethren to share his throne; whose pen would breathe but probity and greatness of mind, and himself would incessantly be laying snares for good faith, and would change creed as might suit times and place—in London an Independent, in Paris a Catholic, a Zealot in Austrasia, and an Indifferent in Germany; if, I say, our country should have produced a writer of this character, I feel convinced that out of regard for his talents one would pardon the failings of his mind and the vices of his heart.”

The number of the periodical with this unmistakable satire circulated in Paris with the rapidity proper to a society greedy of scandal and gossip. Voltaire bounded with rage from his easy-chair at Ferney, on hearing of the effect it had produced. The “insect” that had dared to sting his grandeur in this signal mode he vowed should be crushed by fair means or foul, and as Fréron refused to allow himself to be intimidated by threats of official persecution, Voltaire discharged upon the “malevolent viper” a terrific torrent of obscene virulence which the curious reader may study for himself in *Le Pauvre Diable*—a crushing satire; the 18th canto of the “Pucelle,” where Fréron appears as a galley-slave; and especially in the play of the “Ecoissaise,” where, under the disguise, if it can be called so, of Frélon, he is pilloried in the character of an infamous spy and venal informer. No imagination can realize to itself the stream of abuse which is here poured down upon the devoted head of the audacious critic. It must have exhausted even all the virulent faculties of Voltaire’s genius to furnish such a profusion of vituperation. But Fréron was proof to invective, and himself reviewed the production in a tone of irony which increased Voltaire’s exasperation. With his usual habitual love for disguises, Voltaire had published the *Ecoissaise* anonymously, and on the title-page even introduced it as a translation from Hume. Fréron in his review proved this forgery, and thus wittily expressed his reasons for not believing that Voltaire could be its real author:—

“What grounds are there, in fact,” he said, “for fancying that so middling a production has proceeded from so fine a pen? It has reached me how some petty scribblers pretend that it is myself who am meant under the name of Frélon. Well and good. Let them believe, or feign to believe so, and let them do their best to make others believe

the same. But if it is really myself whom the author has in view, then I draw the conclusion that M. de Voltaire cannot have written the play. For that great poet, rich in genius, especially of invention, would never stoop into a plagiarist of M. Piron, who long ago ingeniously called me Fréron. . . . Besides, would M. de Voltaire ever venture to call a person a scoundrel? He knows too well the obligations of decency and what is due to himself and others. . . . I am accustomed to the petty resentment of writers, and will recount a true anecdote on this subject. A very celebrated French author, who had retired to a German court, wrote a book, of which I found it impossible to say much praise. My criticism hurt his vanity. Being asked one day for news from France, he replied that he had received none. The conversation happening then to turn on me, he exclaimed, 'Ah, poor Fréron! he has been condemned to the galleys; he has just left in chains; they have written me this from Paris.' The author was questioned as to the causes which had brought this misfortune on me; he was requested to communicate the letter with the strange news. He replied that he had only been informed of the fact, without any further explanation, and that he had torn the letter. Every one perceived then at once that it was a pleasant effort of his wit. I myself could not avoid laughing when some friend wrote me the happy sally."

The anecdote was but too true, and the point in this stoical criticism incited Voltaire to further aggressions. He was bent on having the *Ecossaise* represented on the stage. The theatre, like the press, was under the absolute control of authority. But Voltaire was a man possessed of interest in the highest quarters. He was on intimate terms with great men, and he was an object of fear in his literary capacity to people not endowed with Fréron's imperturbability. The licence which would have been refused to the obscure author of an unobjectionable satire, and was on repeated occasions refused to poor Fréron, was readily granted for the representation of a disgusting libel, when the work of the redoubtable patriarch of the powerful sect of the Philosophes. It was the case of absolute government quaking within its apparent stronghold at the shadow of a public opinion. On the 26th July, 1760, the *Ecossaise* was performed at the Comédie Française before an applauding audience impressed from the ranks of Voltaire's fanatical partisans. But Fréron was to be cowed by no intimidation. In the first tier his wife, by his express command, occupied a conspicuous seat. The poor woman, overcome by the strain upon her nerves, could not endure the trial to which she was put under the vociferous jeers of an insulting audience, and had to be carried out of the house. But Fréron himself, in a front stall, sat through the whole representation, studiously regardless of the thousand eyes converging upon him, and of his being the object of the play. It is certainly the

most extraordinary example of imperturbable stoicism on record. This was not, however, his last throw. In a lively and witty paper, under the title of an "Account of a Great Battle," Fréron intended to narrate in his periodical the events of the evening, describing under happy names the frantic exertions upon that occasion of the chief votaries of the philosophical party. The paper is so clever and sprightly, that Voltaire might not have been ashamed of its authorship; while the names applied are free from gross personality or offensive designation, and require some knowledge of the parties to be recognised. Yet the censor who had sanctioned the performance of the *Ecossaise*, demurred to give his *imprimatur* to this slight retort. Fréron appealed then to the head of the Department. But even that functionary, although he listened kindly to his remonstrance, insisted upon considerable erasures. The end of the paper especially gave rise to long discussion. Fréron described how, after the glorious success of the evening, the Senate of Philosophes had commanded an assembly in the Tuileries gardens, there to sing a solemn *Te Voltairium*. This was declared profane, and it was only upon the following representation that Fréron secured the conservation of this sally: "I beg of you," he wrote to the functionary, "to sanction this touch. The whole of my article is made with a view to this stroke, and I am lost without it. I implore you to grant me the favour. I am not guilty of an invention when I say that I have read the *Te Voltairium* to two bishops. Nothing is more certain and more true. I shall have the honour of naming them when I shall have the one of seeing you. They did nothing but laugh." Voltaire, however, was not of this opinion, and in his private correspondence vented his indignation. "Fréron's name is certainly that of the last of mortals, but that of his protector undoubtedly would be the name of the last but one," is one of his frantic ejaculations!

The functionary who, on this occasion, dealt these unequal awards, was none else than the upright and conscientious Malesherbes, whose name is still popularly associated with integrity, and whose liberal sentiments were at no time hidden. In his duties as Superintendent of the Press, he acted with a liberality ungrudgingly borne witness to by the writers of the time, and yet we find him, over and over again, behaving in a manner which we must term vexatious and absurd, if not positively unjust. It is that the system was such as to render impossible an administration of the press on anything like sound principles. There existed no right except in virtue of favour. Such a system could perfectly connive at licence—it never could tolerate the shadow of liberty in the press. A publication could only exist in virtue of a concession on the part of a power by law irresponsible.

When this power was strong, its stringency would be extreme, while from its weakness there could be readily extorted a tacit countenance essentially mischievous to public morality, because depending on accident, and necessarily associating in public estimation the authority of Government with a degrading versatility of resolution. No licence was a safeguard against persecution; and nothing was commoner than the subjection of an author to imprisonment by command of the police, for some offence in a publication, which, nevertheless, had been duly approved by the censor. That functionary, indeed, served for little else than a target to receive the complaints and effusions of all (and their number was legion), whose susceptibilities chose to take umbrage at a printed statement. Malesherbes' "Memoirs" need be read to conceive the petty troubles with which that magistrate was perpetually driven to the verge of distraction. At one time D'Alembert requests him to prohibit Fréron's making mention of his name; at another he receives a remonstrance against the unseemliness of allowing it to be printed that *Italian* music alone was good. Yet these were the lesser obstacles with which a writer had to contend. At every movement he was exposed to arbitrary punishment at the summary injunction of the Lieutenant de Police, if he had been unfortunate enough to offend a person possessed of interest. On one occasion Fréron, in praising an actress of the day, paid a compliment to her private character. This was construed by the jealousy of the famous Mademoiselle Clairon, into an allusion, by contrast, to her own behaviour. The consequence was a *lettre de cachet* against the unfortunate culprit, and Fréron only escaped being locked up in the dungeon of Fort l'Évêque by a timely retreat, until his friends obtained, through the Queen, the revocation of the iniquitous order.

In 1777 there appeared the *Journal de Paris*, which only deserves notice from the fact of its being the first daily paper issued in France. On the death of Count Guibert, its editor, Suard, inserted a necrology which caused Marshal Segur, then Minister of War, to write the following letter to the censor:—"I have read in the *Journal de Paris* an article containing a panegyric of the late Governor of the Invalides, which was inserted without my assent. I request you to direct the editor of this sheet to print nothing in it about the army without having obtained my approval, and, above all, never to dare print my name, whether for good or bad." In the very year of its appearance this journal had been suspended for some weeks at the instigation of a foreign Princess. The ex-King of Poland, father of Marie Leczinska, had contemplated a matrimonial alliance with the Princess Christina of Saxony. Its negotiation was confided to the witty Chevalier de Bouffiers, who was despatched on his errand with

such haste as not even to be allowed time to recover first from a swollen face. His mission met with a very bad reception, and Boufflers gave vent to his sense of the want of courtesy he had encountered in verses which circulated in the salons of Paris. They found their way into the *Journal de Paris*, and the Princess was so indignant at the outrage that she procured the summary suspension of the paper. These are the offending verses :—

“ Avec une joue enflée,
Je débarque tout honteux,
La princesse boursoufflée,
Au lieu d'une en avait deux,
Et Son Altesse sauvage
Sans doute a trouvé mauvais
Que j'eusse sur mon visage
La moitié de ses attraits.”

Everybody at all interested in the history of the last century, has some acquaintance with the voluminous “*Mémoires Secrets*” that go under the name of Bachaumont. They are a compilation from the conversations in the salon of Madame Doublet. For forty years this lady gathered around her the gossip and scandal of Paris, which was drawn up by some of her votaries in the form of a manuscript relation regularly circulated amongst a set of select subscribers. This peculiar gazette was an object of especial annoyance to the Government, for its tone was as malicious as its circle of readers was distinguished in rank and talent. The Duc de Choiseul, who was the lady's nephew, in vain tried to intimidate the perverse temper of her society. At last he addressed the following despatch to the Lieutenant de Police :—

“ Versailles, 24th March, 1762.

“ Madame Doublet informed yesterday the Abbé de Breteuil that M. de Blenac's entire squadron was taken by the enemy. Madame de Doublet's news, which is false, and of which I have no knowledge, does no harm to the king's squadron, but a deal of harm to the funds. After the misfortunes that proceed from Madame Doublet's shop, I could not avoid informing the king of the fact, and of the intolerable imprudence of the news coming from this woman, my dearly beloved aunt. His Majesty has therefore commanded me to direct you to go to Madame Doublet and instruct her that, should a piece of news again be found coming from her house, the king will lock her up in a convent, where she will no longer diffuse reports as impertinent as they are contrary to the king's service.”

But Madame Doublet laughed at the Government, and down to the moment of her death continued to indulge her insatiable

passion for gossip, her last words being a request for a piece of news with which to gratify her friends in the next world.

Such was the system which prevailed with regard to the press down to the very hour of the French Revolution—a system at once vicious and inefficient, inevitably clinging to the profession of principles incompatible with any kind of regulated conditions, and driven to remedy their impossible stringency by expedients entirely arbitrary in disposition, and convicting the Government of weakness. Yet to the last these official censors and licensers of intellect continued to figure upon the crumbling ramparts of the sinking polity, tamely brandishing the wands of their hollow dignity at the angrily rising tide of free thought which meanwhile in their rear was rapidly invading the realm through the cracks in its starting foundation. The last years of the monarchy present indeed an astonishing spectacle of chaotic and incoherent action in regard to the press. The old pretensions to despotic supervision, continued in mock state side by side with a feverish and licentious productiveness, divested of all attempt at disguise—the example of contempt for the formal prohibitions of authority being repeatedly set by the very persons indissolubly linked with its most perfect embodiment. It is well known how, in the period of her girlish inexperience, the giddy temper of Marie Antoinette lent the brilliant countenance of her favour to the popularity which hailed the pointed shafts shot by the wit of Beaumarchais against the established order of society. The same thoughtless love of fun made her for some time take under her protection Linguet, best known for his *Mémoires sur la Bastille*, and the *Annales Politiques*, who, by his pungent sarcasm and paradoxical diatribe, is the truest representative of that frowning and discontented humour which immediately preceded the convulsion of the Revolution. Linguet was essentially an acrid and indefatigable quarreller. There was no surer means to excite his animosity against any object, than the fact of its being in the enjoyment of favour. He quarrelled with his own order, the law; he made the Academy and the Philosophes an especial object of his satire; he never ceased to denounce the Government of France as a tissue of injustice and abomination; he found happiness in holding up to ridicule every existing institution and every prevalent notion, especially devoting his best talents to the paradoxical glorification of Oriental despotism as the embodiment of justice. He was, in short, a man whose soul would centre its delight in a grievance that offered an occasion for raising a loud, ringing protest. With his perpetual revelations and fierce diatribes in every direction, Linguet was an incessant alarm-bell, exactly to the taste of a generation thoroughly ill at ease at heart, and in an unconscious nervous

expectation for the imminent advent of some change. Voltaire nicknamed him the *modern Aretino* and Linguet himself defined his character as obstinate, irascible, and inflexible.

It was in 1774 that Linguet began his career as journalist. He was then already well known for his great powers of controversy, which he had originally exhibited in a quarrel with the members of the Bar, who had expelled him from their corporation. His vanity had likewise exposed him to a rebuff in the pursuit of a seat in the Academy, which had stung him into a violent attack on D'Alembert, at that time the presiding genius of that august assembly. It was probably the interest taken in these frequent effusions which induced the speculating publisher, Panckoucke, to engage Linguet as the editor of a new paper called the *Journal de Bruxelles*. Within two years of its appearance, Linguet, giving unbridled course to his own overflowing gall, involved Panckoucke in such embarrassment that the latter gladly obeyed the command to remove him from the editorship of his journal. The immediate cause of this order was a violent diatribe, full of stinging invective against the Academy, on the occasion of La Harpe's admission. It was now that Linguet went abroad, and started in England the *Annales Politiques*—a periodical which created an immense sensation—occupying in the journalistic world immediately preceding the Revolution, a position that may be likened to the position obtained in the world of polite letters by the works of Rousseau and Voltaire. Here he discharged with unflinching audacity the wormwood of his sarcasm upon his enemies, and these were everybody. The first number contained a characteristic dedication to Louis XVI. "Sir," it runs, "after having spent my life in doing battle for the oppressed, I have become in my turn a victim of oppression. But I have the confidence that your Majesty will avenge me when the obstacles shall have been effaced that hitherto have prevented my complaints from reaching you." In spite of the impudent boldness of his language, and in spite of his direct attack upon the principal minister of the day, M. de Vergennes, the *Annales Politiques* circulated in France. Their admission had been made the subject of a Cabinet Council, where, after considerable debate it was resolved, that although no licence should be accorded to the periodical, its circulation should be tacitly connived at. And what may have been the reason for this decision? Probably the following entry in Metra's *Correspondance Secrète* explains it. "No. 18 of Linguet's Journal has keenly wounded our superb Academy. The chief members came to M. Amelot, the Minister who has the Department of Paris, and requested him no longer to permit the introduction of this scandalous publication. 'I am extremely grieved, gentlemen,' was the reply, 'I

cannot grant your request; the king, the queen, and all the royal family read no other than Linguet's Journal, and they read it with indescribable pleasure." Linguet, however, allowed himself to be so completely led away by his paradoxical and vindictive humour, as at last to become its victim, in spite even of such august protection. The high court of the Paris Parliament commenced a prosecution against him for *libellous defamation*, and Linguet, having pushed his audacious self-confidence so far as to venture within the limits of French jurisdiction, was arrested and thrown into the dungeons of the Bastille on the 2nd Sept. 1780, where he remained for two years. On his liberation, he immediately sped to England. There he relieved himself of his suppressed bile in those famous *Mémoires sur la Bastille*, well characterized as "the first blow of the pickaxe dealt at that old stronghold of despotism," and then proceeded to resume the issue of his former periodical, which now, however, was no longer even tacitly tolerated in France, until, on the outbreak of the Revolution, the shackles set on the press were momentarily knocked off, and Linguet established himself in Paris.

We have now arrived at a point where, for the present, we must close our sketch of the history of the French press. It will at once strike the observer how very imperfect was the shape of its development in the period which we have been reviewing. It is a press of proclamations or of pamphlets, but hardly one of journalism. It is either the direct and avowed organ of Government communication, or it is the acknowledged communication of individual opinions, with the solitary exception of the clandestine Jansenist journal. In this shape the press was transmitted to the generation who performed the Revolution, as an instrument wanting in all conditions of its own. The public, unaccustomed to connect certain fixed obligations and certain recognised opinions with the duties of a press, was disposed, therefore, to regard a journal as a matter depending as absolutely on personal disposition and personal conformation as the sound of voice. Hence the want of any natural defence against misguidance through the press; for a public which, while eager for political information, was ignorant of the true tests of sound political writing, extended a superstitious reverence to the journalistic form of publication. Thus it happened that in turns the public press as readily and as influentially served to circulate the savage yell of Marat's insane denunciations, or the obscene bray of the Père Duchesne's swinish brutality, as the magniloquent appeals of Mirabeau. And this state of things is not confined to a period of wild turmoil. The French press has never emancipated itself from personal connexions. During the epoch of constitutional Government, there appeared no political journal which

assumed a high and national stand, free from any close bond with individual politicians. Every paper was popularly recognised as the organ of some aspirant, or of some political set, desiring the achievement of some particular object or some particular move. The *Journal des Débats* has indeed put forward pretensions to a higher position, but still; the one it has really taken up falls far short of what is requisite for an efficient leading journal. During the time of Parliamentary rule, its dislike of faction made it sink too much into a shadow of the minister in power, and since the advent of the Imperial *régime*, it has been repeatedly led into tactics which, inspired by the peevish humour of the Academy, are essentially factious, and foreign to national feeling. The *Revue des Deux Mondes* alone seems to us to have acquired a superior position, by reflecting with calm and dispassionate evenness those liberal tendencies that certainly, although vaguely and imperfectly, have laid hold on French intellect ever since 1789. Also we see it in possession of a tacit supremacy which at once distinguishes it in the French press. It is with great interest that we look forward to the next volume of M. Hatin's work, in the hope that it will afford us as abundant materials for studying the later period of the French press, as it has already afforded us material for the earlier period. The literary talent to be found in the French press entitles it of itself to a high rank. That characteristic quality which has weakened its practical power as an institution, has indemnified for that loss by a literary point superior to that of our own. For individualism brings out and sharpens the peculiar qualities that constitute the perfection of literary art; while the broad vigour of our English press is, to some extent, undoubtedly coupled with a tone wanting in the graces of refinement.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY.

A VOLUME of "Essays and Reviews,"¹ the contributions of several writers, is a work that in a less pusillanimous age would awaken admiring sympathy as well as provoke open and spirited opposition. In noticing the various Essays, whose tendency is thus briefly indicated, we must bear in mind that their authors, of whom six are clergymen, "hold themselves responsible for their respective articles only;" that "they have written in entire independence of each other and without concert or comparison;" and that it has been their common purpose "to illustrate the advantages derivable to the cause of religious and moral truth, from a free handling, in a becoming spirit, of subjects peculiarly liable to suffer by the repetition of conventional language and from traditional methods of treatment." Moreover, their social and official position, their learning, their abilities, their sincerity, courage, and earnest reverential spirit, as attested by their joint publication, entitle them to an unprejudiced and considerate hearing.

Of the seven articles thus introduced, four may be classified as generally, though not absolutely, critical or negative; and three as generally, though not absolutely, affirmative or constructive. We shall endeavour, concisely, to exhibit the cardinal propositions of each contribution, beginning with the prior division.

The second Essay in the present volume, written by Dr. Rowland Williams, Vice-Principal and Professor of Hebrew, St. David's College Lampeter, and Vicar of Broad Chalke, Wilts, has for its subject Bunsen's Biblical Researches. With Bunsen Dr. Williams generally finds reason to agree, where he has been best able to follow him. With him, he appears to regard the traditions of Babylon, Assyria, &c., as confirming, yet modifying, our interpretation of Genesis. The notices of man's early history, in that book, he seemingly characterizes as half ideal, half traditional. In Bunsen's view, and we infer in that of Dr. Williams also, the deluge becomes a natural and local event; the common Biblical chronology is set aside; and a vast extension of time beyond its limits is demanded. "That there was a Bible," says the Vicar of Broad Chalke, before our Bible, "and that some of our present books, as certainly Genesis and Joshua, and perhaps Job, Jonah, and Daniel, are expanded from simpler elements, is vindicated in the book before us (Bunsen's "Divine Government in History") rather than proved, as it might be." Reminding us of the concessions of Butler, Middleton, Bishop Kidder, Archbishop Newcome, and Dr. Arnold,

¹ "Essays and Reviews." London: John W. Parker and Son. 1860.

which resolve, or tend to resolve, secular prognostication into contemporaneous history, Dr. Williams implies that David did not foretell the exile, though it is mentioned in the book of Psalms: that the book of Isaiah is not the work of one author, but is composed of elements of different eras; and that the Maiden's Child (Isa. vii. 16) was really born in the reign of Ahaz; that the mystical personage (ch. liii.) typifies the collective Israel or prophetic remnant, with a possible reference to the figure of Jeremiah, who tinged the delineation of the true Israel. Yet "in accepting frankly the belief of scholars" in these as in many other instances, neither Bunsen nor his expositor seems to "despair of Hebrew prophecy as a witness to the kingdom of God."

The third Essay was contributed by the now to be lamented Baden Powell, Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford. It deals with "the Study of the Evidences of Christianity;" announcing the order of Nature to be the dominant scientific idea of inductive philosophy, and the sole principle and criterion of proof and evidence in the region of physical and sensible truth. Testimony is described "as a second-hand assurance; a blind guide that can avail nothing against reason;" and the true acceptance of revelation is declared to be "most worthily and satisfactorily based" on the apostolic assurance of faith. To "have any evidence of a deity working miracles, we must go out of nature and beyond reason." For miracles are either resolvable into extraordinary natural facts, in which case they are no miracles at all, or they are *objects* and not evidences of faith, recognisable on religious grounds, incapable of investigation by reason, and not even amenable to its dominion. Thus it would seem that in the domain of *matter* a miracle is a fiction; in that of *spirit* it is a fact!

We come now to the Essay on "Mosaic Cosmogony," by Mr. C. W. Goodwin, the fifth in the volume. It *opposes* the conviction of geologists of all religious creeds, that "the earth has existed for an immense series of years, to be counted by millions rather than by thousands," to the teaching of the Mosaic narrative, that the world was made in six days. It complains that the *conciliators* not only unscrupulously tamper with the Hebrew Record, and in general divest the text of all meaning, but are not agreed among themselves, Miller contradicting Chalmers, and Buckland and Pratt rejecting Miller's principle of interpretation. Mr. Goodwin's own conclusion is, that the narrative in Genesis is not an authentic utterance of divine knowledge, but a human utterance which it has pleased Providence to use in a special way for the education of mankind.

The seventh Essay, on the Interpretation of Scripture, the last in the volume, is also the last of those which we have called critical. Its author, the Rev. Benjamin Jowett, Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford, regards the Bible as "the witness of God in the world, anticipating in a rude and primitive age the truth that was to be," and contends that it ought to be subjected to the same hermeneutical processes as other books. In Mr. Jowett's view, inspiration would seem *not* to be inconsistent with inaccuracies of language, nor with variations of fact, in the historical narratives, nor with the theory of an orally preserved tradition as the source of the synoptical Gospels.

Of the three more constructive Essays, two are mainly theoretical, while one has a practical bearing. In the initial article, "the Education of the World," by Dr. Temple—Chaplain in ordinary to the Queen, and head-master of Rugby School—the human race is represented as under a system of Providential instruction. The field prepared for the dissemination of Christianity included the four constituent parts made up of Rome, Greece, Asia, and Judæa. Judæa disciplined the conscience; Rome the will; Greece the reason and taste; Asia the spiritual imagination. With European barbarism Judaism revived, in the Papal system of the Middle Ages. The Reformation succeeded with its lesson of toleration. Christendom then learned to find her standpoint in the Bible, the study of which, concludes Dr. Temple, is the immediate work of the day. Should that study lead to a rejection of the literal sense of the first chapters of Genesis, or to the conviction that there are inaccuracies and even interpolations and forgeries in the Bible, the author of this paper maintains that the substance of its teaching "will not really be affected by anything of this sort."

The sixth Essay in this volume, by Rev. Mark Pattison, is entitled "Tendencies of Religious Thought in England." It is a masterly production. Asserting that there is a law of continuity in the progress of history, its author counsels us not to neglect those immediate agencies which had their origin towards the beginning of the eighteenth century—namely, 1. Toleration; 2. Methodist and Evangelical Pietism; and 3. Rationalism. Rationalism is treated here as the mode of thinking common to *all* minds in this period. In the Deistical controversy, Mr. Pattison inclines to think the defence about as good as the attack, while characterizing its results—that "it is safer to believe in a God, lest, if there should happen to be one, he might send us to hell for denying his existence"—as a *reductio ad absurdum* of common-sense philosophy. The Evidential school succeeded, he thinks, in vindicating the ethical, but failed in establishing the supernatural and speculative part of Christianity; thus "enriching the history of doctrine with a complete refutation of that method as an instrument of theological investigation." Finally, Mr. Pattison concludes that *evidences* do not constitute theology, theology being, first, the speculative habit which transports the mind into another world; and, secondly, an ethical principle regulative of our conduct in this world.

In a similar spirit, the Rev. Henry Bristow Wilson, in his Essay on "The National Church," founded upon a notice of one of the *Séances Historiques de Genève*, defines the true Christian life to be the consciousness of bearing a part in a great moral order of which the highest agency upon earth has been committed to the Church. Wishing to make the English communion thoroughly catholic and comprehensive, he would remove theological restrictions and artificial discouragements. To promote this policy Mr. Wilson advises a rational application of ideology to the interpretation of Scripture, the doctrines of Christianity, and the Anglican formularies; and an enactment which, while leaving the Thirty-nine Articles as the ultimate law of the Church, not to be contradicted, should at once extend and confine relaxation—for the present at least—to the abolition of clerical subscription; the so-called *Na-*

tionality of the Church would thereby be emancipated, and a portion of the real property of the country would be enabled to circulate freely, unencumbered by family provisions at each succession, in requital for certain performances.

This brief notice will afford some idea of the Vicar of Great Staughton's practical application of the general principle advocated in this thoughtful and fearless volume of "Essays and Reviews."

It is seldom that we have to recommend so sterling a work as the Rev. John Cunningham's "Church History of Scotland."² And the higher praise is due to the author of a singularly impartial ecclesiastical history, because the numerical smallness of the communion of the Church of Scotland, and the extreme ecclesiastical views which have generally characterized its more eminent members since the Reformation, would naturally lead us to anticipate some narrowness of treatment. And after a careful perusal of these volumes, we can say that the author shows himself to have succeeded eminently in his endeavour "to purge his heart of all leaven of polemical and party hatred, and to follow faithfully both truth and charity." The principles of ecclesiasticism may in some respects be studied with especial advantage in the Church History of Scotland, just as the workings of a political constitution may be better observed in a History of Athens or of Florence than in that of a large empire. And as the very same principles are found to be in conflict and in supremacy or depression in large and small States, so there is seen a like struggle for spiritual supremacy in the Geneva of Calvin and Beza, in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and in Papal Christendom. Many causes have contributed to develop in the north of this island a claim to supremacy on the part of the Church as exclusive and excessive as that of Rome itself. Before the Reformation the power of the Scottish Church was at many times comparatively great, because of the feebleness of the monarchy. The theory of Calvin as to Church and State was adopted by the Scottish Reformers, and all but carried out with the same severity as it was by Calvin himself at Geneva. More recently the national feeling of the Scotch has been inclined to indemnify itself for the merging of the separate existence of their nation in the realm of Great Britain, by continuing to maintain that their ecclesiastical courts are subject to no supremacy in things spiritual—themselves being judges what things touch spirituals. The same claim of exemption from the jurisdiction of the civil courts is advanced by the sects which have separated from the Kirk as by the Kirk itself. As this principle is seen to be operating in the most interesting periods of the history, there is imparted a dramatic unity and interest to the narrative, which is scarcely to be found in any other ecclesiastical history, and to which Mr. Cunningham has given effect in a masterly manner. At the same time in depicting the most exciting scenes and in presenting the most agitating controversies, he never loses his calmness or his impartiality. It is a work

² "The Church History of Scotland, from the Commencement of the Christian Era to the present Century." By the Rev. John Cunningham, Minister of Crieff. 2 vols. Edinburgh: A. and C. Black. 1859.

which will take a first rank and is calculated to do infinite good in ecclesiastical circles, both Episcopalian and Presbyterian, from its truly impartial and unsectarian character.

It is impossible to follow the author even in the most imperfect sketch through a range from the earliest planting of Christianity in the island, and the controversy respecting the Culdees, to the death of Dr. Andrew Thomson, in 1831, when he reverently closes, "as approaching the region of living men where character is sacred and passion is strong." We shall probably best do such justice to Mr. Cunningham as our limits permit by subjoining his estimate of the character of Knox.

"Knox was not perfect, as no man is. He was coarse, fierce, dictatorial; but he had great redeeming qualities—qualities which are seldom found in such stormy, changeful periods as that in which he lived. He was consistent, sincere, unselfish. From first to last he pursued the same straight, unswerving course, turning neither to the right hand nor to the left; firm amidst continual vicissitudes; and if he could have burned and disembowelled unhappy Papists, he would have done it with the fullest conviction that he was doing God service. He hated Popery with a perfect hatred; and regarding Mary and her mother as its chief personations in the land, he followed them through life with a rancour which was all the more deadly because it was rooted in religion. He was, perhaps, fond of power and popularity, but he gained them by no mean compliances. On a question of principle he would quarrel with the highest, and having quarrelled, he would not hesitate to vilify them to their face. His hands were clean of bribes. He did not grow rich by the spoils of the Reformation. He was content to live and die the minister of St. Giles'. Is not such an one, rough and bearish though he be, more to be venerated than the supple, time-serving Churchmen who were the tools of the English Reformation? Does he not stand out in pleasing relief from the grasping barons with whom he was associated, who hated monks because they coveted their corn-fields, and afterwards disgraced the religion they professed by their feuds, their conspiracies, and cold-blooded assassinations?"
—p. 407.

In Messrs. Clark's Theological Series, we have this quarter to notice a translation of another work of Professor Kurtz, his "Church History to the Period of the Reformation."³ It is comprised in a single volume and will prove as generally acceptable, and to our minds more really valuable than any work comprised in the three issues—excepting always Neander's Church History and Gieseler's incomparable compendium.

"Hours with the Evangelists,"⁴ is a very respectable attempt to vindicate the miraculous histories of the New Testament, from a point of view like that of the old Socinians, or that of Professor Norton. Dr. Nichols considers that most of the attempts to disturb the "admitted" authorship of the Gospels have arisen from incredulity as to

³ "History of the Christian Church to the Reformation," from the German of Professor Kurtz. With emendations and additions, by the Rev. Alfred Ederstein, Ph. D., Author of "History of the Jewish Nation." Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1860.

⁴ "Hours with the Evangelists." By I. Nichols, D.D. In 2 vols. Boston: Crosby and Nichols. 1860.

the miracles recorded in them. And he thinks he can establish the genuineness of the Gospels through the authority of St. Paul—that is, through the reference which he makes in 1 Cor. xv. to the fact of the Resurrection of Jesus and of His appearance to Cephas and the rest. (p. 125.) Yet it has often been noticed that St. Paul draws no distinction between the appearance to himself on the road to Damascus and those which he had heard of to the other Apostles. There is nothing to show that the appearances to them were not of the same visionary or unsubstantial character as that to himself, and the whole of the reference to the Resurrection of Jesus in 1 Cor. xv., implies no more than a belief on the part of St. Paul of the resurrection, glorification, and heavenly life of Jesus—describes or vouches for nothing as to the manner of it, and is incapable of identification with the history of the Resurrection, of the appearances of the Forty Days, and of the visible Ascension, as given in Luke xxiv. and Acts i. St. Paul, as Dr. Nichols himself observes justly, was not a witness at first hand, and “felt no special responsibility” as to the early history of the religion. He took the story from those sources which were open to all, in fact as he found it. And there is no evidence to show that he found it in the state in which we now have it in the Gospels—every reason to think from such allusions as he has made to it, that he found the tradition respecting the person and wonderful life of Jesus much less circumstantial than it afterwards became. At all events Dr. Nichols’ argument is pervaded by this fallacy. St. Paul refers to a Resurrection of Jesus, therefore it must be the same in all particulars as that described by the Evangelists; therefore the Gospels are genuine books and their authors eye and ear witnesses; therefore, *all* the miraculous particulars which they relate must be true. Looking at the question of the New Testament miracles in a more abstract way, Dr. Nichols thinks that they are instances of the interrupting or superseding of the operation of one law by the operation of another. Examples are familiar to us in nature of the counteracting of one law by another—as for instance the action of the law of gravitation may be overpowered by the law of capillary attraction, as in the tubes of plants. And he says,—

“If it display the wisdom of the Creator, that a capillary attraction has been provided in the vascular system of the vegetable to invert, for the benefit of that vegetable, the course which water would regularly pursue, I can see no conflicting and contrary arrangements if the laws of health and life were arrested in the great providence of Christianity, for the purpose of nourishing the plant whose leaves are for the healing of the nations.”—p. 152.

This may be poetry, but appears to us neither logic, nor philosophy, nor theology, and we cannot think very highly of the critical faculty which can be satisfied with such an imaginary parallel as this between the combined action of different physical laws in order to the sustentation and growth of a plant, and the supposed suspension of all known physical laws in the case of some of the Christian miracles in order to the growth of a metaphorical Balm of Gilead.

Mr. Gilfillan’s “Scripture Studies”⁵ consist of an expository descrip-

⁵ “Alpha and Omega; or, a Series of Scripture Studies.” By George Gilfillan, Minister of the Gospel, Dundee. London: A. Hall, Virtue, and Co. 1860.

tion of the principal scenes depicted in Holy Writ, interpreted in the light of the doctrines usually deduced from them by the thoroughly evangelical school. There is no acrimoniousness of controversy in the book, and up to a certain point there is an apparent candour of discussion; but when the prosecution of discussion might lead to some conclusion at variance with the Evangelical creed, questions are shut up in the "infallible authority of the Word of God," and with a reminder of the profaneness of intruding into mysteries which have not been revealed. Thus, with respect to the Flood of Noah, which Mr. Gilfillan considers to have covered the whole globe, he says, not without a mixture of quaint and self-satisfied simplicity:—

"In reference to the geological and Genesis difficulties, we have some theories probable, although none absolutely certain; but the flood of Noah seems to disdain all scientific sounding, and to wrap itself up in inscrutable darkness. No distinct traces of it are found in nature, since the shells and animal remains which used to be thought its relics are now discovered to belong to a far more ancient period than that of the Noachitic Deluge. The flood, indeed, was a transient event, and by some, although not perhaps by the majority, is thought to have been not a violent convulsion, but a quiet uprise of waters, producing no marked changes either on the surface or the interior of the earth. Still it is curious, supposing large cities to have perished by it, that there are no human bones found in any part of the globe which can be traced to the destructive agency of the flood, although it is possible that these may have been swept away by the reflux of the waves, and are now reposing in the depths of the ocean. On the whole, a great weight of mystery rests upon this story of the deep waters; and till the veil be raised, and the true explication arrive, we must just be content to look to it, as to some other parts of the Scripture narrative, such as the ten plagues of Egypt, Balaam's ass, and Jonah's whale, through the light of a strong and loyal faith."—Vol. i. pp. 293, 294.

Mr. Gilfillan and those who with him call in the aid of a "strong and loyal faith" to supersede the necessity of solving such difficulties do not perceive, we think, the complications which the miraculous theory involves. It is not an interference analogous to a creative fiat which will answer their purpose. It is not a single touch which will set the machine to rights. The miracle to create water enough for the deluge is not sufficient. Another miracle is required to take it away: another, as Mr. Gilfillan seems to apprehend, to remove the bones of men and traces of former human inhabitancy of the earth: moreover, a miracle, to counteract throughout the heavens the astronomical derangements from the addition of bulk to the earth and its environment; and another miracle, to readjust the balance of the heavenly bodies when the body of water was miraculously removed and annihilated. And we are sure that if the terms of many of the Biblical miracles are clearly stated, the contradiction in terms will be found as glaring as that two and two make four. Bodies, for instance, cannot be gravitating and non-gravitating at one and the same time. The waters of the Deluge cannot be conceived of as gravitating relatively to the earth's centre so as to envelope the globe, and non-gravitating relatively to the sun and moon, so as to obey no tidal laws. And in the interest of a rational explication of the supernatural narratives in the

Bible, a much more sure result, though more tedious, will be arrived at by an examination of the miraculous accounts in detail, by way of analysing them into their necessary assumptions which will be found self-contradictory, than in *a priori* arguments about the competency of the Deity to work miracles, or in debates as to the definition of the word miracle itself.

The purpose of Mr. Sargent in his "Critical Compendium"⁶ is to supply the means of relieving the Hebrew and Greek Texts of the Bible from their present state of embarrassment, with a special view to the improvement of our own Authorised Version. For the most part Mr. Sargent executes his undertaking with the impartiality and singleness of purpose which becomes the critic. Occasionally he deviates into the province of the expositor. He is more than sufficiently conservative, as will be evident from his very gentle dealing with the famous interpolation, 1 John, v. 7:—

"The much litigated passage," he says, "of the three heavenly witnesses, which received the sanction of Mill, Wetstein, Ernesti, Bengel, Drs. Hall and Macknight, together with Bishop Middleton, so far as it is dependent on the rendering of the Greek article, and was so energetically defended and maintained by the late Bishop Burgess, has been since adjudicated by the law of evidence on the side of Porson, Bishop Marsh, Dean [Bishop] Turton, Mr. Horne, and Bloomfield, to be a Latin gloss. The only Greek MS. of repute [repute?] in its favour is the Codex Montfortianus, of Trinity College, Dublin, to which the date of the fifteenth century is assigned. From the strength, however, of its internal testimony and antithetical contrast with the earthly witnesses, it ought not peremptorily to be discarded, but may still be allowed to form a part either of the bracketed text, or a marginal comment."—p. 386.

Not unduly conservative is the "History of the Creation and the Patriarchs,"⁷ of which the first volume is before us, nor indeed unduly destructive, but somewhat hasty both in tone and matter. The author designs to counteract that superstitious veneration for the Biblical writings which regards them as literally infallible—an undertaking by no means superfluous. But it is hasty to say of Protestantism that having repudiated the infallible authority of the Pope, it has "thrown itself into the arms of an infallible Hebrew Pontiff." For though many Protestants attribute an infallibility to the words of Scripture, Protestantism, as a principle, implies freedom of criticism, of interpretation, of judgment, in all points, as to the value of the Scripture and its several parts. Nor do the formal declarations of the principal Protestant Churches in their Confessions attribute to the Scripture that literal infallibility which the less enlightened among their members maintain, and which holds out an easy victory to the assailant. The many really shrewd suggestions which we meet with in the present volume as to the probable mode in which the mythical and legendary portions of the Book of Genesis took their actual form,

⁶ "A Compendium of Biblical Criticism on the Canonical Books of the Holy Scriptures." By Frederick Sargent. London: Longman and Co. 1860.

⁷ "A History of the Creation and the Patriarchs; or, Pentateuchism analytically treated." Volume First. The Book of Genesis. London: George Manwaring. 1860.

would have been at least equally valuable without the addition of commonplaces about "designing priesthoods" and "pious frauds." That there are traces of priestly craft in portions of the Pentateuch we fully admit, but the bulk of it is of spontaneous growth. That the principle of pious fraud is not extinct in our own day we are most fully persuaded; but it is a very unfortunate instance which our author produces of the ill-faith of the translators of the English Bible in 1611. It becomes his "duty to demonstrate" a "spurious interpolation" in the authorized translation of John viii. 59, where "a pious fraud is committed." Referring to Bagster's "English Hexapla," he shows that according to the translations of Wickliff (1380), Tyndale (1534), Cranmer (1539), Geneva (1557), Rheims [Romish] (1582), the verse would run thus, "Then took they up stones to cast at him: but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the Temple;" and he attributes the addition by the translators of 1611 of the words "*going through the midst of them, and so passed by,*" to a wilful falsification, for the purpose of exhibiting in the person of the Son of Man another miracle in addition to the many recorded of him in the Gospels. Whether the additional words imply of necessity a miraculous passing through may well be doubted, but the unfortunate thing is, that so far from interpolating, the translators were only doing their duty in rendering what they found in the best Greek original of their day, although it had not been rendered in the Vulgate and the English versions more immediately founded upon it. The clause itself may be spurious, or at least doubtful, and it is not in the Vatican MS., but there is so much at least to be said for it that it is retained by Scholz, and given in the very text which stands at the head of the English versions in the Hexapla. So that we are almost driven to think our Biblical critic ventured to say, "Now the Greek original does not make mention of any such miracle," either without casting his eye to the top of the page he was consulting, or without being qualified to read the Greek which is there printed. The translators of 1611 undoubtedly committed many faults, but they accomplished for their day a version superior to any European vernacular, and are not to be blamed if things known to be errors by us are now continued, which were not known to be errors by them. And nothing can be more puerile than the conclusion that the insertion of a (supposed) spurious passage in the English version "justifies the assertion that the introduction of similar passages in the original Scriptures are not unfrequent." The recoil from ill-founded criticism and inconclusive argument is very damaging to the cause of religious reform. In the same interest it is also our duty to point out, that such an offensive and inaccurate statement as the following should have been avoided—"From the *profundity of ignorance which distinguishes, and has always distinguished, the Hebrew people, the master-mind of Moses stands out in bold relief*" (p. 12); and we hope the author will bear in mind in the sequel of his work, that to say things irritating to the feelings, whether of Jew or of Evangelical Christian, is the most effectual bar to their enlightenment.

Entirely free from all which can reasonably be considered offensive

to the prejudices of others, and composed throughout in a sincerely religious and thoroughly earnest spirit, are Mr. Perfitt's "Discourses on Practical Religion."⁸ He mentions in his preface that he has experienced some petty opposition as a lecturer from the clerical third-rates of Chelsea: he has only been strengthened by it in good designs without being embittered. Though compelled to repudiate the popular teaching, he can acknowledge that vital truths concerning God and Man, Good and Evil lie at the root of it overlaid: and he can honour the great men through whose impulse it still has currency. Reason and the moral instinct forbid us to suppose that a Luther, a Bunyan, a Wesley, could have been consciously dishonest, or that what they taught could have been utterly devoid of truth. Yet Mr. Perfitt can deal courageously with the machinery of existing Churches, as in his Discourse on the "Saving of the Soul." We heartily wish the author success in his undertakings.

There are some curious points touched upon in Mr. Heywood's paper on Biblical Revision.⁹ The main part of the profits of the presses of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge is derived from the printing of Bibles. It is very strange that at Cambridge the whole yearly profits of the press amounted in 1856 to no more than 895*l.* 0*s.* 5*d.*, but at Oxford the revenue from printing Bibles and Prayer-Books was estimated by the commissioners at no less than 8000*l.* a year. The cheapness of the Bibles supplied by these privileged printers would probably not be surpassed if the trade in them were open to competition. But there is one element in that cheapness which, if the paper duty is *not* to be repealed, it is most unfair and altogether unnecessary to continue to the Universities as part of their privileges—that is, the drawback of 1½*d.* per lb. on the paper used by them in printing the Bibles. Among other subjects referred to by Mr. Heywood in connexion with revision of the English version is one which cannot be too frequently brought before the Bible-reading public—namely, that the headings of the chapters have not only no basis in the original, but have been subject to continual alterations in the English version without authority. They partake of the nature of a commentary, and are most objectionable.

There is another subject which cannot be too frequently ventilated, so long as it is done at once forcibly and temperately—that of a reformation or reconstruction of the Liturgy.¹⁰ This is essentially a question for the laity. The services of a National Church will, perhaps, long contribute to form the religious tastes and opinions of multitudes. And there is no parent who is not deeply concerned that the religious impressions received by his children at church should be those

⁸ "Practical Religion contrasted with Theological Theories." Discourses by Philip William Perfitt. London: George Manwaring. 1860.

⁹ "State of Authorised Biblical Revision, with references to recent Parliamentary Papers." By James Heywood, F.R.S., B.A., Trinity College, Cambridge. Read before the Anglo-Biblical Institute, 3rd January, 1860. London: E. T. Whitfield. 1860.

¹⁰ "The Liturgy and the Laity." By Edward Shirley Kennedy, A.B., Cantab. London: Hatchard. 1860.

which he would himself approve; and that the services provided by the nation should not be such as to instil misconceptions of the Divine Being, or be likely to alienate from religious worship altogether. The objections to the Church of England service, as it now stands, are classed by Mr. Kennedy under the heads of—1. Obscurities; 2. Contradictions; 3. Inconsistencies; 4. Repetitions; 5. Disbelief; 6. Example. There is a great deal in the pamphlet deserving the attention both of influential Churchmen and of public men. "The Prayer-book in its present form," Mr. Kennedy concludes, "is the cause of carelessness and insincerity in the observance of religious ordinances, and of consequent faithlessness and deception in the ordinary transactions of civil life,—thus checking the growth of genuine Christianity, and inducing a low tone of public morality."—(p. 36.)

In much better taste, more intelligible, and really much more to the point than other works on the same controversy is Dr. Young's "Criticism on the Bampton Lecture for 1858."¹¹ He shows that the whole war is carried on in a region of shadowy abstractions, points out the futility of treating the Absolute, the Infinite, &c., as if they were *things*, wherein we apprehend Mr. Mansel would entirely concur with him, and, which is more to his purpose, especially notes the confusion which has arisen to the lecturer from considering these abstractions as equivalent to the Absolute and Infinite Being—God. It follows hence that it is impossible for the lecturer, if he has succeeded in the destructive portion of his undertaking, to succeed also in his orthodox reconstruction. If the Infinite, and all which belongs to it, is not an object of human thought, Dr. Young shows forcibly some of the applications of the doctrine which the Christian apologist—of whatever school—would find very distasteful.

"There is a doctrine, very venerable by antiquity, and as having been devoutly held, as being held at this moment by myriads of the human race—the doctrine of *The All*—no individual, personal God, but *The All*—one immanent life for ever and ever developing itself, and absorbing back into itself what it gives forth, an everlasting egress and regress, outgoing and resumption. All alleged contradictions, its adherents might maintain, have no validity. The subject does not belong to the sphere of human thought at all. It is inconceivable, and therefore the moment reason approaches it, it *can* find in it nothing but contradictions. This high transcendental method of dismissing objections would lead logically to some curious results. No Protestant, for example, could utter a word against such a dogma as transubstantiation, to name no other. The ultra Calvinists, also, to whom the lecturer seems to bear little love, and their doctrine of eternal justification and eternal reprobation, would be perfectly safe. They have only to utter the magical words—'The Infinite is not an object of human thought at all—this belongs to the region of the Unconditioned, into which you have no right to enter.' . . . —Meanwhile, so far as the Bampton Lecturer is concerned, those who have separated themselves from Christianity are completely triumphant, and have had conceded to them all that they ever contended for. They have always

¹¹ "The Province of Reason;" a Criticism of the Bampton Lecture on "The Limits of Religious Thought." By John Young, LL.D., Edin., Author of "The Christ of History," "The Mystery—Evil and Good," &c. &c. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1860.

alleged, they do now allege, that Christianity has no foundation in reason, cannot stand on the ground of reason. The lecturer simply acknowledges the fact. In his view, Christianity is *as full of as insoluble contradictions as he imagines philosophy to be*. But it does not seem to occur to him, that in such a case wisdom would teach us not to adopt the one, because it is no worse than the other, but to reject both, for the same reason."—pp. 281, 282.

It is quite inexcusable that Dr. Young should throughout his book mis-spell Mr. Mansel's name. In a note also, at p. 307, Dr. M'Cosh becomes McOsh.

Dr. M'Cormac's "Aspirations"¹² rise from a heart full of affection for human kind and full of piety to the great Author of all. Gentle, pure, and deeply religious, the thoughts here recorded will be comforting to many minds, for they are hopeful and encouraging. Though we must not despair of some such progress as he hopes for, it will be long before that union and co-operation of good influences, intellectual, and moral, political, social, and ecclesiastical, can be brought about, by which alone it can be effectually advanced. It is difficult to select from a book like the present, both on account of its form, and from its general excellence. We make room for one extract.

"It was the noble conception of Oersted and Schelling as it was of Plotinus long before them, that the Divine will was one of reason, and that the world was a thought of God. What we term nature is thus an eternal discourse on love, and truth, and every heavenly thing between man and the Divine. Tepid breezes fan the infant's cheek, pleasant perfumes salute his nostrils, the gay parterre his eyes. He is conscious, as the lower animals are conscious, but in a little he begins to discern the intent of creation and of his own soul, and straightway that sacred, that holy converse begins, which, unless interrupted by Sin, endures for ever. And thus do we commune, as in a paradise, with the Divine, in the heavenly garden which is in man's soul as in the ambient world. Viewed in this light, thought is of yet greater moment than the mutations of a world, since each thought is a reality, in short a soul. And wherever the soul feels, and is conscious of what it feels, it is conscious of everlasting life. I feel and think and love now, and therefore I shall feel, and think, and love for ever."—pp. 285, 286.

A Lecture by Professor Newman,¹³ delivered very recently at South-place Chapel, Finsbury, will attract notice. The author differs from usual opinions among liberals respecting the proper connexion of the State, as such, with religion and morals. And we must agree so far with the learned Professor as to think that if the true idea of a State could be realized, the spiritual and civil societies would so coincide, that the citizens as a Church would enforce upon the State that it should be guided by virtue in all international relations and in national legislation—while the State as a civil organization would so order itself as to place no stumbling-blocks in the way of the weak members of the spiritual or moral society. But the tendency of the Christian

¹² "Aspirations from the Inner, the Spiritual Life, aiming to reconcile Religion, Literature, Science, Art, with Faith and Hope, and Love, and Immortality." By Henry M'Cormac, M.D. London: Longmans and Co. 1860.

¹³ "The Service at South-place Chapel, Finsbury, on Sunday, May 20, 1860." Conducted by Francis W. Newman. London: G. Manwaring. 1860.

Churches, both in the smaller sects and in the larger communions, has been to substitute dogma for morality, as the basis of communion—and men will, we fear, long continue to lean for their hope of salvation upon their speculations rather than upon their virtue. The State necessarily in the end must hold itself aloof from being the teacher of a speculative creed, but in so doing runs a risk of withdrawing itself from the due moral influence which the Church should exercise upon it. The Church in its turn takes a lower and a lower tone, not only in respect of its creed—which is comparatively unessential to it, if it would but think so—but in respect of things virtuous, honest, and of good report, without the flourishing of which among its members, it is not really a spiritual society at all. It is true that we cannot make people virtuous, any more than we can make them believe in the Trinity, by Act of Parliament; but while a parliament has no right to prevent any man's reading, hearing, or seeing that which may cause him to become a pure Theist instead of a Trinitarian, it has a right to keep out of his way that which will render him a vicious man instead of a virtuous one. At least it seems strange that the law may interfere with my neighbour's exercise of a noisome trade or business, offensive to my senses or injurious to my health, but may not interfere with the plying of an immoral trade, offensive to the virtuous and corrupting to the weak. If this principle be acknowledged, there will, no doubt, be debates and even dangers attending its particular applications, and so there must always be as to practical minor premises. Fanatical persons may seek to push too far the interference, for morality's sake, of public law with individual liberty, and ecclesiasticisms may seek to infer from such intervention, the legitimacy of State action in the interest of dogmas; but it will be the part of earnest and sincere persons of whatever communion to prevent these reactions. Mr. Newman's summing up at least is as follows:—

"The claim rising from us all that the authorities, central and local, armed by the law, shall put down public solicitations to corruption, and shall thereby help us, and the weaker than some of us, to avoid ruinous vice, will never be mistaken for ecclesiastical ambition or democratic disaffection. There is therefore a real and great power resting in the churches just in proportion to their moral simplicity and earnestness—a power which they cannot innocently misuse. All that is needful is, that they shall speak from the *heart* of all good men, not from their own private *heads*, and plead with the organs of the State for that virtue on which we all agree, not for that theology on which we deeply differ. This is reasonable, for the State belongs to us in common, and no man or sect may claim to work it for private ends. This also is on the side of spiritual advancement; for the higher the morality of the nation, the better material it affords for a truly spiritual church. Oh! what a day, worth living for and worth dying for, that would be, in which all the good and pure-hearted should co-operate to abate every palpable immorality of the land. The common action would teach them a common esteem. Their unwise animosities would drop off. Cultivating simplicity of eye, they would find their whole souls full of light; and without proselytisms, controversies, or heart-burnings, a new and real reformation would be begun."—pp. 23, 24.

The "Primitive Gospel"¹⁴ is an attempt to draw out the moral

¹⁴ "L'Évangile Primitif." Par Eliakim, London: Williams and Norgate. 1860.

precepts of Jesus so as to supply a foundation for a Church of the future and an agency for the regeneration of human society. The history of the Saviour, as derived from the three first Evangelists, is exhibited as the framework on which this teaching hangs—divested, however, of the greater part of the supernatural incidents. There is prefixed a vigorous preface showing the hopeless condition into which society is sinking, both ecclesiastically and politically, for want of the guidance of the pure Gospel as Jesus delivered it :—

“La faute en est aux mensongers de la terre, aux guides de l'espèce humaine, qui, en abolissant le vrai JESUS CHRIST pour s'en créer un de fantaisie, fabuleux comme leur christianisme, ont remis sur les peuples l'enveloppe redoublée et la couverture qu'avait fait disparaître l'évangile du fils de Dieu.”
—(p. xxxiii.)

Since the year 1850, has been published at Strasbourg, the *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie Chrétienne*, as the exponent of a rational but spiritual Christianity, under the able editorship of M. Colani.¹⁵ Some sermons of his will be read with interest. We can only afford space to open the subject of one of them. Paul at Cæsarea appears before Agrippa; his parting words to him are these—“I would to God, that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost, and altogether such as I am, except these bonds.” Such words indicate a conviction so deep and energetic as to engage us in investigating what were the special objects of it. The truths of which Paul was thus visibly convinced appear upon a hasty perusal of his Epistles difficult to develop with certainty amidst a great mass of argument, illustration, and rhetorical appeal. On further investigation two points are seen to be the cardinal ones in his system—a system not of faith, so much as of knowledge and intuition. First, is the presence of God by His Spirit in fulness in Jesus of Nazareth; secondly, the presence of the same Spirit through Jesus in Paul himself and in every believer. This certitude of the Divine presence with himself is remarkably distinguished from the feeble faith mingled with doubt which is all that ordinary Christians can pretend to; and on the other hand, from enthusiasm, which is usually selfish, while Paul's spiritualism overflowed freely out of himself, and he saw in all men capable recipients of the same principle of life of which he was conscious in himself—a life begun here, to be continued unbroken in a higher sphere at the next manifestation of the Saviour. Is it possible, then, for the Christian of the present day to place himself in thought in a like position towards Jesus of Nazareth to that in which Paul stood, and if it were possible, would the same or like effects flow to him as did to St. Paul? Moreover, if the same subjective effects were to follow, what would be their value as evidence of the realities of things? Indeed this is the difficulty, to measure the inferences which may fairly be drawn from his convictions in St. Paul's own case.

English preachers are for the most part no great masters of their art, and when one of them achieves a great popularity, it is frequently

¹⁵ “Nouveaux Sermons.” Par T. Colani, Directeur de la Revue de Théologie. London: Williams and Norgate. 1860.

less due to real merit than to the successful pandering to some popular prejudice or to the exaltation of some sectarian doctrine. The French have for generations produced great orators of the pulpit. The French oratory will not precisely fit the English taste, but those who really desire to form themselves as English preachers will nevertheless do well to read M. Coquerel's "Practical Observations."¹⁶ His own eminence entitles him to speak on this subject, which he treats with unreserve, and illustrates by many anecdotes from his own personal experience.

More and Fisher¹⁷ are naturally produced by the Roman Church as eminent martyrs in its cause, and it would have been strange, indeed, if the Reformation had been altogether guiltless of blood. But there is to a certain and very important extent a misrepresentation on the part of the Romish authors when these distinguished persons are stated to have been martyrs for the [Roman] Catholic *faith*. They were, in fact, martyrs for the Papal supremacy. The virtues, learning, and dignity of Fisher were unimpeachable; and it is a grievous stain even upon Henry VIII. to have put such a man to death; yet it was the only method of coercion which would be thought of in those days. Victor Emmanuel may be able to neutralize the political claims of the Pope over his dominions by arresting an Archbishop of Pisa; Henry, under his circumstances, could hardly have maintained his supremacy if he had spared Fisher. The struggle at last took the form fatal to the bishop, upon the Pope's sending him a cardinal's hat. M. Kerker allows that the Pope's intention in so doing was to protect Fisher from the King, and to clothe him with a character which even Henry would not dare to touch. If Fisher would have declined the hat, there is no reason to think that Henry would have sought his life. But the gist of Herr Kerker's book, after all, does not lie in any new information upon the events of Fisher's life or martyrdom, or upon the relations of the Holy See to the author of the Anglican schism—as it was technically and properly called; for the repudiation of the Papal supremacy was a *schism*, not as yet a Reformation; just as a like repudiation of Papal jurisdiction by the kingdom of Piedmont would be considered by Rome to be a schism, although the Piedmontese Church might make no alteration in its doctrines. But our author thinks he has made a grand discovery in tracing the scepticism and infidelity of modern Europe to the Erastianism of the English Church and to the establishment of the royal supremacy (*Cesareopapie*) by Henry and Elizabeth—for according to him from this root sprang Thomas Hobbes, Lord Herbert, and Lord Chancellor Bacon, the fathers not only of English, but of all French and German free-thinking. (pp. 291-295.)

We cannot give any abstract of Mr. Pryce's work on Romanism,¹⁸

¹⁶ "Observations pratiques sur la Prédication." Par Athanase Coquerel, un des Pasteurs de l'Église Réformée de Paris. London: Williams and Norgate. 1860.

¹⁷ "John Fisher, der Bischof von Rochester und Martyrer für den Katholischen Glauben. Sein Leben und Wirken." Von M. Kerker, Mit einem Anhang über die Englischen Karthatser. London: D. Nutt. 1860.

¹⁸ "Is it not Written? Being the Testimony of Scripture against Romanism." By Edward S. Pryce, A.B. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1860.

which would be to review the chief points of a mighty theological controversy, but we can recommend it as a fair and perspicuous statement of the Protestant's argument from the point of view of the sufficiency of Scripture in all controversies of faith. No exception can be taken to the representations given by Mr. Pryce of the Roman tenets, which are drawn either from the acknowledged formulas of the Romish Church, or from the statements of her ablest modern controversialists, such as Dr. Wiséman.

Even the most cautious interpreters of the Bible allow that its language may receive valuable illustration from the symbols employed in Oriental worship, and from the figurative expressions current in all Oriental diction. And it may well be expected that some light may be thrown upon it by a better understanding of the significancy of the Egyptian hieroglyphics.¹⁹

Admiral Saumarez has devoted himself for many years to hieroglyphical researches for the purpose of interpreting the Biblical records upon a hieroglyphical system. With many of his general and pre-fatory observations we entirely concur, but must leave his special interpretations to the judgment of Egyptologists. We can only lay before our readers a specimen of the results at which he arrives." Gen. i. 1.

"At the first of *these events*, Elohim (the personification of Divine intelligence, the delegate of his power) organized a heaven and (*the other inhabitants of*) the earth. 2. Then (*the residents on*) the earth was without a spiritual arm, and (*his faith*) an abortion, and the Star-worship was on the feature of their confusion; and the spirit of Elohim breathed upon (*gave vitality to*) the character of the people. 3. And Elohim said there shall be (*spiritual*) light; and there was (*spiritual*) light established. 4. And Elohim saw the light that it was in harmony, and Elohim divided the light from the star-idolatry. 5. And Elohim called Divine justice a foundation under spiritual light, and the star-idolatry he called wickedness. And the evening and morning (worship) were the first (*spiritual*) light," &c., &c.

Mr. Wrightson's²⁰ unpretending treatise on Sanskrit literature will be found useful as an introduction to those who wish to acquire some knowledge of the Hindu philosophical systems. Concurrently with an account of the Sánkhyā, Vedānta, and Nyāya philosophies, it advances confutations of the chief errors which belong to them, considered from the point of view of the Christian system; and it contrasts the theory of Vedic inspiration with the claim as usually understood for the Divine inspiration of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures.

Mr. Hardy's works on Buddhism, originally published in 1850 and 1852, are now, we are glad to see, offered to the public at a most

¹⁹ "An Introductory Key to the Hieroglyphic Phraseology of the Old Testament; with numerous emendations, illustrated by an Interpretation of the First Chapters of Genesis through the medium of Egyptian Symbols, extracted from the works of the most approved authors, and supported by monumental data." By Rear-Admiral Saumarez, K. Ld. Bath: James Lewis. 1860.

²⁰ "An Introductory Treatise on Sanscrit Hagiographa: or, the Sacred Literature of the Hindus." In two Parts. Part I.—"The Philosophy of the Hindus." Part II.—"The Veda and Puranas." With Appendix and Notes. By the Rev. R. Wrightson, A.B., Perpetual Curate of Moy, &c. &c. Dublin: 1859.

moderate price.²¹ Even in the short period which has elapsed since their first appearance a rapidly increasing interest has gathered, from various causes, about all which concerns the history and present condition of our remote Indian possessions. Mr. Hardy, by long residence in Ceylon and intercourse with the Buddhist monks, qualified himself to describe the system as it now exists in that island, and in his translations from Singhalese works, his purpose has been to supply an authority on his subject rather than to obtain distinction as an author. The parallel has often been noticed between some of the observances of the Buddhists and those which prevail in the Romish Church. In one of his works Mr. Hardy draws out this parallel with great research and perseverance as to the monastic systems of the two religions. The volume in which this is done is calculated to be the more popular, not the more valuable of the two. Upon the disputed point concerning the doctrine of *Nirvāna* Mr. Hardy considers that it amounts to annihilation, and distinguishes it from the absorption of the Brahmanical creed. Indeed, with him while the Brahman is a pantheist, the Buddhist is an atheist.

In Buddhism "all sentient beings are called upon to regard the entire cessation of existence as the only means by which they can obtain a release from the evils of existence." (East. Mon. p. 300.) The sequence of existences, usually denominated transmigration, is more precisely described as follows:—

"There is no such thing as an immortal soul. Every being until Nirvāna, or extinction, is attained, necessarily produces another being, unto whom are transferred all the merit and demerit that have been accumulated during an unknown period by an endless succession of similar beings, all distinct from each other, never contemporaneous, but all bound by this singular law of production to every individual in the preceding link of the chain, so as to be liable to suffer for their crimes or be rewarded for their virtues. Yet though the effects of Karma are infallible as to the consequences they produce, they are by no means certain as to the period or person upon whom they fall. A man may be the inheritor of the foulest crimes, committed during the three or four generations of being immediately preceding; and yet, on account of some virtue performed by the being immediately preceding him in the fifth generation, he may live in happiness without a cloud to darken his prosperity during any part of his present existence, and may leave the consequences of these crimes and his own added to them, to be endured in all their bitterness by the being he himself will produce, or by some more distant being in the same series. We think that no one can deny these inferences who has had the opportunity of studying the system, although it must be confessed that the popular notion upon the subject approaches rather to transmigration as that idea is usually received."—(East. Mon. p. 340.)

²¹ "Eastern Monachism: An Account of the Origin, Laws, Discipline, Sacred Writings, Mysterious Rites, Religious Ceremonies, and present Circumstances of the Order of Mendicants founded by Gôtama Budha (compiled from Singhalese MSS. and other original sources of information); with comparative Notices of the Usages and Institutions of the Western Ascetics and a Review of the Monastic Systems." By R. Spence Hardy, Member of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. London: Williams and Norgate. 1860.

"A Manual of Buddhism in its Modern Development; translated from Singhalese MSS." By R. Spence Hardy, author of "Eastern Monachism," &c. &c. London: Williams and Norgate. 1860.

The purpose of a little book by Mr. Cronheim²² is to show that the belief in predestination has originated in misconception of the Divine eternity and of the Divine foreknowledge. Though it be impossible for the Finite to comprehend the Infinite, the author hopes to assist in removing some misconceptions of things incomprehensible in their own nature. The solution which he proposes of the difficulties connected with the philosophical and theological dogma of predestination will be best understood from an extract.

"The doctrine of predestination rests entirely on the notion that there is a *future* to the Almighty, which is the object of his foreknowledge. Now, a *future* implies a *present* and a *past*, a successive existence similar to our own in kind, surpassing it only in degree. But the Eternal had no beginning, and an eternal succession of existence in the past without a beginning being a manifest absurdity and impossibility; it follows that God's existence cannot be successive, cannot have a past, cannot have a future, but must be an abiding present. There is, therefore, neither past nor future for the Almighty. He must be omnipresent in duration as in space. His must be the 'everlasting NOW' without succession of existence; his, the ubiquitous HERE, without expansion of substance, or diffusion of essence. And his foreknowledge must cease to be future, cease to be causal, cease to involve predestination. If these views be correct, then also must cease the perplexing conflict between the doctrine of predestination, grounded on misconceptions of God's foreknowledge, and the intuitive truth of man's free agency and moral responsibility, declared alike by reason, by conscience, and by revelation."—p. 42.

The author may be thought to have solved a difficulty to religious minds connected with the word *Predestination*, but he cannot be considered to have grappled with the question itself of destiny or fatalism. For though that which is successive to us may be ever present to the Divine mind, the co-existence to that mind of events which appear to us to follow each other in time is quite consistent with a causal connexion between them, with their being *necessarily* co-existent, both to the Divine knowledge and by reason of the Divine will. Mr. Cronheim is quite right in saying that "predestination has no special relation to Christianity," but it should be added that Christianity has done nothing to solve the problem, indeed, as generally taught, has deepened the anxiety for a solution without advancing it.

M. Bautain's present work on the Philosophy of Law,²³ is founded on a course of lectures delivered at the Sorbonne. He finds insufficient the definition of Cicero and of Montesquieu, that "laws are the natural relations of things" (*Lex ratio perfecta a rerum natura*); and lays down that law is the expression of the sovereignty of one being over others—that it supposes on one side authority and command, on the other, the obligation to obey;—that it is not an abstraction, nor an idea, but an act. Law is thus a force operating from a superior and supreme source upon that which is subject to it: "dans

²² "Inquiry into the Origin of the Belief in Predestination." By F. W. Cronheim. London: Rivingtons, 1860.

²³ "Philosophie des Lois au point de vue Chrétien." Par M. L. Bautain, Ancien Vicaire-Général de Paris, Professeur à la Sorbonne, &c. London: Williams and Norgate. 1860.

son expression le plus simple, la loi est le rapport naturel du supérieur à l'inférieur."—(p. 25.) The eternal law of God is that whereby He governs the Universe which He has created; the natural law under which humanity is placed is a branch of this eternal law, and is called natural, because it enforces the obligation on man to live according to his true nature, and because its sanctions are discoverable by the natural reason of man. This reason, however, is depraved and insufficient for a guide, and the Natural Law is therefore supplemented by the Revealed. This Revealed Law is declared in the Word of God written and unwritten, and in the ordinances of the Church which speaks through the Pope, who is the vicar of God upon earth. So that this treatise, which sets forth with something of a semi-philosophical character, comes round to a defence of ultramontaniam. The Gallican liberties, as they are called, are expressly surrendered and argued against. The style of the work is lucid, and the parts of it follow each other with a concatenation which, as not unfrequently with Romish controversialist writings, is made to pass for logical sequence.

In order to deal fairly with men in their social relations, and particularly in matters of criminal jurisprudence,²⁴ the nature of man physically and psychically, must be known. There are some good observations on these subjects, particularly on some of the more obscure forms of insanity and of moral derangement in Mr. Warden's book, which is, however, somewhat too diffuse and artificial in its style.

M. de Careil has devoted himself for many years to the illustration of the life and works of Leibniz. He is the author of a brilliant notice of the great philosopher in the new issue of the *Biographie Universelle*. The edition of the works of Leibniz²⁵ upon which he is now engaged, to be completed in twenty volumes, will be enriched by a great mass of matter never before published. The twenty volumes will consist of series in—1. History and Public Economy. 2. Law and Jurisprudence. 3. Theology. 4. Philosophy. 5. Philology. 6. Correspondence. Out of the twenty volumes of which this new edition will consist, the hitherto unedited portion is estimated to occupy twelve, and the entire publication will be an inestimable contribution not only to the history of philosophy, but to the political history of the seventeenth century.

POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, AND TRAVELS.

AMONG the books and pamphlets produced by the present agitation, if agitation it can be called, on the question of Parliamentary Reform, Mr. Hare's treatise stands forward as *facile princeps*.¹ It is

²⁴ "A familiar Forensic View of Man and Law." By Robert B. Warden. Columbus. London: Sampson Low and Co. 1860.

²⁵ "Œuvres complètes de Leibniz, contenant un grand nombre de documents inédits et publiées d'après les Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Royale de Hanover." Par Le Comte Foucher de Careil. Paris: Firmin Didot. 1860.

¹ "A Treatise on the Election of Representatives, Parliamentary and Municipal." By Thomas Hare, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. London: Longman. 1859.

characterized by a philosophical breadth and scientific equanimity that at once take it out of the class of merely temporary controversy, and establish its claim to a consideration as calm as the spirit in which it is written. Although pregnant and overflowing with the most acute and well-founded criticisms on the present condition of political science and public morality, it is far from any narrowness of party-feeling, and full of the most penetrating appreciation of the good qualities which characterize the most opposing parties and opinions, and which so often blind a man to every merit beyond his own horizon. Mr. Hare not only reviews the shortcomings of our existing Representative System, but proposes a most elaborate plan by which most of the political evils, deplored on every side, shall be at once obviated and gradually eradicated and destroyed. This is no mean ambition, and Mr. Hare's proposal is no trilling suggestion that meets but a part of the evils it proposes to cure and quietly ignores the rest. We will endeavour to epitomise his plan, warning our readers, at the same time, that we must do Mr. Hare some injustice, for one of the greatest merits of his book is the patient inquiry into every suggestion that can be brought to bear against the character of his proposed reform of our electoral system, and into these full details we cannot, of course, in this place, follow him. The book consists of a "Proposal for a New Electoral Law," drawn out with the fulness of a Bill prepared to be laid before the House of Commons; each clause is incorporated in an essay, showing the need for it, the mode of its operation, and meeting such objections as may be most probably anticipated.

It is proposed that the number of electors in the kingdom should be every year ascertained by the returning officers of each constituency, who shall report the names of all to registrars to be appointed in London, Edinburgh, and Dublin, which registrars should then certify to the Speaker of the House of Commons the aggregate number of registered electors in the three kingdoms; that it should be the Speaker's duty annually to declare the *quota* or number of votes necessary for the election of any member for any place,—this he will ascertain by dividing the number of registered electors by the number of members constituting the House; thus, at any election, the quota shall be the necessary condition of the return of any member, so that supposing the electors to amount to 1,200,000, and the House to contain 600 members, no one can take his seat for whom less than 2000 electors have voted; and that more than the quota should not be used for the return of any member; that every elector shall be allowed to vote, not only for the candidates in his own borough or county, but for any and as many other candidates for other places as he pleases; placing their names on a voting paper he is to be supplied with, in the order in which he would wish them to be elected, so that should his voting-paper from any cause become useless to the first-named candidate, it may not be lost, but become applicable, in the order of his indicated predilections, to any other whose name appears on it. How great the revolution here suggested cannot fail to strike every one; but a little reflection will also show the gain to be as great. No one is any longer oppressed by a majority whose views are obnoxious to him; he can at once disfran-

chise himself at home, and assume the franchise elsewhere if a better chance of personal representation anywhere offers itself to him.

The great debate of the rights of minorities finds a facile and complete solution. Bribery and intimidation are no longer hateful or formidable, for no candidate can determine the area over which his virtual constituents are spread; no close run divisions make certain votes indispensable; no political clubs have it any longer in their power to carry the election of a hotly-contested small borough; thus with the occasion of corruption the wages of corruption must necessarily cease. The ballot, that unmanly and demoralizing device, which offers itself, like a cloak of darkness, to those whose deeds shrink from the light, is no longer needed with its offer to stand between an act and its responsibilities; the remedy offered by Mr. Hare goes far deeper, cuts to the root of the malady, and instead of offering the timid voter a tower of refuge in an unequal struggle, routs his enemy in the field and leaves the weak judgment to grow in peace.

The present geographical distribution of the constituencies of the United Kingdom is defensible only on the ground that it exists with a view to ensure the representation of interests; thus the counties balance the towns, and the inland the seaport boroughs. But the constant fluctuation of the population in times like the present, when the discovery of a new coalfield, or the establishment of a new line of ocean packets, will cause a populous town to arise where a few years before there was a desolate waste, shows how open this justification of the present distribution of constituencies is to attack from the very principles themselves which are brought forward to support it. The geographical distribution is a relic of those times when the fief was more important than the feudatory, and when the burgess was only called to determine *how much* should be paid by his fellow-citizens.

The gradual growth of the idea of personality has won many victories, and has many more to win; whether this, its attack upon so time-honoured an institution as the complete identification of every member of Parliament with some city, town, or county, will be successful without many additional efforts, is a point that may well be questioned: one thing, however, is unquestionable, that none of the reasons brought forward in defence of the geographical distribution of our constituencies can be maintained for a moment against the more complete efficiency of personal predilection. If there is any interest which ought to be represented in Parliament, the plan proposed liberates the votes of all concerned in its welfare for its exclusive support. This personal relation between the elector and his representative is of the most elevating kind; no member need any longer consider with trembling the effect of his votes upon some petty local prejudice, none with a national interest at heart need pander to Little Pedlington on the one hand; and no one on the other is restricted in his choice to the determination of which of two claimants of his vote is least divergent from the views he would wish to see advocated. Another most desirable result is the destruction of that obnoxious tendency, which has too much prevailed of late, to look upon the local member as a delegate rather than as a representative; a tendency that can only

result in a gradual lowering of the character of those who offer themselves as representatives, by disgusting all who are conscious of high motive and who feel themselves superior to the petty and temporary outcries which generally prompt the interferences of constituencies with the free action of their representatives. These are a few of the advantages offered by the substitution of a personal for a local constituency. A system which ensures the return of every political or social notability, that gives a just chance to eminence of every kind, that shuts the door to no legitimate aspirant, has roots in the fitness of things that are not easily torn up. What project can be imagined richer in result, and, at first sight, what plan seems simpler in its execution? But this simplicity, at first sight so fascinating, soon loses its attractiveness when the proposal is pursued into the minute machinery of its execution. It cannot have escaped the reader's observation that when the surplus votes of the most popular candidates have to be distributed among the second, third, and other names associated with them in the voting papers, questions of the utmost difficulty must arise, which, though simply arithmetical ones, yet supply problems which tax the highest ingenuity, and are not soluble without some arbitrary rules. This is the weak point in Mr. Hare's armour, and he has addressed himself to the difficulty with a fulness of consideration and facility of resource that will surprise every one—we wish we could say, will also convince and satisfy. Some of his difficulties arise from his merely partially discarding the local element, and from his allowing the local electors to have not only their weight, but also a priority in the completion of the member's quota or number of votes necessary to his return; this he does from a very just appreciation of the often elevating and desirable ties which connect a local magnate with a neighbouring constituency, and is one of the instances in which Mr. Hare shows himself loftily superior to many a popular advocate. A liberal of the most advanced description, he is in the farthest possible degree removed from anything approaching the demagogue; he supports his views throughout by the concurrent opinions of the first political thinkers, and points his strongest arrows of argument with citations from Burke, Guizot, or Calhoun.

We have only been able to touch upon the cardinal points of this original and suggestive project, but the fullest detail of the modes of election, the expense of ascertaining the quota, the cost of polling-places, the filling up of vacancies during the session of Parliament, and the course to be adopted on members taking office, with many other incidental questions, receive the fullest consideration, and are provided for with the most remarkable care and forethought.

This book has already been recommended to the public by the greatest scientific politician of the time, and has been epitomised and brought into a convenient focus by Mr. Fawcett,³ who has carefully gone over the various sections of the Bill now before the open Parliament of the nation, and who invites suggestions, with Mr. Hare's

³ "Mr. Hare's Reform Bill Simplified and Explained." By Henry Fawcett, Esq., Fellow of Trin. Hall, Cambridge. London: Ridgway, Piccadilly. 1860.

approval, by which it may be rendered more accessible to the narrower Parliament of St. Stephens.

To all Volunteers who wish to know what their fathers thought about the French Expedition to Bantry Bay, the descent on Fishguard, and the camp at Boulogne, what steps they took, and what face they set against the anticipated invasion, the "Perils and Panics of Invasion," by Mr. Blunt,³ will be a welcome compilation. The book is made up of extracts from Alison, the "Annual Register," and other equally recondite sources. It is difficult, even while we are threatened by a similar one, to refrain from smiling at the post-prandial style in which the panics of 1796 and 1804 are recounted by Mr. Blunt; we cannot help fancying that he must have been one of those Queen's Royal Volunteers whose march to Ranelagh to receive their colours at the hands of the Countess of Harrington, he thinks worthy of such a full description. The book, however, contains several amusing pictures of England fifty-five years since, and the confidence displayed by the author, in spite of military diffidences, in the efficiency of our rifle corps, is at any rate the right animus, and one not a little encouraged by the success of Garibaldi's volunteers, whether fighting in the north against Austria or in the south against Naples, but in both places against armies of high reputation for disciplinary efficiency.

Count Mamiani's "Rights of Nations,"⁴ is a defence of the almost universal protest against the *dicta* of the Holy Alliance, and a vindication of contemporary opinion against the last authoritative statements of international jurists. The new law to which he appeals is the principle of non-intervention, a principle of very recent birth, and which may be looked upon as the assertion of national individuality, and as an appeal to those notions of right and justice which have at last become sufficiently general to have acquired a weight that gives them an appreciable influence in the formation of public opinion, and through that opinion on the direction of public force. The necessity of self-preservation first brings men together in societies, and the nature of the bond which at first connects them is not more binding than the necessity from which it took its rise. The influence of the locality in which these first societies originated gave birth in the course of time to the idea of a common nationality. In satisfying this first need of mankind, co-operation is found to offer the means of attaining every other desire, and with the means in view the desires grow until they work out their own accomplishment. It is with States as it is with man; at first everything is sacrificed to the nutritive and assimilative functions, but these primary needs once satisfied, those functions themselves have built up a stage on which nothing but the action of the higher phenomena of life can be henceforward allowed.

These higher phenomena of national life are unquestionably the ideas

³ "Perils and Panics of Invasion in 1796-7, 1804-5, and at the Present Time." By H. Blunt: London: Newby. 1860.

⁴ "Rights of Nations; or, the New Law of European States applied to the Affairs of Italy." By Count Mamiani, Minister of Public Instruction in the kingdom of Sardinia. Translated from the Italian, and edited, with the author's additions and corrections, by Roger Acton. London: W. Jeffs. 1860.

of right and justice. Count Mamiani, however, seems to forget that they are born of parents less noble than themselves—that they are the direct lineal descendants of wrong and oppression—that only in flying from things dreaded and intolerable do we ultimately discover the longed-for, rather than the promised, land of mutual rights and undisturbed development. Right and justice are appealed to by many people as though they were the inhabitants of heaven, and might be allured to the earth by the earnestness of their adjurations. As well might they expect the rose to descend upon its stalk, or the lily to arrive on earth borne in an angel's hand. Absolute right has never yet appeared on earth; through periods of the world's history, the countries in which it has most prevailed have always lent a local colour to its attractiveness, that at another time and in other places has frequently disguised it from men's sight.

We approached the truth by slow degrees, and Count Mamiani calls upon us to chronicle the advance we have made in international justice. It would be well that his call were answered, for the most overwhelming physical power at present existing is appealing for support to the most wide-spread aspiration of the time; French legions offer themselves again as the right-hand of universal suffrage, and Europe will have to determine whether it will again submit to the sword of that idea passing blood-reeking through its nations, or by a timely resolution and common consent in insisting on the principle of non-intervention, put a stop to the progress of that Corsican Vendetta with which it is threatened.

Dr. Guthrie's "Seed Time and Harvest of Ragged Schools"⁵ is a very pardonable piece of triumph at the success of an unquestionably benevolent undertaking, and gives a very full history of the progress of the Ragged Schools in Edinburgh since their first establishment there by him in 1847. His very natural exultation partakes somewhat too much of a personal character, and the stories he tells in the course of his book of picturesque distress are so dressed up in a style of florid ornament, that we are quite ready to pardon the Scotch lady who asked him whether he invented them himself. We are very far from sharing her suspicions, but the Doctor's jewels take so much of their attractiveness from a setting unquestionably his own, that the suspicion might very naturally arise in an uncritical mind. The Doctor's pleas open and abound with descriptions of the neighbourhood of the Modern Athens, and that general glorification of the northern capital which so amusingly characterizes the outpourings of every patriotic Scot, and seems to be a sort of toll that every one publishing a book in Edinburgh must of necessity pay to the genius loci. While he attributes the destitution and misery of almost every one of his scholars to the intemperate habits of their parents, the same local feeling forces him constantly to demur to the assertion that the vice in question is more prevalent in the North than elsewhere, and in the face of his own facts to shut his

⁵ "Seed Time and Harvest of Ragged Schools; or, a Third Plea, with New Editions of the First and Second Pleas." By Thomas Guthrie, D.D. Edinburgh: A. & C. Black. 1860.

eyes to the inevitable conclusion to be drawn from them. But whatever may have been, or may still be, at the root of that destitution he so well describes, there can be but little doubt that the schools have been of the greatest use to the pauper population of Edinburgh. It is with a very natural and pardonable self-deception that those who give themselves up to such labours as the Doctor's seize upon any good result, and pass over failures and shortcomings. The fact, however, of a most decided decrease in the returns of juvenile offences speaks, in spite of the fallaciousness of figures, of an effect produced that cannot be other than rejoiced in. These Ragged Schools are much to be preferred to the Reformatories of which we hear more in the South; that all the advantages of house, clothing, and education, should be approached through the police-court with greater facility than by any other means, revolts our sense of justice, and must lie at the root of those complaints we often hear that the favourite pupils are more frequently the astute and cunning, than the high-spirited and less selfish boys who are with more difficulty rendered amenable to control.

The book has a portrait facing the title of a most unpromising subject, which the Doctor calls "the Soil," and is from a photograph "of a boy on entering the school, now a respectable tradesman." We hope he has improved in appearance as much as in character and attainments, or it would be the height of cruelty thus to introduce him to the public.

Few persons are aware of the extent to which the sentences passed upon our criminals are modified by the executive in carrying them out. The whole subject of punishment is surrounded with difficulties; the conflicting theories which look upon it as either retributive, minative, or ameliorative, can never be brought to agree in any system that shall not be open to some exception. Few are now-a-days prepared to carry out the first conception; we are now ready to attribute vengeance to whom vengeance is due, and shrink from wielding that ancient sword too heavy for our hands. The second theory on which punishment depends for its authority is drawn from the fact that he who has injured one has threatened all, and may be seized upon by those he has threatened, and used as a warning to his brothers; that he may be nailed to a social barn-door *in terrorem*. Even in capital punishments the human vermin cannot be left like jays and weasels to rot in the open air, and gibbets and chains are no longer supportable. In secondary punishments, after the sentence has once been passed in public, the minatory element seems to be exhausted, and the prisoner, once in the hands of justice, must be treated either from the old rejected principle of retribution, or from the new and hardly yet fully-accepted one of reformation. The first requisite of any system of reform is a means of working on the wills of those to be reformed, and this, among prisoners, can only be extracted from a modification of their imprisonment either in its severity or its duration; in other words, by an interference with the full incidence of the penalty the convict has incurred. This at first sight seems a dangerous power to leave in the hands of the administrators of our prisons; but although much has been said against the exercise of a discretion of this kind,

much may also be said in vindication of it. At the very outset it is manifest that among six convicts who have fallen under the same technical classification of crime, there may, and indeed most probably will be, as many different degrees of culpability; that each case will present to those who have time for the examination, and whose duty it may be made to examine it, a different opening to influences of a reformatory character; that it would be the highest wrong to ignore, from any pedantic desire to carry out an external system which, under pretence of equal justice to all, would in effect confound degrees of guilt which, although they cannot be allowed for in courts that give no effect to extenuating circumstances, are yet very distinct and undeniable. The operation of our present system has recently been made the subject of a very able report by a German publicist of considerable reputation, Baron von Holtzendorf, who last year published in Berlin a brochure on the Irish Convict System, which has now been translated,⁶ and gives a very full and clear account of the methods pursued in the prisons of the United Kingdom; for the peculiar feature of the Irish intermediate prisons arises only from this, that the Government itself is obliged to provide those refuges and reformatories which in England are ready to its hands from the exertions of private individuals, and which offer a kind of purgatory in which the last stains of criminality may be wiped off before the prisoner's return to society. The effect produced by the examination of our system on the mind of a very competent authority may be best judged of by the following words, with which the essay closes:—

“Making allowances for deficiencies in details, and admitting that the system is still susceptible of improvement, it must, nevertheless, be confessed the Irish method of treating convicts, at the same time that it satisfies the indispensable and never-to-be-forgotten claims of justice, by means of the punishment it inflicts, leads the criminal through a series of gradations to the great object which we have in view—the reasonable use of liberty on his discharge.

“Whether we consider the union of those different stages of cellular imprisonment, of compulsory labour association, and intermediate establishments, as one combined system of punishment, or as a gradual diminution of its pressure, in neither case can it be regarded as contradictory, or opposed to the existence of real punishment, or inconsistent with the ends for which it is inflicted; a fact which is universal in the history of penal repression, and which constantly reappears in the development of criminal legislation, is found equally to apply in carrying out the system of coercion to which each individual criminal is subjected. The history of the penal code of every nation shows that forms of punishment seek a milder appearance in proportion to the progress of civilization, and that the increasing development of general morality in a nation brings with it ideas of what is right in itself, and the means by which that right may be reduced to practice.

“The period of time which elapses between the commencement and end of the imprisonment contains the history of the moral cultivation of each indi-

⁶ “The Irish Convict System, more especially Intermediate Prisons.” By Baron Franz von Holtzendorf, Doctor of Law, and Professor in the University of Berlin. Translated from the German. Dublin: W. B. Kelly. London: Simpkin & Marshall. 1850.

vidual criminal subjected to its influence. If we admit it to be true, that in the present time also there is a general progress towards improvement in the condition of the individual undergoing punishment, then we should apply to the punishment of the prisoner, in each individual case, that general tendency to mildness which now prevails in penal legislation, and thus endeavour to soften gradually the punishment in proportion to the progressive moral improvement of the person undergoing the sentence."

We ought not to omit to say that we have hardly ever met with a translation from the German which bears so little trace of its origin, or which shows a greater mastery over the foreign technicalities connected with the subject.

Herr Kolb has published a second and revised edition of his "Manual of Comparative Statistics,"⁷ in which the separate States of Europe and the world are passed in review under the heads of Productions, Population, Finance, Military Establishments, Social and Commercial Conditions, and Colonies. The first edition was very well received both in Germany and France; the present one is very full and complete, bringing its information up to the latest possible date, and cannot fail to be of use to economists, sociologists, and merchants, from the mass of facts it brings together in a very accessible manner.

Dr. Müller's "History of German Coins"⁸ is not merely an account of extant specimens, but an attempt at a connected history of the relation in which money stood to society, of its first appearance among the Franks, of the laws passed to regulate it by the Carolingian kings, of the right of coinage, of ancient mints and their officers, together with an attempt to determine the standard quality and weight of the coins themselves. The present volume extends only to the reign of the Emperor Henry I.; the second is to close with the termination of the Middle Ages; and the third will bring up the subject to the present time.

Mr. Wingrove Cooke has collected and revised the Letters on Africa which he furnished to the *Times* paper, and published them in a convenient and handy form.⁹ The statistics have been brought up to the present date, and advantage has been taken of all that has been published on the subject in France since the date of the first appearance of the letters; the result is a most useful manual on a question to which too little attention has been given in England. This is the more surprising when we consider either the position of the French in the Mediterranean, and the prospects they indulge in of ultimate predominance on its coasts, or the study they offer us of an European race engaged like ourselves in India in a struggle with a hostile civilization. Mr. Cooke addresses the following questions to the French occupation of Algeria—Will you last? Do you pay? What is your principal political object? To what do you lead? and forces an answer to

⁷ "Handbuch der vergleichenden Statistik, &c." By G. J. Kolb. Leipzig: A. Forstnersche Buchhandlung. London: Williams & Norgate. 1860.

⁸ "Deutsche Münzgeschichte." By Dr. J. H. Müller. Leipzig: T. O. Weigel. London: Williams & Norgate. 1860.

⁹ "Conquest and Colonization in North Africa." By G. Wingrove Cooke, Author of *China in 1857-8*. W. Blackwood & Sons, London. 1860.

these searching interrogatories from the mouths of the French themselves. At the present moment Algeria is held by the sword at a great annual expense; the endeavours of the different governments to induce the French peasantry to colonize their conquest have met with a success very far from proportionate to the exertions made, yet colonization is the only means which can be relied upon for permanent occupancy. The Arabs yield to an overpowering force, but to force alone, and look forward with a fanatical belief to the time when their promised deliverer shall come. They are quite unchanged by their contact with the French, if, indeed, they are not rendered more bigoted in their own convictions by the contempt they feel for everything French but their power; they are at the mercy of every fanatic who announces himself as the looked-for deliverer, and the French are obliged to quench in blood the first sparks of a disturbance, for any appearance of success would cause a universal rising.

Colonization thus becomes the only means by which possession can be taken of the land, but after a quarter of a century the richest and securest part of the colony, the valley of the Metidja itself, which contains six hundred square miles of fertile land, cannot count thirty villages, each having its little zone of cultivation. It would, however, be strange if the French were to fail where Vandals, Saracens, and Turks have succeeded before them. Mr. Cooke gives rapid surveys of the features of the country, the state of cultivation, the natural and naturalized productions, the administration of justice, the character, manners, and customs of the Arabs: he illustrates this last subject by well chosen and most excellently told Arab stories. The native land of fable and apologue shows itself in his hands to possess in full vigour that acuteness and aphoristic homeliness for which it was of old renowned. The chapter on the *Bureau Arabe*, the French local court of justice, is most instructive, and pregnant with hints to Englishmen in India. The magistrate is usually an officer, but always some one who is remarkable for a delicate and high sense of honour, and knowledge of the customs of the country. To these qualities a large discretion is intrusted, and with the most complete success, the natives using these courts with great willingness and alacrity. To his personal survey of Algeria Mr. Cooke adds all the information that can be collected on Morocco, and enters into the origin and prospects of the Spanish invasion, which he is inclined to attribute to French intrigue, and in the ultimate success of which in extorting anything more than compensation and apology, he entertains but little confidence. As we find with China, so they with Morocco; highly organized States are mortal in many places, while the semi-barbarous ones, like the lower animals, are with difficulty deprived of that degree of vitality they enjoy.

Captain Shakespear's volume on *Hunting in the Madras Presidency*¹⁰ is one of the most genuine books we ever came across; it can hardly be recommended more forcibly to young men proceeding to India than in his own words:—

¹⁰ "The Wild Sports of India: with Remarks on the Rearing and Breeding of Horses, and the Formation of Light Irregular Cavalry." By Capt. Henry Shakespear, Commandant Nagpore Irregular Force. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1860.

“Ye anxious parents, who perchance read or hear the title of my book with a full determination and dread resolve that your boys shall not peruse or obtain it, bear with me a little while I explain to you that by making them Shikarees, or hunters of the large game of India’s magnificent forests, you are keeping them out of a thousand temptations and injurious pursuits which they can scarcely avoid falling into, if from no other cause, from ennui and thoughtlessness. Induce them, if possible, to become fond of field sports; this will keep them fit for their duty as soldiers both in body and inclination.”

The great good sense of these remarks speaks for itself, and the manly modesty of the following paragraph from the preface is most graceful in the mouth of one of the most courageous hunters that ever mounted Arab and followed tiger through a jungle:—

“I must beg my reader to be indulgent, and forgive many mistakes and ill-worded sentences in the following pages, requesting him to bear in mind that those who are in the habit of taking much out-door exercise can hardly brook the restraint required to keep them steadily at work in writing a book.”

Captain Shakespear’s book has far higher merits than well-worded sentences—it is graphic and full of matter; he fully understands and loves his topic, and overflows with interesting stories and entertaining adventures among every variety of what he is fond of calling the *genus ferox*.

His account of hunting the wild boar is the most complete we have met with. This is a sport not sufficiently honoured in popular estimation, though the pictures of Snyders and the engravings of Riedinger show us that it is far from child’s play. The hog must be followed close, and speared at the first run; for, if he is allowed to get his wind, he escapes from the fastest horse. He grows to between three and four feet high, and his tusks often attain the length of nine inches—a very formidable fellow, affording, in our author’s opinion, the best sport of all the wild animals of India. In Bengal, from the nature of the ground, the tiger is always hunted from elephants; in the other Presidencies the favourite method is to meet him on foot, an undertaking calling for the greatest nerve, and exposing the novice to enormous risks. There are few years in which some hunter does not lose his life in acquiring the necessary steadiness and self-possession. This, however, once arrived at, the tiger does not appear to be by any means so formidable an adversary as the panther, whose courage and pluck is far greater than that of the royal beast of Indian jungles. Bears, buffaloes, wild elephants, and deer are all treated of in this very amusing and instructive book; the best weapons, and the best way of using them, are touched upon with the manifest knowledge of one who has often relied on them, and not in vain, in the most desperate encounters.

Captain Shakespear has an Indian peculiarity very strong upon him. Few who are acquainted with returned Indians but must have been often amused by the way in which they will volunteer a good story, the point of which turns on the meaning of some Hindostanee word which they do not explain, and yet call upon their auditors to laugh at a joke that is as good as buried. The following opening paragraph is a little mysterious:—“The naib duffadar, or rather lance naick

of my small guard, was himself a Shikaree." This is very explanatory in form, but partakes of the *obscurum per obscurius*. The supplementary chapters on the different breeds of horses in India—the Arab, the Aneizahs, the Kuttewar horse, and the Australian and Cape animals, are written with the same fulness of personal observation which characterizes the hunting portions of the book. The remarks on light irregular cavalry pursue the subject into the minutest professional detail, and will no doubt be of the greatest use to those who would emulate the career of many of our celebrated Indian cavaliers.

It is a curious feature of most works recently published by missionaries, that in almost every case some secular subject receives a degree of attention, side by side with the main purpose of the journey, which in earlier works of the kind would hardly have been allowed to show itself with that prominence which is now so willingly admitted. We have travels in the interest of Christianity, in which the missionary seems to have been as much engrossed by botany as by the Bible, and in which the interest is shared between gardening and the progress of the Gospel. In Dr. Krapf's book¹¹ we are called upon to recognise the geographical and ethnographical value of his researches in a manner that leaves a curious impression on our minds. There are few careers which call for such lofty self-devotion as that of a missionary; few which imply such great self-sacrifice, which involve such personal risk, and which to an ordinary mind promise so poor a harvest. We should be inclined, *à priori*, to imagine that the character must be of a very elevated type which finds its fit sphere in such a calling. It is, however, but too often the case that we are forced to recognise a singular littleness in the histories we receive at the hands of those who have devoted themselves to what is surely one of the greatest tasks a man can undertake.

The small immediate results with which they can flatter themselves, however it may be accompanied in their own minds by a lively faith that in due season the seed they have sown will bring forth abundant fruit, tends to give to the books of missionaries a singular appearance of incompleteness, and the necessity of producing a book of even moderate dimensions inevitably leads to the introduction of small personal adventures and trite reflections, that stand in a somewhat poor relation to the great enterprise of which they are the chief recorded features. We almost fancy that some sense of this impression, produced by their works, may be the cause of that increased attention to the collateral topics offered by the strange countries they may be visiting on which we have just remarked, and in doing so, we are far from wishing to depreciate the efforts and exertions of reverend writers in the more immediate sphere of their activity. It was a wise remark of Livingstone's that the labours of the missionary can only well commence where those of the explorer have been brought to an end. So long, however, as the Christian interest in

¹¹ "Travels, Researches, and Missionary Labours during an Eighteen Years' Residence in Eastern Africa, &c." By Dr. J. L. Krapf. With an Appendix by E. G. Ravenstein, F.R.G.S. London: Trübner & Co. 1860.

savage countries is greater than scientific curiosity, the two characters are likely for some time to be found with their somewhat incongruous features in the persons of those to whom we shall be indebted for our first reliable information of their peculiarities, whether of geography, race, or productions. The scene of Dr. Krapf's labours is that eastern corner of Africa which is between Abyssinia and the coast fronting Madagascar, of which but little is as yet fully known, in spite of the works of Harris, Beke, Barth, Rebman, Isenberg, Burton, and Speke. Throughout the district south and east of Abyssinia, the corrupted remains of that Christianity destroyed by the Mussulman conquest are still to be met with, and Amharic Bibles are still extant in Shoa, which when the bases of a scientific criticism shall have been acquired, may throw light upon the history of early Christian heresies. From the journeys in the more southern districts, many curious instances might be extracted from this volume of the difficulty which the missionaries encounter in convincing the savages of sin; their *naïve* replies, that some one has been slandering them when they are accused of wickedness, have a simple naturalness that is very striking. Their systems of ordeal by fire and bread exhibit a wonderful identity with the superstitions of our own Saxon ancestors.

The country is healthy and invigorating to Europeans, and is clothed with a rich and varied vegetation, but the inhospitable sea-coast, which from Aden to Zanzibar hardly offers one good port, renders communication with the interior tedious and difficult.

The inadequate results which have hitherto flowed from the early connexion between France and Madagascar have not disheartened French politicians, who look forward to the extension of the influence of their country along this coast as one of the many advantages they promise themselves from the opening of the Suez canal; these advantages will, to all appearance, lose much of their attractiveness on a nearer view. Much has still to be done before a profitable trade can be established on, or power founded, by the possession of these coasts.

The contributions of M. Ravenstein to this volume are a valuable epitome of all the information at present accessible on the vexed question of the source of the Nile, on the snowy mountains of the East of Africa, and of the recent progress of discovery in those regions. The book is illustrated by some views of the country, and groups of natives, which, however, hardly possess the ethnographical value attributed to them by the preface.

Herr W. Heine's "Summer Journey to Tripoly,"¹² is a description rather of the places he passed upon his way, than of the one to which his steps were directed. We are obliged to begin with a picture of Heidelberg as an appropriate introduction to a book about an Eastern city; and when we leave Marseilles, after having discussed the Crimean war, we are at once taken back to Diodorus Siculus at the aspect of Malta, while at least half the little volume is occupied by an historical epitome of the past fortunes of that fortress. When at

¹² "Eine Sommer Reise nach Tripolis." By W. Heine. Berlin: W. Hertz, London: Williams & Norgate. 1860.

last we start for Tripoly itself, we are again detained by an account of the difficulty, for it can hardly be called the war, between the United States and Tripoly at the commencement of the present century. These narratives, which together occupy nine-tenths of the book, are fairly written, but required no journey to the spot, while the descriptions of manners, customs, and local scenery, are of the slightest and weakest kind; this is the more remarkable, as the author is a painter, and made his journey to furnish himself with studies for pictures of the conflict between the Tripolitans and Americans. We do not remember to have seen any of his works, but suppose they must enjoy some reputation in the United States, as Herr Heine was appointed to accompany the late expedition to Japan.

SCIENCE.

AMONG the physico-physiologists who have made a special study of Animal Electricity, none holds a higher rank than M. du Bois-Reymond. His well-earned reputation, both as an experimenter and as a philosophic thinker, led to his being appointed the successor of Johann Müller in the Professorship of Physiology at Berlin; and he has given ample proof, in the recently-published continuation of his elaborate work,¹ that his zeal in his favourite pursuit has not been abated by the new demands thus made upon his time and powers.

From Berlin we have also one of those massive volumes² which our German neighbours, with a sort of ponderous facetiousness, designate a "handbook," devoted exclusively to Mineral Chemistry. The author is a disciple of Heinrich Rose, who is generally accepted as the highest authority upon inorganic analysis; and his work displays the fullest evidence of that comprehensive grasp and careful elaboration of the subject, which might be expected from a proficient of a school so justly celebrated.

In contrast with the foregoing we may mention a very compendious treatise on Physical Science,³ well adapted to the use of the student and general reader, which has recently been completed by Dr. Stammer. As it embraces not merely the abstract principles of the several departments of physics, but also their most important practical applications, and is, moreover, copiously illustrated, it deserves to obtain an extended circulation as an educational treatise.

The geological structure of the Azores, which offers a great number of phenomena of scientific interest, especially in relation to the general doctrines of igneous agency and volcanic disturbance, has lately received a careful exploration from Dr. George Hartung, who has published

¹ "Untersuchungen über Thierische Electricität." Von Emil du Bois-Reymond. Zweiten Bandes, Zweite Abtheilung. Berlin. 1860. 8vo, pp. 384.

² "Handbuch der MineralChemie." Von C. F. Rammelsberg, Dr. und Professor an der Universität und Lehrer am Gewerbe-Institut in Berlin. Leipzig. 1860. 8vo, pp. 1037.

³ "Lehrbuch der Physik." Von Dr. Karl Stammer. Zwei Theile in einem Band. Mit 331 Holzschnitten. Lahr. 1859. 8vo, pp. 470.

the results of his researches in a volume of very moderate dimensions,⁴ accompanied by an atlas, chiefly consisting of a series of views of these islands, which, although little more than outlines, convey an excellent idea of their most remarkable physical features.

The natural history of the group of Entomostracous Crustacea (*vulgo*, water-fleas) belonging to the family *Daphnidae*, has been studied by various excellent observers; the curious phenomena of their reproduction having been specially investigated not long since by one of the best among our younger observers, Mr. John Lubbock. Much still remained, however, to be worked out, in regard both to the structure, physiology, and systematic arrangement of this group; and we are very glad therefore to receive from an observer so accomplished and so zealous as Prof. Leydig, a memoir⁵ which seems almost to exhaust the subject, as regards both the copious details of its text and the beauty and abundance of its illustrations.

It is doubtless well for science that so many men have their special *hobbies*, since many objects of research are zealously pursued for the pure gratification of the inquirer, which would be scarcely thought worth following out for their own sake, although they cannot be regarded as by any means valueless. Thus we have a large volume⁶ from a French ornithologist upon Birds' eggs, of whose forms and colours he has made a special study, and about which he has got together a good deal of curious information. It is the general fault of such specialists, however, to ride their hobbies too far; and M. des Murs is no exception to the rule. For in endeavouring to make the similarity and dissimilarity of the eggs a basis of classification, he is led to violate the best established principles of zoological science; since any such scheme, if consistently worked out, must bring together species which are essentially different, and must separate others which are closely allied. There is ample evidence that the external characters of birds' eggs are related rather to the circumstances under which they are destined to be ordinarily deposited, than to the zoological affinities of the species.

Another group of minute animals, hitherto comparatively neglected, the *Acarida*, or Mites, has been taken up by an excellent German microscopist, Dr. Pagenstecher, who has given us, in this first instalment⁷ of the monograph which he has in preparation, a most careful and complete account of the structure of two species of *trombidium*, with illustrative figures of great beauty and excellence.

⁴ "Die Azoren in ihrer äusseren Erscheinung und nach ihrer Geognostischen Natur," geschildert von George Hartung. Mit Beschreibung der Fossilen Reste von Prof. H. G. Bronn. Nebst einem Atlas, enthaltend: neunzehn Tafeln und eine Karte der Azoren. Leipzig. 1860.

⁵ "Naturgeschichte der Daphniden" (Crustacea Cladocera). Von Dr. Franz Leydig, Professor an der Universität zu Tübingen. Mit zehn Kuppertafeln. Tübingen. 1860. 4to, pp. 252.

⁶ "Traité Général d'Oologie Ornithologique, au point de vue de la Classification." Par O. des Murs. Paris, 1860. 8vo, pp. 640.

⁷ "Beiträge zur Anatomie der Milben." Von Dr. H. A. Pagenstecher, Docenten an der Universität Heidelberg. Heft. I. Mit zwei lithographirten Tafeln. Leipzig. 1860. 4to, pp. 32.

The results of recent researches into the history of the Cystic and Cestoid Entozoa,⁸ have so completely changed the aspect not merely of their zoological affinities, but of all questions relating to the origin and transmission of the diseases to which their presence gives rise, that a new treatise was much needed upon the whole subject. Such a treatise has been undertaken by M. Davaine, a member of the Société de Biologie, well known for his activity and intelligence; and has been very satisfactorily executed. The first part of it gives a concise summary of the natural history of the entozoa that infest man and the domestic animals in which he is most interested, based upon the most recent and reliable information; the second part, which evinces great observation and research, gives a copious account of the various modes in which the presence of these entozoa deranges the health of the beings they infest.

Under a fanciful, and not very appropriate title,⁹ Mr. Cooke has brought together an interesting body of information, which is presented in a popular form, respecting the most important Narcotics in which man indulges in the various regions of the globe, and the customs connected with that indulgence. It is not a little remarkable that almost every nation has its favourite amongst these substances, the craving for which seems deeply ingrained in the human constitution,—whether originally or by habit we shall not take upon us to say. Certain it is, however, that when any of these narcotics is habitually made use of, the system *grows to it*; so that the doses which would at first have been poisonous, come to be tolerated with comparative impunity; but the converse result is no less certain, that when this accommodation has taken place, the system becomes so dependent upon its accustomed stimulus as to be most intolerant of its withdrawal. It is a pity that some of the introductory pages which Mr. Cooke has occupied with fables of a not peculiarly apposite character, should not have been devoted to a sober exposition of the remarkable properties which all these narcotics have in common; in particular their tendency (which we hold to be the gravest objection to their habitual use, even in moderation) to weaken the controlling and directing power of the will, and to render the individual who yields to their seductions the slave either of a dreamy imaginativeness or of grosser passions.

Mr. G. H. Lewes's "Physiology of Common Life,"¹⁰ which has been issued in monthly numbers after the fashion of Prof. Johnston's "Chemistry of Common Life," to which it is intended as a companion, being now complete, we take the opportunity of giving some account of the contents and general character of the treatise. The author in his preface states that "its object differs from that of all other works

⁸ "Traité des Entozoaires et des Maladies Vermineuses de l'Homme et des Animaux Domestiques." Par C. Davaine. Accompagné de 88 figures intercalées dans le texte. Paris. 1860. 8vo, pp. 838.

⁹ "The Seven Sisters of Sleep: a Popular History of the Seven prevailing Narcotics of the World." By M. C. Cooke, Director of the Metropolitan Scholastic Museum. London. 1860. Post 8vo, pp. 321.

¹⁰ "The Physiology of Common Life." By George Henry Lewes. In Two Volumes, post 8vo, pp. 940. Edinburgh and London. 1859-60.

on popular science in its attempt to meet the wants of the student while meeting those of the general reader, who is supposed to be wholly unacquainted with anatomy and physiology. The many excellent treatises which exist (he continues) are only suited to the advanced student; they assume a knowledge and a facility of apprehension which can only issue from a practical familiarity with the subjects." Mr. Lewes can scarcely be ignorant of the fact that Prof. Milne-Edwards, in France, and Dr. Carpenter, in this country, have issued treatises on popular physiology addressed to the very class designated by him, and that both these treatises have an extensive circulation. Of course he had a perfect right to offer another to the acceptance of the public, but there was no occasion, in so doing, to assume that the existing demand is altogether unsupplied. The great peculiarity of Mr. Lewes's book undoubtedly consists in the novelty of many of the views which it contains. Most writers of popular treatises have thought it better to abstain from the discussion of controverted questions, and to limit themselves to an exposition of the doctrines which have come to be generally accepted among men of science. "I could not," says Mr. Lewes, "adopt this easy and convenient plan. I could not bring myself to publish, on the authority of respected names, statements which I knew to be false, and opinions which I believed to be erroneous. After having laboured earnestly to get at the truth, it would have been disloyal to contribute in any way to the spread of what I believed to be error. All that I felt bound to do was, to state impartially the facts and opinions current among physiologists; and, when these opinions seemed inadmissible, to state the reasons for their rejection. There is, therefore, a great deal of criticism and much original matter in this work. It is in the chapters on the nervous system that the greatest amount of dissent from current opinions will be found; and it is there that the reader will most probably feel the greatest difficulty in agreeing with me, especially if he be versed in the doctrines of the schools, and not very familiar with the subjects through direct observation and experiment."

The readers of Mr. Lewes's book, therefore, must not expect to find in it a smooth and pleasant setting forth of those parts of the received body of physiological science which are most suited to popular apprehension; they are called upon to follow the author through his discussion of some of its most difficult and recondite problems; and though that discussion is so skilfully managed as invariably to persuade the uninformed that Mr. Lewes has the best of it, yet those who are qualified to criticise his criticisms would not find it difficult to expose at least as many weak points in his argument, as he thinks he has detected in the scheme of doctrine which he opposes. The state of the case, in regard to the general functions of the nervous system, is simply this:—a certain body of facts, arrived at by observation and experiment, has to be colligated by principles, or (in popular language) *explained*; there are difficulties in every explanation which has yet been offered; and the question is, what explanation most satisfactorily accounts for the facts, and is encumbered with the fewest difficulties. Thus, physiologists generally have come to accept the doctrine of

“reflex action,” revived and extended by Dr. Marshall Hall, as applicable to those movements of animals which are performed through the instrumentality of parts of the nervous centres which have been separated from the brain. Now, it is unquestionably true that many of these movements *appear* to indicate a guiding direction, being analogous to those which we should ourselves perform for the removal of some cause of irritation; and hence it has been urged that they indicate the existence of sensation and volition in the separated nervous centre. But this doctrine, if true of the lower animals, must be true of man; and there can be no escape from the deduction (which Mr. Lewes seems willing to accept) that when a patient has received an injury of the spinal cord which cuts off its lower portion from functional connexion with his brain, and thus deprives him both of sensibility and of volitional control as regards his legs, and yet leaves them capable of executing movements in response to stimuli applied to themselves (the feet being violently jerked away, for example, when their soles are tickled or have the flame of a candle brought under them), there is a separate *ego* established in the lower part of the spinal cord, which not only feels that which the *ego* acting through the brain does not feel, but wills those movements which it judges to be suitable for withdrawing the limbs from disagreeable or injurious impressions.

Now, if there be two such independent centres of consciousness, intelligence, and volition, acting concurrently in the same body, there must be *two distinct personalities*;—a doctrine which physiologists generally have come to regard as a *reductio ad absurdum* of the system advocated by Mr. Lewes, who seems quite unaware that the views now current have come to be generally accepted only after very full discussion of the facts and arguments which he has adduced as novel. There are in the human body many reflex actions which take place even in the normal state without the slightest consciousness, even when we direct our attention to them, and many more can be proved to take place unconsciously in those abnormal states in which accident does that which we imitate by experiment in the lower animals; many of these actions, moreover, evince a marvellous adaptation of means to ends, which, if we were to look on them as spectators, would seem fully to justify the notion that they are under the guidance of sensibility and will. But as we know from our own experience that they are not so, but that they arise out of that wondrous mechanism of our corporeal frame, which was designed by an intelligence and executed by a will much higher than our own, we seem justified in extending the same view to the actions performed by the lower animals under the like circumstances, and in refusing to admit that they are anything else than automatic. And however difficult it may seem at first sight to admit such an explanation, yet it is found to consist well with that large class of facts supplied by comparison of anatomical structure; which justifies the belief, that whilst in Man a great proportion of the actions of the body are placed under the control and direction of his intelligence and will, that control and direction are less and less exercised as we descend the scale, the movements necessary to the well-being of the animal being provided for more and more by the automatic

mechanism, until we lose all trace of any higher power of receiving and responding to impressions than that of which we have examples among plants.

It is rather a curious feature of Mr. Lewes's work, that his acquaintance with the Continental literature of physiology should be much greater (as he himself acknowledges) than with that of his own country. If he had given his attention to the subject about a quarter of a century ago, and had gone through that educational training in the science which is involved in a long habit of careful study, not only of facts, but of such intelligent discussions of those facts as our own literature can show, we should have been disposed to attach much more weight to his dissent from the doctrines currently taught. His acuteness and ability are undisputed; his power of exposition is not surpassed, possibly not equalled, by that of any scientific writer of the day; but when he sets himself to convince the public that the body of scientific doctrine, which has been built up by the labours of the most eminent experimenters and reasoners that physiology has ever had in its service, is fundamentally erroneous, and brings the matter forward as one suited for popular discussion, we feel bound to call in question his authority, and to express our conviction that educated physiologists, not the uninstructed public, constitute the proper tribunal before whom such questions should be raised, and with whom the decision should be left. We have ample reason for the belief that, in this country at least, there is not a single physiologist of repute who would not hold with us, either that Mr. Lewes is fundamentally wrong in his general principles, or that he uses his terms in such a different sense from that which physiologists have come to attach to them, that the question becomes one of words rather than of things.

We are glad to receive another edition of Dr. Andrew Combe's excellent treatise on the physiological and moral management of Infancy,¹¹ which we have no hesitation in pronouncing to be the best treatise of its kind, and in recommending to the perusal of every one who either is or who may be charged with maternal duties. The work has been improved by the editorial care of Sir James Clark, who has retrenched it in some parts where there was a little redundancy, made some important additions, altered for the better the arrangement of the chapters, and prefaced it with some judicious observations on the duty of making a knowledge of the elementary laws of health a branch of general education. A cheap abridgment of the work, adapted to the capacity of minds less educated than those to which the author specially addresses himself, would be a "real blessing to mothers."

Dr. Forbes Winslow¹² has issued, as a distinct and separate treatise of no small dimensions, what he originally intended as a prefatory

¹¹ "The Management of Infancy, Physiological and Moral, intended chiefly for the use of Parents. By Andrew Combe, M.D. Ninth Edition, revised and edited by Sir James Clark, Bart., M.D., F.R.S. Edinburgh. 1860. Post 8vo, pp. 302.

¹² "On Obscure Diseases of the Brain, and Disorders of the Mind; their Incipient Symptoms, Pathology, Diagnosis, Treatment, and Prophylaxis." By Forbes Winslow, M.D., D.C.L. Oxon. &c. London. 1860. 8vo, pp. 721.

essay to a work which he has for some time had in preparation, on "Softening, and other Types of Organic Disease of the Brain," his object being to lead both the profession and the public to a truer appreciation of the importance of close attention to those earlier manifestations of disease, which are too often only brought to mind when the disease has attained its full development, and has passed the stage in which remedial treatment could be of any avail. "My attention," he says, "has been called to cases in which serious mischief to the delicate structure of the brain and its investing membranes has been thus allowed by the patient's friends to proceed uninterruptedly for years, no treatment being adopted to arrest the progress of the fatal disorganization." Other deviations from the normal state are not, as a general rule, treated with similar neglect; for the disturbance of health which they produce is ordinarily sufficient to excite the attention either of the patient or his friends, and thus to bring him under professional observation and direction. But every one is conscious of a sort of instinctive dislike to making known any sensations or disordered states which may lead to the suspicion of failure of mental power; hence such conditions are very commonly ignored; and hence it is that diseased actions which result in paralysis or apoplexy, in loss of mental power or in destruction of life, are allowed to continue unchecked, giving rise to the prevalent idea that these results are due to sudden lesions of the structure of the brain, instead of having been prepared by a long process of gradual change. One of the commonest and at the same time most insidious forms of such a change, is the "fatty degeneration" which is liable to take place in the walls of the blood-vessels of the brain, especially in elderly persons, or in those at an earlier period of life who have accustomed themselves to alcoholic excesses. This degeneration is simply a form of disordered nutrition, consisting in the replacement of the proper tough fibrous tissue of the vessel by non-tenacious fatty particles. When this change has proceeded to a certain extent without any ostensible indication, the vessel bursts, and sudden effusion of blood in the substance or on the surface of the brain, with its train of attendant symptoms of the gravest character, is the sad result.

Now, it is maintained by Dr. Winslow that the antecedent progressive changes are attended, in the great majority of cases, by indications which are sufficient to guide the inquiring and observant physician, if not to a precise diagnosis of the exact pathological condition, at any rate to a general conclusion as to whether the symptoms indicate any essential disorder of the brain requiring that remedial measures should be directed primarily to it, or whether they are traceable to disorder of the stomach, liver, or some other part of the digestive apparatus with whose state the functional activity of the brain is intimately associated. This is often a question of the greatest nicety, and one on which the success or failure of medical treatment must mainly depend; for it is far more important to determine whether the brain, or some one of the viscera, is itself the seat of the disease, than it is to know what is the precise nature of the change which the brain, if it be pri-

marily affected, is undergoing. In fact it cannot be said that cerebral physiology is yet sufficiently advanced to give anything like a rational interpretation of the symptoms of cerebral disease; and as it happens that many of the most important symptoms are common to several different kinds of organic change in the substance of the brain, these affections are not for the most part distinguishable in their earlier stages. Dr. Winslow, however, has done good service by directing attention to the inquiry; and we anticipate that, in proportion as the *rationale* of the various symptoms is rendered clearer, in that proportion will their value as indicative of different kinds of change become apparent. The following is an outline of the arrangement under which Dr. Winslow has grouped his facts:—

Starting with the three great divisions of the functions of the cerebro-spinal nervous system, he discusses, in the first place, the morbid phenomena of *Intelligence*, then the morbid states of *Motion*, and then the morbid conditions of *Sensation*. Under the first head are embraced all the premonitory symptoms of Insanity; and a great deal of curious information is brought together from the accounts given of themselves by patients who have recovered more or less completely from mental aberration, as to the mode in which the disorder first operated in producing a perversion of the ordinary current of thought and feeling. What we chiefly miss in this portion of the work is a more careful analysis and classification of the phenomena referable primarily to disturbance of the *intellectual* and of the *emotional* activities respectively. The morbid phenomena of memory fall under this head, and are very fully treated. The morbid phenomena of motion and of speech (which constitutes one special form of motion) are then discussed; and here the present imperfection of cerebral physiology becomes most apparent. After the morbid phenomena of sensation generally have been examined, those of the special senses are considered; and thence Dr. Winslow proceeds to the morbid phenomena of sleep and dreaming, a subject which is less satisfactorily treated than most of the preceding, and requires a much more extended development than it has obtained at Dr. Winslow's hands. The morbid phenomena of organic and nutritive life constitute the subject of the next chapter, and the work closes with a rather lengthy chapter on the "General Principles of Pathology, Diagnosis, Treatment, and Prophylaxis." The work is obviously intended rather for the profession than for the public, and we fear that it will not receive the attention it deserves, on account of the prolixity and verbosity, which seem to be the author's besetting sins—readers whose time is limited, and who look for definite practical results, being apt to avoid large books which leave but little, if any, definite impression when they have been laboriously perused. The literary research displayed by Dr. Winslow is no less creditable to him than the accumulation of the results of his personal experience; and yet if the whole had been more thoroughly digested and prepared before being given to the world, we think that it would have been alike better for his reputation as a writer, and would have done more to foster that habit of careful and sagacious observation on which he rightly lays such important stress.

The amount and sources of the medical knowledge displayed by Shakspeare constitute the subject of an interesting inquiry, suggested to Dr. Bucknill by the perusal of Lord Campbell's work on our great dramatist's legal attainments.¹³ Having found many passages cited in proof of these, which to one ignorant of legal phraseology would seem phrases of only ordinary significance, he was led to surmise that passages might present themselves no less indicative of medical acquirement, if expressly sought for by some one possessing the requisite mental training. Dr. Bucknill does not, like Lord Campbell, claim Shakspeare's youth as having been spent in the regular pursuit of his own profession, but he brings from his various plays and poems a very satisfactory body of evidence that Shakspeare must have been a diligent student of such medical knowledge as existed in his time.

As Dr. B. justly remarks:—

“If it be attempted to argue that Shakspeare had obtained his knowledge, either of law or medicine, by any formal connexion with either of these professions, it must be admitted that the arguments mutually invalidate each other; since the double event, say of his having been both a lawyer's clerk and a doctor's apprentice, is far more improbable than either single event would be. But if the argument only be urged that Shakspeare had been a diligent student both of medicine and law, not for professional purposes, but for the sake of increasing his general information, it would seem that the evidence of diligent study in either department of knowledge would fortify the evidence of such study in the other department; for the great hungry mind, which had an appetite for all accessible knowledge in one of the large divisions into which the knowledge of cause and effect may be separated, would, in all probability, be far from satisfied without appropriating to itself the counterpart of such knowledge from the complementary department.”

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

THE fourth volume of Mr. George Rawlinson's valuable version of the “History of Herodotus”¹ completes the work. It contains the seventh, eighth, and ninth books, which we may consider, with Mr. Blakesley and the learned translator, as forming in themselves a species of independent history, to which the previous books “may almost be regarded as a mere introduction, for the more complete understanding of what follows.” The magnificent tale of Persian invasion and Greek resistance, with the mighty interests involved in the struggle between the representatives of Oriental compression and

¹³ “The Medical Knowledge of Shakspeare.” By John Charles Bucknill, M.D. (Lond.), Superintendent of the Devon County Lunatic Asylum, &c. London. 1860. 8vo, pp. 292.

¹ “The History of Herodotus.” A new English version. Edited, with copious Notes and Appendices, &c., by George Rawlinson, M.A., late Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, Oxford; assisted by Col. Sir Henry Rawlinson, K.C.B., and Sir J. G. Wilkinson, F.R.S. In four volumes. Vol. IV. London: John Murray. 1860.

European freedom of development, will be read once more with renewed delight, in the scholarly pages of Mr. Rawlinson's annotated version. Had the translation itself been free from a certain archaism of expression, which we believe to have been purposely adopted as an equivalent for a corresponding peculiarity in the original, it would, we think, have been more graceful and more agreeable. But taste differs, and the point is one of quite secondary importance. Taken as a whole, the work before us must be pronounced a permanent accession to the library of the historical student. The notes, derived from the most recent sources of information, throw new light on the history and geography of Herodotus; or embody the chief results "which have been obtained in the progress of cuneiform and hieroglyphical discovery." The maps and illustrations in the present volume alone amount to more than forty. An index to the entire history spreads over nearly fifty pages; and an appendix to the seventh book includes three separate essays—1. On the Obscure Tribes contained within the Empire of Xerxes; 2. On the Early Migrations of the Phœnicians; and 3. On the Alarodians. Of these three disquisitions the middle one is that which will perhaps be found most interesting. The author, in opposition to Bochart and Kenrick, denies the identity of the Phœnicians and Canaanites. He insists on the marked contrast of character which the two peoples present, pointing out that the Canaanites are fierce and intractable warriors, not addicted to commerce or the pacific arts; while the Phœnicians are quiet, skilful in navigation, unwarlike except at sea, commercial, manufacturing, and artistic. On the other hand, he urges that the arguments advanced in favour of their identity, on a near scrutiny lose much of their force. Thus the genealogical historians may have meant only that the one name (Chna) preceded the other (Phœnice) in the same country; "the statement of St. Augustine that the country people about Ilippo called themselves Chanani," and the very doubtful interpretation of a single Phœnician coin, furnish but a slender foundation for the opinion that "the Phœnicians bore the name of Canaanites," and "knew their country by no other name than that of Canaan." On the whole, the writer concludes that the Canaanites and Phœnicians were two distinct races; the former being the original occupants of the country, and the latter being immigrants at a comparatively recent date. The testimony to the aboriginal character of the Phœnicians, derived by Movers from the work which Philo-Byblius put out under the venerated name of Sanchoniathen, but which may possibly have been composed by Philo himself, the essayist readily sets aside, regarding the speculations which it upholds as "mythological fancies parallel to those of Hesiod and clearly dating from a time earlier than Alexander." Finally, Mr. Rawlinson concludes that the Phœnician immigration took place in the thirteenth century before Christ. In the third essay, by H. C. R., the Alarodians of Herodotus are, in the author's opinion, "almost certainly the inhabitants of Armenia, whose Semitic name was Urarda or Ararat;" and Ararud, of which Alarud is a mere variant, serves in his view "determinately to connect the Ararat of Scripture with the Urarda or Uartha of the inscriptions." Modifying a judgment

given in a previous essay (vol. i. p. 589) that the principal Armenian Deity named *Khaldi* answered to the Ashur of Nineveh, H. C. R. now affirms that *Khaldi* can only represent the moon-god, known to the Assyrians as Sin, and to the Babylonians as Hurki or Hur; and adds, "a suspicion is thus raised that Ararat or Urarda may, after all, be Hur-areth, or the Moon country, and be thus a mere synonym of Chaldea.

In Book ix. we are informed in a note that the three-headed bronze serpent which supported the golden tripod dedicated to Apollo is still to be seen at Constantinople. When Spon and Wheeler saw it in 1675, it was, according to report, perfect. The heads, however, are now gone. One of them is still preserved in the armoury of the Church of St. Irene at Constantinople. It is pleasant to learn that during the recent occupation of Constantinople by the Western Powers, the inscription was almost entirely recovered by the application of chemical solvents. The thirty-six Greek States mentioned by Herodotus, as having taken part in the three great battles of Thermopylæ, Salamis, or Plataea, include every name as yet found upon the monument. Our interest in this discovery is enhanced when we are told that the serpent exhibits traces of that erasure which Thucydides records in his first book. We would add, as our final comment, that while Mr. Rawlinson seems generally to accord with Mr. Grote in his exegetical and historical conclusions, so far is he from a servile following of that eminent historian, that he sometimes records an absolute dissent from his decisions; as when he affirms (B vii. 10), that among the Spartans writing was a common practice; or corrects the statement (History of Greece, vol. v. p. 172), that the Piræus, when the battle of Salamis was fought, was a mere "natural harbour," wholly "unimproved by art," whereas, though still unfinished, Themistocles had commenced his great works there thirteen years earlier. (B. viii. 5.)

With the vivacious and intellectual Athenian people more than one writer has compared the restless and impressible nation, "the leading epochs of whose local history are also the leading epochs in the general history of the world"—the French.² A competent English historian of the rise and progress of this impulsive and powerful nationality has long been wanting. An American author, Mr. Parke Godwin, is doing his best to render the future appearance of the British author superfluous. One volume only of Mr. Godwin's projected history is published; but if the residuary volumes should resemble the present, the completed work will, we predict, be found an adequate record, even by an advanced student, of the sources and development of the national life of France. The plan adopted contemplates a narrative of the principal events in French history, from the earliest times to the outbreak of the Great Revolution. Each volume is intended to exhaust a period, and will thus be complete in itself. Thus the first volume, describing Ancient Gaul, terminates with the era of Charlemagne; the second, delineating feudal France, will close with

² "The History of France." By Parke Godwin. Vol. I.—"Ancient Gaul." London: Sampson Low, Son, and Co. New York: Harper Brothers. 1860.

St. Louis ; while the remaining periods specified are, France during the national civil and religious wars ; France under the great ministries of Sully, Mazarin, and Richelieu ; the reign of Louis XIV. ; and the Eighteenth Century. For his historical construction, Mr. Godwin's principal reliance has been on the great collection of Bouquet (*Rerum Gallicarum et Francicarum Scriptores*, 20 vols. folio, 1738). He has, in addition, consulted the more modern writings of Dubos, Montesquieu, Sismondi, De Petigny, Fauriel, Guizot, and others ; he is familiar with the Greek and Roman historians, as, indeed, with classical literature generally ; he is acquainted with various historical, philosophical, and ethnological works, published in France, England, Germany, and his own country ; and apparently possesses an available knowledge of some languages which are only exceptionally studied. The references in the foot-notes are copious and punctual. The narrative portion of the work is admirably done. It is condensed, yet is sufficiently circumstantial to be thoroughly interesting. The reflective or expository part is deserving, perhaps, of equal commendation. We do not, however, recognise in Mr. Godwin an original or powerful thinker. His remarks are just and sensible ; his historical judgment, generally sound ; his interpretation of the past wise and sympathetic. More than this we cannot find in his pages. The composition is animated, often glowing ; and the style, when most rhetorical, seldom over-fine, though we sometimes meet with a superfluous "rosy dawn," or "roseate glory," or with "silvery rays" that shine with rather an equivocal splendour.

The first instalment of this new History of France is divided into four books, each of which is subdivided into chapters. The subject of the first book is primitive Gaul from the most remote period to Cæsar's eighth triumphant campaign and the final reduction of the clans ; that of the second is the organization of Gaul by Augustus to the instauration of Christian society towards the close of the Roman dominion ; that of the third book, Roman-German Gaul to the death of Dagobert ; and that of the fourth, German Gaul to the dissolution of the empire of the Franks. In the commencement of his history, our author takes us back to that distant time when the physical characteristics of Gaul were more austere than those of modern France are now ; when animals which are found chiefly in colder regions were not uncommon, and the largest streams were frequently frozen to a solidity which allowed of the passage of armies over them. After describing its climate and geography, he passes on to a consideration of the origin and earliest appearance of three races—the Keltic, Iberian, and Greek, to a brief notice of the influences of supposed Oriental civilization, when the Phœnicians under their tutelary god Melkarth, penetrated to the gold mines of the Pyrenees and the Cevennes, and to a rapid recital of the adventurous career of the Gauls, till, "after sacking Rome, scaling Olympus, plundering Delphi, besieging Carthage, menacing Egypt, and establishing an empire in Asia," they approached the close of their nomadic career. In the next chapter, the character, manners, government, and religion of this terrible race are delineated. The structure of its society, originating like the Hebrew tribe, the

Greek phratry, the Roman gens, and the German sippenschaft, in an expanding union of families, and called by our author the Clan, is then discussed; and is followed by a picturesque sketch of the institution of the Druids, their orders, doctrines, and scientific pretensions. To the general reader, the etymology of the name Druid, which Mr. Godwin finds in De Chineac, will probably have the advantage of novelty, as it has, we think, of philosophical appropriateness. Deriving it from *De* God, and *ra-wydd*, De Chineac explains the composite *Derawydd*, as God's speaker, or a theologian. Two more chapters are included in the first book, treating of the "earliest inroads of the Romans in Gaul; the defeat of the Teutones in their projected march into Italy, under the "cool, blunt, rigid, self-centred," yet prodigiously energetic Marius; and the conquest of Gaul by Julius Cæsar, described by Mr. Godwin as consciously "fighting the battle of civilization against barbarism;" and as, in right of a large open ambitious nature of mingled audacity and prudence, comprehensiveness of purpose, with iron tenacity of will, and superiority to conservative superstition, a master spirit bearing the republic stormily on to its end. The extent of the Roman empire, the nature of its organization, the influence of its assimilating policy, both for good and evil, in all material, moral, and intellectual aspects, the adoption of the Roman system in Gaul; its new territorial division; the part which Gaul played in the social and political drama, the revolts of Flèrus and Sacrovir, and of Vindex under the Cæsars; the introduction of Christianity and the persecutions of its professors under the *good* emperors; the advent of the legions to power; the growing preponderance of Africa and the East; its influence on Roman society and the degradation of the religious sentiment; the commencement of the barbaric invasions and the decline of the old religion and empire under the reign of the *bad* emperors, are among the topics of the next two chapters. It was at the period when Rome, long since invaded by a motley throng of theurgies, mysticisms, anthropomorphisms and occult sciences, was swamped in the deluge of coarse idolatries and foul mystic rites, when "the old heathenism seemed divested of its glory, and the genius of the once proud and domineering nation moaned and sighed around its deserted temples," that the new religion which Jesus of Nazareth proclaimed three hundred years before, achieved the conquest of the world. The general spirit of this religion as an "exemplification of a new life and the annunciation of a new society," is, we think, faithfully indicated by Mr. Godwin; but the subject is too hurriedly and too orthodoxly treated to admit of complete elucidation. Notwithstanding its growing acceptance, Mr. Godwin points out the inefficacy of Christianity to reach the "radical ills of the ancient socialism," deflected as it was from its direct and practical ends, and supposed to imply "not so much the regeneration of mankind in this world as the salvation of the individual soul in the next." The advance of the old Teutonic world on the empire; the physical and moral characteristics of the Germans, the great federations of the Goths, Saxons, Franks, Alemans, and Burgundians, the reign of Honorius; the administration of Ætius; the great invasions; the establishment of the barbaric monarchies and the annihilation of

Roman dominion, are described in the ninth and tenth chapters of the History. The Christian bishops, our author reminds us, now deservedly possessed great influence, as organs of local patriotism; men of the people as well as men of God. Accordingly, as a counterpoise to the oppressive Arian monarchies, the prelates, "led by a double motive of piety and ambition, determined to give their support to Chlodwig, the King of the Franks. His victory over Syagrius, his marriage and conversion, the consolidation of his power; the new organization of Gaul, with the changes effected in the royal and aristocratic power, and the distribution of lands as benefices, the division of the kingdom among the sons of Chlodwig, "the real founder of the Frankish monarchy;" the invasion of Italy and the redivision among the sons of Chlothar; the civil wars of Austrasia, Neustria, and Burgundia; the fortunes of Sighebert, Hilperik, Galswintha, and Fredegonda; the protectorate of Gontramm and the regency of Brunahilda, are the subjects treated in the remaining chapters of the third book, which further examines, at the close, the character of the Merovingians and their rulers. The fourth book takes a survey of Gaul under the administration of the Mayors of the Palace, Echinoald, Ebroin, Pippin, and Karl the Hammer, who founded the Karlingan dynasty and entered into alliance with the Pope; it describes the efforts of his sons to restore order; the establishment of a new royalty by Pippin the Short; the policy, campaigns, and revival of the Western Empire, under Charlemagne or Karl the Great, as Mr. Godwin, who on principle adheres throughout to the German forms of the royal names, prefers to call him. The story of this pre-eminent monarch's life, as told by our author, is coherent, vivid, and even epical in its completeness. Karl, Mr. Godwin contends, was not a political plagiarist. In borrowing from Rome the great thought of European unity, he "endeavoured to modify the stringent centralism of Rome by the local independence of Germany."

"But," he continues, "in this scheme, grand and benevolent as it was, Karl was overborne by the tendencies of his times. All the deeper impulses of the nations were toward independence rather than unity; he could not reverse or control them. Germany was stronger than Rome; feudalism than imperialism. . . . The grand fabric he had raised speedily crumbled into dust; it had no foundation in the soil; and, as soon as his plastic genius and powerful hand were withdrawn, there came

"Red ruin and the breaking-up of laws,
The craft of kindred and the godless hosts
Of heathen swarming over Northern Seas."

From this picture of menaced havoc in the European past, we are summoned to a historical survey of Japan and its inhabitants.³ A German squadron, commissioned by the Prussian Government, has recently sailed for Eastern Asia. An actual civic interest is thus imparted to those once exclusive islands; and a hand-book dedicated to

³ "Japan und seine Bewohner. Geschichtliche Rückblicke und Ethnographische Schilderungen von Land und Leuten. Von Wilhelm Heine. [Leipzig: Herman Costenoble. London: D. Nutt. 1860.]

the Prince-regent, and intended to satisfy the popular demand for information on this subject, has been published by William Heine, the author of the "Expedition to the Seas of China, Japan, and Ochotsk, under Commodores Ringgold and Rodgers;" a "Voyage Round the World to Japan, under Commodore Perry," &c. The present manual is rather an ethnographical delineation and historical retrospect than a systematic description of the country and the people of our own day. The author has drawn largely on the literary accumulations of earlier explorers, availing himself of the peculiar colouring which distinguishes their reports, and even retaining, when he could, the orthography and punctuation of the original documents. The first chapter, with its significant triplet of sceptical interrogatory notes ??? investigates the primæval history of Japan, a corruption of the Chinese Jih-punquo—i.e. Kingdom of the Source of the Sun. The inhabitants of this resplendent region regard themselves as autochthonous, and disclaim with horror all "connexion with the people over the way," the co-exclusives of the Celestial Empire. Their physical constitution, religion, manners, and customs are widely different from those of the Chinese. The hypothesis of a community of race is alike rejected by Kämpfer, Golowin, Klaproth, Meylau, Titsing, and Siebold; the first of whom refers them to primitive Babylonian emigrants, who wandered over Asia, reached Corca, and finally transported themselves to Nipon; while the last derives them from the Tartar hordes who inhabit the north-east of Asia. Japanese history and chronology are divided into the three periods, of fable, doubt, and certainty. In the fabulous period, Japan was under the government of the Seven Celestial Spirits, or unembodied Gods, known collectively by the agreeable appellation of Ten Dsin Sitzai Dai. Of these divine potentates the three first were never married; while the four last had each a wife, who shared their names and was associated with them in the government. Only one of these incorporeal husbands was blest with a family, Isanagi Mikotto, whose wife, Isanami Mikotto, produced five young demigods, the eldest son and heir being Ten-sio Dai Dsin. They appear to have succeeded each other in the government and to have lived out most of their days, none of them reigning for less than a quarter of million of years, and the entire period of their dynastic administration amounting, if Herr Heine has done his summing rightly, to the not very small figure of 2,342,467 years! Of the second and dubious period, when light begins to dawn, that is, from the era of the Mosaic Creation downward, nothing is known till the time of the first monarch, Sin Moo Ten Oo, B. C. 660, when the historic intellect of Japan becomes so brilliantly illuminated, that it is able to fill up the lacuna in its own annals with a list of the monarchs who, after the abdication of Katsura Kuki, sat on the throne of China. The third and last period begins with the six hundred and sixtieth year before the birth of Christ. From B. C. 660, to B. C. 1693, the Japanese throne has been occupied by 114 spiritual hereditary emperors, commencing with the eldest branch of the family of Tensjo Dai Sin. Though inheriting the crown of their noble forefathers, they do not bear the name of Mikotto but of Mikaddo, a diminutive implying an emperor, prince, and great lord. Descended in

a direct line from the primitive national ancestor, each of these imperial personages is regarded as having a sacred and papal character. His dignity requires that he should not touch the earth with his feet. He is, therefore, carried on men's shoulders. The sun is not worthy to shine on his head; he must not venture, therefore, into the open air. Under the name of Zipangu, Japan, resumes our author, is first mentioned in the travels of the Venetian, Marco Polo, A.D. 1298. Polo's description of that island is then inserted, followed by the revelations of Fernan Mendez Pinto. Japan, at the arrival of the Jesuits, the introduction into it of Christianity, and the eventual fall of the Christian Church; the procedures of the Dutch and English, and the commercial relations of the former in Japan; Engelbert Kämpfer's journey to that sunny isle; the experiences of Thunberg, Titsing Doeff, Golowin, and Ricord, with topographical notices and sketches of character, are the topics of most of the ensuing chapters. An account of Fischer, Meylau, Siebold, Biddle, Glynn, down to the American expedition under Perry, succeeds; and subjoined are four documents, of which the most important furnishes a tabular view of the islands of the Japanese kingdom, their names, area, and number, which is legion.

From the north-east of Asia we cross over to the north of Europe. "The Court of Russia a Hundred Years since,"⁴ is a kind of historical summary of great and little events in which the principal members of the imperial family, or the leading personages connected with the government, were actively or passively interested. This epitome, which will be found clear and intelligible, is largely interspersed with illustratory extracts from the despatches of the English and French ambassadors. The period thus reviewed consists of about fifty-eight years, twenty-three of which are crowded into rather less than one page. Thus the term becomes very nearly centenary. It commences at the death of Peter the Great, January 25 (Feb. 8), 1725, when his widow Catharine, once a "Livonian peasant girl," was by the resolution of Mentchikow placed on the throne of all the Russias. During her brief reign and that of her successor, Peter the Second, son of Alexis (1725—30), the only remarkable incident was the conclusion of a commercial treaty with China (1727); unless we can call the ascendancy of the person already named under Catharine, and that of the Dolgorouki family under Peter, remarkable incidents. On the death of Peter II., Anne, daughter of Ivan, the elder brother of Peter the Great, was called to the throne, the imperial power being limited in favour of the nobility. The act of limitation, however, was soon cancelled, conformably with the suggestions and views of the Chancellor Ostermann, M. Yagusinski, and Prince Tcherkaski; and the Dolgorouki, victims of revenge and hatred, were unjustly accused of peculation and banished to Siberia. Anne was succeeded by her grand nephew, Ivan, an infant (1740),

⁴ "La Cour de Russie il y a cent ans 1725-1783. Extraits des Dépêches des Ambassadeurs Anglais et Français." Troisième édition. London: Trübner and Co. 1860.

under the regency of Biren. Biren's power, however, was soon subverted and himself exiled to Pelim. A revolution soon followed, the true author of which was Lestocque. Elizabeth, the daughter of Peter the Great, was now proclaimed Czarina; Ostermann and Marshal Munnich went into exile; and Bestuchew assumed the political presidency, which he retained for many years. Before long, a war with Sweden broke out, which ended in the acquisition of part of Finland by Russia. The accession of Elizabeth was the inauguration of a new era. Russia was now fairly recognised as one of the European powers. For her new position she was indebted to the friendly feeling of Great Britain. Taking part in the war of the Austrian succession, invading Russia and maintaining an army of observation in Poland, the northern empire acquired, during Elizabeth's reign, an important influence and a brilliant renown. This princess was succeeded in 1762 by her nephew Peter III., Duke of Holstein Gottorp, when Lestocque, Biren, and Munnich were re-called. The innovating policy of the new Emperor alienated his subjects; revolution again broke out; and he was deposed and murdered. So at least says M. Bérenger in his despatch of August 21, 1762, on the authority of a personal servant of the Emperor's, who never left his master, and who declares that Peter was first poisoned and then, to accelerate his decease, strangled. Catharine II., the wife of the murdered Emperor, supposed by some to have been an accessory to the crime, now ascended the throne. Conspiracies, however, were formed, which had for their object to exclude Catharine from the succession and to confer the crown on her son, the Grand Duke Paul, on whom it subsequently devolved. This son, born 1st October, 1755, was, according to the compiler of this volume, undoubtedly not the child of the Emperor, but of Count Soltykow, one of his attendants. Catharine's character, administration, her hatred, and her loves—the career of Orlov, Potemkin and others—the leading occurrences in her reign, all receive illustration from our historical commentator on the foreign ambassadors, whose despatches he quotes. Among these we may mention Maguan, Rondeau, Finch, Hyndford, Swart, Hanbury Williams, Keith, Breteuil, Buckingham, Macartney, and Malmesbury. The value of the book thus noticed lies in its clear and summary registration of facts, and the selection of elucidating passages from contemporaneous and authoritative sources.

About a quarter of a century after Catharine's death, the formidable invasion of Russia was undertaken by one of the greatest masters of war that the world has seen. The Narrative of this Invasion,⁵ which historical students will regard as most conclusive, will probably be that drawn up by General Sir Robert Wilson. Born in London August, 1777, Wilson joined the British army on the Continent at the end of 1793. After serving in Holland, Egypt, the Penin-

⁵ "Narrative of Events during the Invasion of Russia by Napoleon Bonaparte, and the Retreat of the French Army, 1812." By General Sir Robert Wilson, K.M.T. Edited by his Nephew and Son-in-law, the Rev. Herbert Randolph, M.A., &c. London: John Murray. 1860.

sula, &c., and conducting important diplomatic negotiations in the East, he was ordered to proceed to the Emperor of Russia at St. Petersburg. Present at the battle of Smolensk, he accompanied the Allied Armies, after the passage of the Beresina, through Poland and Germany. He thus enjoyed peculiar advantages—advantages which qualified and entitled him to be the historian of the Invasion. After a discreet and almost heroic reticence of thirty-six years, a narrative, containing either his own actual experiences or embodying carefully tested information, has been given to the public by his relative and editor, the Rev. Herbert Randolph. The whole of the materials of which the volume consists Sir R. Wilson himself “revised, arranged, and cast in their present form for posthumous publication, in the year 1825.”

The Invasion of Russia, in Sir Robert Wilson’s opinion, derived its origin from the war and peace of 1806 and 1807. Napoleon knew and feared Russian power, and resolved to reduce it. Controversial discussions, introducing asperity into the relations established between the two sovereigns, matured into mutual incrimination, and terminated in rupture and war. At this juncture the entire military force at Bonaparte’s disposal was no less than 1,189,000 men, while that of Russia presented a total of 518,000 men. Napoleon with a vast but heterogeneous and ultimately insubordinate multitude, consisting of 460,000 men, in simultaneous and active operation, and brilliantly officered by Davoust, Oudinot, Ney, Eugène, and other renowned generals, advanced into Russia. Inferior in numbers, and led by Barclay de Tolly, Banningson, Wittgenstein, &c.—their sole pre-eminent chief being Bagration—the Russian soldiers, 304,350, including the Moldavian army, were “consolidated by a common love of country” and devotional allegiance to their emperor. Such were the numerical and moral relations of the invading and assaulted armies. The campaign opened in June. By a rapid movement Napoleon succeeded in entering Wilna on the 28th of that month. Here he remained till 16th July. On the 18th he established his head-quarters at Glubokoie, a hundred and twenty miles north-east from Wilna. Barclay, finding that Napoleon’s dispositions rendered the Russian camp of Drissa untenable, anticipated his operations, and evacuated the camp on the 18th. Two days after, the whole Russian force reached Polotzk, in the direction of Moscow. It was now “too late to impede Barclay’s movements and bring the ‘retreating’ army to battle, or even to harass its march.” Napoleon had committed a capital error. Resuming his progress on the 20th, Barclay arrived at Witepsk on the 23rd. Hearing that Bagration had passed the Dnieper and gained the Soje, with the intention of reaching Smolensk, Barclay now directed the army on Poréczie, in order to secure Smolensk and effect a junction with Bagration. Napoleon, finding that the Russians were decidedly moving on Smolensk, returned to Witepsk, which he had reached on the 28th, and determined to rest his army for some days. Bagration meanwhile, after a severe battle, succeeded in securing the desired union with the first army (Aug. 3), and thus effectually baffled Napoleon.

It was now the middle of August. Napoleon had already decided to move on Moscow instead of St. Petersburg. The infirm and vacil-

lating Barclay, though the united Russian army numbered 120,000 men, declining to hazard a general battle, and abandoning the offensive attitude which he had for a moment assumed, fell back upon Smolensk. About two in the afternoon of the 17th August Napoleon resolved to carry that city by storm. On entering it the French found themselves in possession of only burning ruins. Quitting Smolensk, and vainly awaiting the attack of the French on some neighbouring heights, the Russian army, in various divisions, made for Sloboneva, the point of rendezvous. Twenty miles from Sloboneva, and six miles nearer for the enemy, was Loubino, on the Moscow high road. Junot's unaccountable inaction alone saved Barclay and lost himself the marshal's staff. The Russian officers, dissatisfied with their leader, now deputed General Wilson to demand "a new chief" from the emperor. This critical mission was successfully discharged. Kutusow was elected to replace Barclay, and Wilson was specially authorized by "Moi ! Souverain de la Russie," who it seems was not accustomed "to hear such things from any one," to use his influence, should occasion require, to prevent all negotiations with Napoleon as long as an armed Frenchman remained in the territories of Russia; his Imperial Majesty remarking that he would sooner "let his beard grow to his waist and eat potatoes in Siberia !"

The retreat under Barclay continued. Napoleon decided on the disastrous march to Moscow. The destructive action of Borodino, a drawn battle which lasted two days, was fought under the superintendence of the French Emperor, and of Kutusow—who had now assumed the command of the Russian army. Napoleon advanced. On the 14th Murat arrived within sight of the capital. Kutusow promising Rostopchin, the Governor, to give him three full days' notice if any change in his resolution to defend the city should occur, broke his word and retreated. Rostopchin never forgave him for the infraction of the promise. It was the Governor's fixed intention to have "arranged a general and municipally regulated conflagration;" and Sir R. Wilson was persuaded that Rostopchin, frustrated in his original design of assuming "the avowed responsible lead in an act of public virtue enhancing national fame," was compelled to make clandestine preparations to accomplish this noble and patriotic purpose. The sacrifice was completed. Moscow became one flaming pile. Of 40,000 houses in stone only 200 escaped; of 8000 in wood but 500; 800 churches were consumed, and more than 20,000 persons burnt alive. The enemy had planted his eagles on the towers of the Kremlin: he was the captor of a city in ruins; the inhabitants had withdrawn; the army had fallen back across the Moskwa. After various movements the Russian forces recrossed the Pakra and occupied a position selected by Benningsen of which the humblest soldier at once recognised the value and dignity. Napoleon now endeavoured to effect an arrangement with Kutusow through Lauriston. There was a general suspicion entertained that Kutusow did not wish to push the enemy to extremity. The acceptance of "pacific propositions," however, was precluded by Sir Robert Wilson's intervention, conformably to the Emperor's instructions. After the surprise and defeat of Murat,

Napoleon quitted Moscow, October 19, ultimately retreating on Smolensk, which Kutusow's intentional vacillation and deliberate retirement enabled him to re-enter. Sir Robert Wilson plainly charges the Russian Commander-in-Chief with this treacherous policy. At Wiazna, Kutusow "granted a pont d'or," to the three corps of Davoust, Poniatowski the Viceroy, and Ney; at Krasnoi, where Napoleon was not *chased* but *stalked* down, Kutusow allowed him to escape, while all the dilatory and discursive marches subsequently made were but so many more consistent sequences of a predetermination "to make the victor weep to see the vanquished fly." But now the winter had fairly set in, with its "razor-cutting wind," its "crisp and brittle" atmosphere, and its hard diamond-like snow, "The horrors of the retreat, the famine, the cold, the "denaturalized humanity;" the retaliative cruelty of the Russians, who buried their prisoners alive; the tender loyalty of the dogs, who crouched on their masters' bodies, looking in their faces and howling their hunger and their loss; the cruelty of the peasant women, beating their sixty naked victims over the heads with sticks, in accompaniment to a national air, while the sufferers incessantly cried, "La mort! la mort! la mort!" and the anguish of the young beautiful French mother, writhing in the snow, red with her blood, clothed only with her long black shiny hair, and frantically crying, "Rendez-moi mon enfant" (it was newly born), are described with an unpretending but terrific eloquence in Sir Robert Wilson's narrative. "The severest campaign of six months on record in the annals of the world" now drew to a close. Of the enormous army of invasion, about 80,000, including the Austrians and Prussians, repassed the frontier; 125,000 perished in the different combats; 190,000 soldiers were captured; 100,000 destroyed by cold, hunger, and disease; while 48 generals and 3000 officers remained prisoners. Such at least is the Russian calculation.

"A Chapter of English History,"⁶ re-written by the very competent author of the "Essay on the Grand Remonstrance," affords a detailed and vivid description of a famous passage in the life of the first Charles—the arrest of the Five Members. To rescue this incident from Lord Clarendon's ingenious misrepresentations, and restore it, with all its accessory circumstance, to its proper historical proportions, has been Mr. Forster's object in composing the present work. Its true history he has endeavoured "to elicit from trustworthy and as yet unpublished contemporary records," as the letters of Pennington's royalist correspondents, Wise, Smith, and Slingsby; Pennington having the command of the fleet in the Downs, and not long after carrying Lord Digby, the asserted sole adviser of the attempt, across the Channel, as well as "the Queen and the English crown jewels, to be employed abroad in raising material and means for the waging of civil war at home." The Five Members whom Charles undertook to seize sitting in their places in Parliament, after having exhibited in the House of Lords, on the preceding day, articles of impeachment against them for

⁶ "Arrest of the Five Members by Charles the First. A Chapter on English History rewritten." By John Forster. London: John Murray. 1860.

high treason, through his Attorney-General, Sir Edward Herbert, were Pym, Hampden, Hollis, Haselrig, and Strode. Their arrest Mr. Forster shows to have been, not as Clarendon describes it, "a sudden act as suddenly repented of," but a deliberate scheme on the part of Charles I. to strike down the leaders of the majority, assuming that the King "honestly believed himself to be in possession of evidence which, before such a tribunal as might be obtained to try them, would bring the accused members certainly within the penalties of treason." He adduces as evidentiary facts, Charles's removal of the guard from the House and the substitution of companies officered by himself; the withdrawal of Balfour and the appointment of the dissolute Lunsford to the Governorship of the Tower which commanded the city; the recasting of the offices at court, in order to include in his councils the leading opponents of the Great Remonstrance; the endeavour to conciliate the comparatively moderate Pym with the offer of the Chancellorship of the Exchequer; the King's persistence in the outrage between the 4th and 9th January; his warrants, his commission of the Royal Sergeant, and his three proclamations on 4th, 5th, 6th, and 8th. Accepting the construction put on the act by the writer of the "Eikon Basilike," who ascribes it to reason and not to passion, Mr. Forster contends that the stake played for was worth the hazard. The preliminary incidents, so dramatically described by Mr. Forster, we must pass rapidly over. The section on the "*Westminster Tumults*," "*Citizens and Soldiers in the Hall*," are important, because "the first blood shed in the great civil war flowed on that 27th December," and Mr. Forster pronounces that bloodshed to be the true beginning of the war, making the king's friends and dependents exclusively responsible, while acknowledging the "insolences" and vexatious conduct of the mob, which provoked the officers, as Clarendon allows, to words of great contempt, and finally to "cuts and slashes that drew blood," the feud ending in the death of Sir R. Wiseman. The sections on the proceedings in the House; the imprisonment of the bishops; the impeachment and the scene in the Queen's apartments, bring us to the midnight visit to the city, and the morning of the eventful day when Lady Carlisle, who had learnt the secret from the Queen, betrayed it to Pym, in vindictive retribution, according to Mr. Forster, for the King's treacherous desertion of the Earl of Strafford, for whom she had entertained an eminent and constant affection. To avoid collision with the King and his armed force (about 400 men, according to Verney, Rushworth, Ludlow, May, Hutchinson, D'Ewes, and Slingsby), the Five Members were commanded by the House to absent themselves. Charles thus arrived to find his "birds flown," and returned disappointed to his palace. In his estimate of this extraordinary narrative Mr. Forster charges Clarendon with raising a false issue. The noble historian declares that the leaders "claimed immunity against even regular proceedings upon the charge of treason." This, says his critical impugner, is untrue. In reply to the King's message, the House sent word by a deputation, including Culpepper and Falkland, that the "accused should be ready to answer any legal charge." The issue raised, concludes Mr. Forster, was and could be no other than one of violence.

The attempted arrest of the Five Members was, in Mr. Hallam's words, "an evident violation, not of common privilege, but of all security for the independent existence of parliament," a violation which rendered the King's affairs irretrievable by anything short of civil war. In brief:—

"Charles raised the issue, the Commons accepted it, and so began our great Civil War. The King drew the sword upon the day when he went with his armed followers to arrest the Five Members in their places in the House. The House of Commons unfurled their standard on the day when, declining to surrender their members, they branded with the epithet of a scandalous paper the articles of impeachment issued by the King."

Mr. Forster's book abounds in valuable matter. To the pages in which he appreciates the characters of D'Ewes, Lenthal, Hampden, and Pym, and canvasses the statements of Lord Clarendon, we invite careful attention. The volume is admirably appointed. It has a copious analytical table of contents and an excellent index; and is rich in marginal topical references and illustrative foot-notes.

Passing from history to biography, we take up the authorized translation of the Letters of Alexander Von Humboldt,⁷ to which is prefixed the vindictory preface belonging to the third German impression. These letters, edited with rare and culpable indiscretion, contain but little that is intrinsically excellent. Still they are not without value or interest as records of the opinions of an eminent scientific intellect, and all who wish to learn what Humboldt thought on political, theological, or literary subjects, will, independently of the gratification that an inquiring mind may derive from its magnificent scandal-mongery, find in this exceptionable volume materials for the satisfaction of a less ignoble curiosity. In religion Humboldt seems to have been a deist; believing, we should say, in an Original Creative and Impelling Power, but rejecting the Immanence of God in nature, and comparing the physiological assumption of vital powers to explain organic phenomena, with the theological hypothesis of a divine government to explain historical phenomena. Anti-supernaturalist and anti-sacerdotal, he discovers in Strauss's *Leben Jesu* "what was believed by the black men who understand how to impose fresh fetters upon mankind;" or, as he says in another place, "the whole history of the religious beliefs current in our time, especially the priestly craft with which people, Schleiermacher-like, profess all forms of Christian myths." Anti-pictistic, he complains of the occasional interrogation of "an extra-super Christian Mr. Foster," as to whether he believed the souls of the lower order of animals come within the scope of redemption—whether, in fact, bugs and gnats are to be partakers of heavenly bliss, adding, "if they are, I am threatened with them hereafter, and therefore shall find those well-known animal spirits with which I have made such close acquaintance on the Orinoco, hymning their songs of praise." In politics Humboldt was of opinion "that even the wildest republic can never do as great and lasting injury to the intellectual

⁷ "Letters of Alexander von Humboldt, written between the years 1827 and 1858 to Varnhagen von Ense," &c. London: Trübner and Co. 1860.

progress of mankind, &c., as le régime de mon oncle, le despotisme éclairé which avails itself of all the contrivances of civilization to make the will and caprice of one man powerful;" that one man, as he insisted, being a son of Admiral Verhucl. Humboldt, however, was far from approving of Transatlantic liberty, which he says is "but a dead machinery in the hands of utilitarianism," while he calls the U.S. a "Cartesian vortex, carrying away and levelling everything to dull monotony." Of the statesmen of our own times Humboldt had but a poor opinion. Among public men, Bunsen seems to have been his "favourite aversion." He makes merry with the Chevalier's "newly-invented Apostolical Church under the firm of Hippolytus," and his hypothesis on "the locality of Paradise for which a map is already ordered of Kiepert." In literature, Humboldt's taste was large and sympathetic. On Byron's poetry he set a high value; and of Prescott he speaks as the great American historian. Perhaps the most philosophical reflection in the Humboldt-Varuhagen correspondence relates to the question of inference from the silence of authors. To show the inconclusiveness of historical reticence, Humboldt adduces three important and undeniable facts, but which are entirely omitted where we should naturally expect to find them. "In the records of Barcelona there is not a trace of the triumphal entry made by Columbus; in Marco Polo no mention of the great wall of China; and in the archives of Portugal nothing about the voyage of Amerigo Vespucci in the service of the crown." There are some characteristic *mots* in the volume, for one only of which we can find room. At Berlin Humboldt was much hated by the Ultras and Pietists, and used to say that but for his connexion with the Court he should not be able to live there. One day, General Von Gerlach, purposely to embarrass him, observed, "I suppose your Excellency often goes to church now." To which Humboldt at once replied, "That *now* of yours is very kindly put in: you mean to point out to me how to make my way in the world!"

Guizot, of whom dishonourable mention is made in this somewhat vituperative correspondence, has recently published the third volume of "Memoirs to illustrate the History of my Own Time."⁸ To us the work seems unnecessarily diffuse. It abounds in discussion, some of which might be readily spared; and reads like a sort of biographical blue book. Its starting-point is the cabinet of the 11th October, 1832, the period of "the first premeditated trial of what has since been called Parliamentary government." In this Cabinet M. Guizot took office as Minister of Public Instruction. The new minister deciding against compulsory and a purely gratuitous education, founded a system of primary instruction legalized by the act of 28th June, 1833, admitting of free competition between the government and private individuals, and adopting the principle of giving it to those who have not the means of paying for it. Though far from regarding it as a panacea for all moral diseases, he pronounces the education of the

⁸ "Memoirs to illustrate the History of my Own Time." By F. Guizot. Translated by G. J. W. Cole. Vol. III. London: Bentley. 1860.

people an absolute necessity; for, "when a new and influential force, physical or moral, steam or intelligence, once enters the world, it can never be expelled." In treating the question of secondary education, the Minister endeavoured to conduct himself as a liberal conservative, defending the University against impatient rivals, and the great classical studies against frivolous innovators. In a chapter on "Superior Education," M. Guizot panegyricizes the English University system, with its double principle of liberty and discipline, and desiderates its equivalent in France. Complaining of the metropolitan monopolization of intellectual life, he remarks that a great nation requires something more than cultivated and enlightened minds, namely, varied, original, and unfettered spirits, and maintains that the qualities which he extols are only preserved when men expand and live where they are born. Mental uniformity he deprecates as ending in weakness or servitude—"a result as much to be lamented for the liberty of a nation as for its honour and influence in the world." Three chapters on education, elementary, secondary, and superior, followed by one on academies and literary establishments, treat of the nature and objects of instruction; explain the legislative reforms introduced by himself; describe his personal relations with such distinguished men as Burnouf, Jouffroy, Ampère, and Rossi; and give an account of the re-establishment of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences in the Institute. Some insight into the state of the religious phases of the question is afforded, and strong condemnation of revolutionary opinions in general, and of the "theocratic extravagances" of De La Mennais in particular, is expressed in two of these chapters. In another we find a brief description of Guizot's interview with Auguste Comte, the Positivist, whose sincerity, devotion, and intellectual blindness inspired the minister "with that mournful esteem which takes refuge in silence." The sixth chapter treats of the importance of historical studies, and glances at the foundation, constitution, and results of "The Society of the History of France." The concluding chapter characterizes the internal policy of the government, which from 1830 to 1836, was one not of concession but resistance; depicts the insurrection of April, 1834, at Lyons; and describes the secret societies, the ministerial crises, the return of anarchy, the Fieschi assassination, and the dissolution of the Cabinet of 11th October, 1832. A bulky appendix contains various letters and reports, with a narrative of the insurrection of Lyons, written by an eye-witness.

The philosophical statesman¹ is, in our biographical review, succeeded by a literary inquirer of some renown, Edmond Malone, the editor of "Shakspeare." The story of his life, as related by Sir James Prior, has little in it to interest us; the narrator has no skill in working up his materials, such as they are; his composition is clumsy, and his language poor and uncouth. Edmond Malone was born in Dublin, October 4, 1741. His education was commenced at a school kept by

¹ "Life of Edmond Malone." Editor of Shakspeare. With Selections from his Manuscript Anecdotes. By Sir James Prior, M.R.T.A., F.S.A., &c. With a portrait. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1860.

Dr. Ford, and was completed at Trinity College, Dublin. In 1763, he was entered of the Inner Temple, London. In 1769 he returned to Dublin, and joined the Munster circuit. In 1777 he left Ireland and settled in London. Here he became intimate with George Steevens and Johnson, whose "*Shakspeare*" was full in the current of popular favour." Malone had been early attached to the literature of the stage. He now began that series of critical researches which has conferred on him such celebrity as an editor of the works of the great English poet. In 1782 Malone was elected a member of the famous "Literary Club." He appears to have led for many years a studious sedentary life, united in the closest intimacy with Dr. Johnson, Burke, Reynolds, Lord Charlemont, and other distinguished men. "In the early part of 1812 his health, which had been gradually declining, seriously gave way," an exhausted frame could not longer sustain itself against increasing debility, and on the 25th of May of the same year he expired, in the 71st year of his age.

The "Life" contains some agreeable gossip and an amusing story or two. The collection of "Maloniana" which succeeds it will probably be considered as the most valuable part of Sir James Prior's book. It consists chiefly of anecdotes transcribed from the MSS. of Malone. Some of them are very diverting, notably one which relates to an anonymous personage, "who was always complaining of ill-health and low spirits, without being able to assign any particular malady as the cause. One evening at Hayman's club, it was mentioned that this *malade imaginaire* had been married the day before. "Is he, and be d—d to him," said Hayman. "Now he'll know what ails him!"

BELLES LETTRES.

THE memory of the late William C. Roscoe¹ well deserved the monument which has been raised to it by the affection of his brother-in-law, Mr. Hutton. The two volumes of his collected works will be very welcome to all who can appreciate the rare and delicate qualities of their author. The biography with which they are introduced, though coloured—and that highly—by the affectionate regard of the writer, is judicious and attractive, and deserves the attentive study of all who can find interest in the portraiture of a mind that singularly reflected the best tendencies of his time—and that time our own. The first volume contains his published tragedy, "Violenzia," with "Eliduke," another tragedy, his minor poems, and some sonnets. "Violenzia," at the time of its publication, met with but little success—nor is this surprising. Mr. Hutton endea-

¹ "Poems and Essays." By the late William C. Roscoe. Edited, with a Prefatory Memoir, by his brother-in-law, Richard R. Hutton. 2 vols. London: Chapman and Hall. 1860.

vours to account for its want of popularity by the revolting character of the crime on which the plot turns. This is the delusion of friendship: it is not the rape which has caused it to find so few readers, but the strange abstract morality of which the hero Ethel is made the exponent, joined to the absolute unreality of his character. Second in command of the king's army (the two brothers of his betrothed holding the first and third places), he defeats and takes prisoners these his best-beloved friends who have endeavoured to carry over their soldiers to the enemy, that they may jointly march upon the capital of the voluptuous king, who, in their absence, has violated their sister. Taken with arms against their country in their hands, Ethel, who loves them as himself—nay more—as brothers of her who is as the very breath of his nostrils, yet from a sense of duty, and thrusting from him all suggestions of mercy as the weak promptings of a fainting conscience, condemns them to death; they escape by the connivance of Ethel's most trusted officer, who cannot think but that his superior will really thank him for thus stepping between him and the execution of a purpose that wrings his very soul; but no, he earns his dismissal for his disloyalty. The liberated brothers find their way to their dishonoured sister's refuge in the camp, and slay her to wipe out the stain on the honour of their ancient house. They fall again into Ethel's hands, and are executed by his order as murderers. In this we think that Mr. Roscoe oversteps that ideal of strict legality which he endeavours to embody in Ethel; for if he was, as general, obliged to execute rebels taken with arms in their hands, his jurisdiction did not extend to murderers. After their death, he moves the army, which is devoted to him, towards the capital, with the avowed purpose of obtaining justice on the guilty king, and is tormented by the universal assumption that he will depose, and perhaps kill him, but certainly seize upon his crown for himself. Arrived at the capital, he calls the king before the assembled judges of the land, who, after hearing the accusation, declare him beyond their jurisdiction. All law failing him, Ethel solemnly adjures the king to repent, reminding him that revenge remains. The king is stricken with remorse, resigns his kingdom and his crown to Ethel, who puts them aside, handing the king's brother the insignia of temptation and responsibility, too great to be chosen by any wise man; and then, alone in the world, all his friends dead, his mistress dishonoured and murdered, his heart breaks, he falls down, and dies upon the spot.

This is not tragedy, but an essay in verse on a particular system of metaphysical morality; not Christian, for endurance is not inculcated, and extramundane hopes, and retribution beyond the limits of this life are not even alluded to, but faithfulness and loyalty to the highest idea of duty is advocated as the ideal of human conduct; but this highest idea does not rise above the conception of a very confined legality, temporary in its character, revolting in its inconsistencies, and without any sanction or interior support; indeed, the whole result amounts to this, that there are certain circumstances in which a virtuous man may be placed from which there is no refuge; the natural impulse to self-defence destroyed by an over-refining intellect, the mind

gives way, and death or madness is the only result of setting the human soul a task too great for its powers of endurance. Human life may show itself to some in these sombre colours, but on these principles can no tragedy be based. The human race cannot be embodied in any single hero; individuals only can become the heroes of any tragedy; the antique Titan appeals to no modern sympathy, and so utterly unhuman a conception as Ethel can never hope to attain any general popularity. •

The play is full of separate beauties; the author has studied the Elizabethan poets with such closeness that his style too fully calls our older dramatists to our remembrance. "Violenzia" is the work of a cultivated man, but it is no tragedy, and leaves a sense of moral inadequacy of a very painful kind on the mind of the reader. The problems started are not solved; there is no reconciling element on which we can fall back to allay the suffering they occasion; the author is himself false to the high and soothing influence of art, which he elsewhere declares to be an absolute requisite in any work that shall lay claim to exert a wide influence or enjoy general popularity. These reasons seem to us a much more adequate explanation of its want of success than Violenzia's unhappy fate. The rest of the poems are marked by refined taste, considerable power of verse, but, in our opinion, by no poetical originality; in fact, the great features of Mr. Roscoe's mind were his critical faculties; these were of the highest and most refined description, and we know of few collections of essays so well worth study as those contained in the second of these volumes.

Though hardly to be called a poet himself, his poetical criticisms are of the first degree of excellence; his papers on Tennyson, the classical school of English poetry, on Mrs. Browning, Rogers, Moore, Gray, and Crabbe, are mines of judicious thought and careful appreciation; they form of themselves an *ars poetica* of the highest value, and will repay the most careful study. There are few who have once read them that will not recur to them again and again with renewed pleasure. Whatever we may think of his theory of life as given in "Violenzia," we cannot fail to be struck by the justness and penetration of his views of life itself in his articles on Defoe and our modern novelists. There are some remarks in his essay on unideal fiction which we should like to extract, did our space permit, but we cannot refrain from quoting the following passage from his "Ghosts of the Old and New School," which, for humorous, but at the same time refined and gentlemanly banter, we think will not be easily equalled.

"Another work we have cited² has nothing whatever human about it, except the printer and the publisher. From cover to cover it is the work of 'an angel in heaven,' who has dictated it word for word to a lady for our benefit. 'Ce que femme veut, Dieu veut;' how much more, then, a solitary mankind-angel? and we cannot help feeling that the present one has deferentially permitted the lady to suggest to him what he should dictate to her. At any rate, if any one be curious to know how an angel of heaven writes, we can assure him it is

² "An Angel's Message: being a Series of Angelic and Holy Communications received by a Lady." London: J. Wesley and Co. 1858.

exactly as an amiable and enthusiastic woman would do, who possessed warm feelings, a devotional spirit, and a somewhat limited stock of ideas. He will find the angel in question without bigotry, and willing to submit his lucubrations to the judgment of his human readers, who are permitted, and even urged to pass by his truths if they find themselves unequal to their acceptance. We will even find in him occasional signs of diffidence as to his being an angel in heaven, or a lady in the flesh. He insists strongly on the importance of an unqualified acceptance of every word in Scripture; and tells us, the outward letter has an esoteric meaning, and sometimes more than one, each deeper and more interior than the other. And while he tells us he is sent to confirm our faith in the great Rock of Life, and bids us set him aside if he contradict one word of the Bible, he gives us a signal example of the precariousness of our trust in the meanings it is in our own power to extract; for one main object of his work is to contravene the saying of our Saviour, that after death we are neither married nor given in marriage, but are as the angels which are in heaven. These words are to be understood according to the spirit, not the letter; and so considered, they mean that there *are* marriages in heaven, with this distinction, that we are not by them conjugally, but 'conjugially' united, according to the spirit, not according to the flesh.

"On this idea hinges the romance which is embodied in the work. The angel left this world at middle age, without having contracted any matrimonial tie; the lady through whom he reveals himself had been attached to him here, without any response on his part; and it was only after his removal to the angelic sphere that he discovered that holy and spiritual links united them; and it has been his special and exceptional happiness that the two should become conscious of this, and find themselves 'conjugially' one with bonds of spiritual wedlock, although so widely separated. While dealing largely and specially with the matrimonial relation of the heavenly state, the whole work is characteristically silent on the subject of female angels and their attachments."

This is very charming, but Mr. Roscoe's most valuable thoughts will be found in his papers on Swift, the Miss Brontës, Bulwer, and Thackeray, which contain not simply passages of the deepest insight, but, in our opinion, judgments that will be as lasting as the interest taken in the works on which they are pronounced.

It is unfortunate that many of Mr. Reade's poems,³ either in title, subject, or structure, forcibly suggest to us works of world-wide fame. His "Italy," both by the subject-matter itself and the stanza in which it is written, reminds us of "Childe Harold," his "Catiline" of Ben Jonson's tragedy of the same name, his "Cain" of Byron's drama, and, among his smaller pieces on classical subjects, that called "The Olympian Gods," cannot fail to recall Schiller's "Götter Griechenlands," so admirably (although not completely) rendered by Mrs. Barrett Browning. We call this unfortunate, because suggestion unavoidably provokes comparison, and in the glory of such luminaries as Byron, Ben Jonson, and Schiller, a brighter star than Mr. Reade's might well "pale its ineffectual fire." In despite of all suggestion, however, we honestly set ourselves to the perusal of some of the principal poems in these volumes; we tried to wrap ourselves up *totus in illis*, to forget for awhile that any standard of comparison

³ "The Poetical Works of John A. Reade." Fourth edition. London: Longman and Co. 1860.

at all existed, and to test them only by the effect produced on our own mind, by the force with which the stream of feeling and imagination that might run through them should carry us along. Truth compels us to say that we were not carried along at all; there we stood knee-deep in the flood, calmly watching its gentle current, noting the straws as they floated languidly down, and the sleepy waving of the sedge plumes beneath the surface; diverted, it may be, for a moment by the simulated chafing of the otherwise placid stream at the resistance of a pebble of quartz which lay in its bed. Dropping metaphor, we found agreeable rhythm, a diction not wanting in elegance, and a number of historical allusions gracefully interwoven, the whole pervaded by a tone of thought in no way remarkable, and altogether lacking the force and fire, the indescribable somewhat which distinguishes true poetry from the most unexceptional prose. As we read on and on without being warmed into any feeling akin to enthusiasm, we began to suspect that the fault must be in ourselves. We own to having reached that time of life when the "hey-day of the blood is tame, is humble, and waits upon the judgment"—perhaps what Mrs. Browning calls the "poet passion" had died out of us; possibly it was but a property of our youthful blood, and had subsided with the ardour and the glow which belong to youth alone. We reached "*Childe Harold*" from our shelves, and, opening on the fourth canto, read stanza after stanza, page after page, not because we consciously willed to do so, but because we were borne along upon the full tide of song and cared not whither or how far it led us. No; the old fire had not gone out; it smouldered still, and wanted but a breath of the divine afflatus to fan and kindle it into flame. In spite of much false sentiment, in spite of many and glaring faults, poetry "is justified of her children;" and though "Byronism" has gone out of fashion, has become, indeed, and with justice, in some sense a reproach, there is that in it which is of an undying essence, which changes not with varying fashions, and without which it would never have stirred the world's heart at any time as it once did. In making these remarks, we have had Mr. Reade's "*Italy*" more especially in view. The subject is a fertile one, rich in incident, rich in association; but the stanzas are wanting in the *vis viva* of poetic inspiration. It is the glory of the poet to add to the deathless memories which his verse awakens. Doubtless there is a pure and exalted pleasure derived from the mere calling up of these, but this is a pleasure which the reader himself brings with him, and the poet has not done his work unless the very words by which the associations he deals with are suggested add at least one more to the number. When Byron, for example, speaks of Venice, he makes allusion severally to many of the memories it evokes:—

"In Venice *Tasso's* echoes are no more."

And again:—

"Ours is a trophy which will not decay
With the Rialto; *Shylock and the Moor,*
And *Pierre*, cannot be swept or worn away."

But he has so entwined them in his song that we cannot henceforth think or speak of them without associating them with the "Harold" itself; not simply because in it they have found a peculiarly happy expression, but because this work as a whole has a grandeur which stamps it, apart from the material wrought up in it, as a *monumentum cere perennius*. In Mr. Reade's poem there is no palpable blot, no fault upon which we can lay the finger of criticism and say "this spoils it;" we only feel that it does not possess that inner rhythmical impulse of which the metrical form seems to be the natural and spontaneous expression, and which ought to be there to fulfil the requirement we make of all true poetry—that of adding fresh lustre to the subject-matter it makes use of.

We conceive it to be a great mistake for a poet of our time to work upon any subject so alien to modern ideas and feelings as the mythology of ancient Greece, unless he have the faculty (by no means a common one) of subordinating the transitory form to the substantial truth which was latent in it, and thus links the thoughts of those long passed generations of men to the conceptions of our own age by means of a vital principle common to both. Mr. Reade has not done this in his "Olympian Gods," and a more egregious failure in any attempt to produce a poetical effect can scarcely be conceived. For proof that the subject may be handled with consummate success, we have only to refer to Schiller's "Götter Griechenlands." Let us be understood here; we would not institute this comparison for the purpose of convicting Mr. Reade of bad taste or faulty execution; it would perhaps not be fair—certainly, it would not be worth while for this purpose to pick out a poem which only occupies a couple of pages in a collection filling two goodly octavo volumes. We select it not so much for the sake of criticising Mr. Reade, as for that of asserting a principle which we believe to be of great importance. What pleasure can we possibly take in a recital, made up of phrases which are little more than mere Homeric allusions, of the names and acts of the Olympian deities? The wisdom of Athene does not elevate, nor the laughter of Momus move us when presented in this guise. Either languishing in the lap of Aphrodite, or thundering through the embattled plain, Arès is a being to whom we are utterly indifferent. But when Schiller treats of these same gods, he creates an interest even in our modern breasts, by making us feel that they satisfied a craving of the human soul, common to ourselves as well as to the ancients, in a way for which we have as yet discovered no equivalent.

"Da der Dichtung zauberische Hülle
Sich noch lieblich um die Wahrheit wand
Durch die Schöpfung woss da Lebens-fülle
Und was nie empfinden wird, empfand.
An der Liebe Busen sie zu drücken
Gab man höhern Adel der Natur,
Alles wies den eingeweihten Blicken
Alles eines Gottes Spur."

The belief in those fabled beings made life more beautiful; they peopled the woods and sported on the hills, and lifted laughing faces

from the floods. The poet contrasts this faith with the dull, lifeless, mechanical view of nature which, whilst it alone seems possible to modern thought, is not the less a source of ceaseless regret.

" Fühllos selbst für ihres Künstlers Ehre
Gleich dem todtten Schlag der Pendeluhr,
Dient sie knechtisch dem Gesetz der Schwere
Die entgötterte Natur."

Nature is prosaic as long as she is to the inward eye inanimate; the Greeks, without any conscious effort of imagination, looked upon all natural forms as so many living beings, each having its independent power of conscious volition; *we* have arrived at a stage of culture, which renders it impossible to do so spontaneously, but it is not the less a demand of the poetic instinct in our own day, and we fulfil that demand by a distinct effort of the will, shutting as it were the eyes of our understanding, that the play of imagination may not be impeded. We either absorb the phenomena of nature into our own souls, giving them back again stamped with the impress and dyed with the colours of our pleasures and pains, our passions and aspirations, or we endow outward objects with a personality of their own, from which, however, we cannot altogether exclude the sense of what they really are; when the river seems to flow onward "at its own sweet will," we still know it to be a *river*, not a *river god*. It is this poetic tendency to give life to nature that is the permanent element of which the mythology of Greece was a transient form; this is the ground which Schiller works upon, and is the secret of his success; Mr. Reade, on the other hand, deals only with the transient form, and touches no responsive chord in the reader's breast.

We have already given more space than we can well spare to our notice of these volumes, but we cannot dismiss them without a remark or two on "The Wanderings of Cain." A dramatic poem so utterly purposeless it has never been our bad fortune to read. We can only suppose that Mr. Reade had some vague notion of treating a fine subject in an irreproachable tone, and showing how the first murderer and the arch-fiend could be brought upon the stage without shocking the susceptibilities of the orthodox. This we know Byron did not do; the world was scandalized at the freedom and consistency with which Cain gave vent to his murderous hate, and Lucifer to his rebellious defiance. Mr. Reade will certainly not scandalize the world, but in order not to do so he has emasculated the two chief persons of the drama. Of Cain we can make absolutely nothing; of Lucifer we certainly do get some further ideas. We know that "the Prince of Darkness is a gentleman," but we did *not* know, till we made his acquaintance in these pages, that he is a gentleman of the sentimental *dilettante* sort.

"A Man's Heart," is the title of a poem in seven cantos, by Charles Mackay, which assuredly will not add to its author's reputation. There is nothing manly about the work but its title. The story is the very A B C of romance. The son of an English *dilettante*

⁴ "A Man's Heart." By Charles Mackay. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1860.

by an Italian peasant girl, whom he had become enamoured of and married, grows up under his father's care (his mother having died in his infancy) into a handsome and promising youth. Near their modest English home is the mansion of a wealthy *parvenu* baronet, who has "a daughter passing fair." Of course the young people often meet in the park, and in accordance with the rule in that case made and provided they fall in love. But the baronet, failing to acquire nobility, the great object of his life, by political influence, and thinking that next to being noble himself an alliance with a noble family is the best thing, determines on marrying his daughter to a neighbouring earl, who has passed the noontide of his years. The poor girl is accordingly sacrificed to her strong sense of filial duty, and her despairing lover roams about Europe sick at heart, and, as a natural consequence, unable to find rest or satisfaction in any place or pursuit. The middle-aged earl is, however, accommodating enough to die some months after the nuptials; and although we are given to understand the affection of the young widow's former lover had in the meantime turned to hate, yet after some trifling with the matter the young couple are brought together once more, and in due time united. Perhaps some uneasy suspicion crossed the author's mind at this point, lest his story might wear too commonplace an aspect, or it may be, he thought that five cantos would make too small a volume; at all events, instead of winding up, he accompanies the pair on their wedding tour in Scotland, and takes them up Ben Nevis. They are overtaken by a storm, and compelled to pass the night on the mountain; in the morning the young wife is missing, and her mangled body is at length found at the foot of a fearful precipice; the hero shortly after dies of a broken heart, and so ends the tale. Imagine all this put into smooth blank verse, the lover holding very free converse about the state of his heart with an amiable father, who talks magniloquently and does nothing, and the necessary scorn expressed here and there for wealth, title, politics, &c. &c., and as much will be known of this poem as it is at all needful to know. There cannot surely remain any demand for such stuff as this; not even, we should imagine, among romantic seamstresses or languishing housemaids, for have they not their "Reynolds' Miscellany" and their "London Journal?" And even should it be proved that a demand exists, should not a "people's poet" have some higher aim than that of pandering to the unwholesome taste? For our part we find it difficult, without overstepping the limits of a critic's licence, to express the nausea which these prating lovesick heroes (!) create in us. If all the laureate's skill and genuine poetic fire could scarcely avail to get his "Maud" received with tolerable complacency, how in the world can Mr. Mackay expect us to welcome his seven cantos of sickly sentiment? We suppose he has his circle of admirers, with whom it will be a point of honour to buy his book; these apart, we feel pretty confident that a very limited sale will justify the severity of our condemnation. At least, for the honour of literature we hope so.

In the romance of "Monte Beni," we have lately had the reverie of a poet in the Holy City, images that the imagination suggests to a scholar and an artist in scenes so provocative of ideal fiction. It is

strange that Mr. Hawthorne can have spent so many years in a city so torn by tumultuous political passion, and have preserved his work so free from any indication of the life that the Romans lived during his stay among them. Human nature, as it showed itself to him, seems to have been overwhelmed by the impressions produced by art in all its forms; the great and glorious past quite shut out the agitated present, and obscured even to the eye of an educated republican the great and glorious struggles of the present which lay panting before his eyes. If any one has felt this want in Mr. Hawthorne's book, he may satisfy it by the perusal of "Mademoiselle Mori."⁵ In this novel the fortunes, the hopes, and fears of modern Romans are fully set before us, and the past in its turn gives way to a life at once too agitated and too aspiring to concern itself with anything but dreams of the future. The political struggles of the Romans from the accession of Pio Nono to the death of Rossi are brought before us by the author in a very graphic manner; there are few phases of modern life in Italy that escape her acute observation; a lengthened residence and a lively sympathy with the liberal party could alone produce such detailed and natural pictures. The coincidences between the author's experience and the epigrams of M. About are curious from their number and completeness; we are constantly reminded of "Tolla" and "La Question Romaine," but in a manner which renders it impossible for us to suppose for one moment that either is indebted to the other for the view that they both take of the state of society under their observation. The tale is very simple, and somewhat sad. Vincenzo and Irene Mori are the orphan children of an English artist and an Italian mother. The brother, an artist like his father, is deprived by an accidental fall of the power of earning that small income on which they lived; brought to the very verge of starvation, they are rescued by a benevolent English lady, who enables Irene to cultivate her talent for music; her brother's partial recovery and her great success as a singer soon put them beyond the reach of want. They are surrounded by a crowd of characters which represent almost every form of opinion prevalent in Rome. The patriot poet Leone Nota and the *Papiste* Count Clementi are suitors for her hand; the Count, rejected in favour of the poet, becomes the *bête noir* of the book, and is at the bottom of all the intrigues that give it its dramatic interest, which, however, is not great. His ultimate defeat may be anticipated from the first; we do not tremble for Irene at any period of the story, we feel that she and Leone are too strong in their mutual love.

The plot is not the great merit of the book, but its constantly recurring pictures of Roman life give it an interest which rises to the height of historical truth. It may be allowed that the discussions so frequently introduced are somewhat prolix; we feel impatient at the slow movement of events, and it is only when we reflect that the author's intention is to give us a moving panorama of Roman society, "a tale of what Rome once has borne and yet may bear again," that

⁵ "Mademoiselle Mori: a Tale of Modern Rome." London: John W. Parker and Son. 1860.

we are willing to await the somewhat tedious *denouement* and ultimate fortune of those in whom she interests us. Their fate is, as we said, somewhat sad. Leone dies of wounds received in the defence of Rome against Oudinot, and Irene finds a solace, but not forgetfulness, in the triumphant pursuit of her profession, which she had resigned for the prospect of domestic happiness with him.

The subordinate characters are somewhat conventional, and mere supporters of different phases of Italian character; but if they are not vividly individual, they bear the impress of well-grounded studies of the different classes of society of which they are produced as types. While the book offers, as we have said, many points of undesigned coincidence with the brilliant sketch of M. About, it at the same time more fully impresses us, by its tone of truth and by the absence of all exaggeration, with a sense of the intolerable condition of modern Roman society under the government of men who are shut out by their profession from the possibility of arriving at the full stature of manhood.

"A Mother's Trials"⁶ is an excellent novel, though it opens with an unnatural and most improbable incident. Charles Crawford, a *blancé* man of pleasure, has fallen in love with and married a sweet country girl much his inferior in station. He lives for the first year of their marriage at Hesse, and the story opens with the young mother hanging over the cradle of her first-born, a girl, with all the intoxicating pleasure of such a new possession. The father comes home late at night, orders his wife to put on her shawl and take a walk with him; she finds the walk very long, and soon discovers that it is, in fact, a secret flight from debt contracted at a gaming-table that her husband cannot pay; she begs and entreats to be allowed to return for her child, but blind to everything but the chance of detection, her husband will not allow of her doing so. Their flight is as rapid as post-horses and railways can make it, and at the third days' end they are again in England.

Amy is struck down by brain-fever, which her husband explains as resulting from the sudden death of her first infant. At her recovery every one has taken up her husband's tale, and she is for a short time bewildered into half-believing it herself; but the sight of a package she had seen him make up upon the evening of their flight, reawakens her to the sense of the horrible desertion (for desertion Crawford insists it shall be), lest any inquiry on their part should give a clue to his retreat and cover him with the disgrace he so well merited. The effect is crushing on the poor mother; subsequent children give her very little comfort. At the birth of their first son, Crawford acquaints his relations with the fact of his marriage, and is coolly dropped by them; but his elder brother's marriage is without children, and Rookley must have an heir; he is, therefore, after all hopes of any other successor are given up, invited to his father's house to find himself in a suspected and merely tolerated position in the house where of old he had

⁶ "The First-Born; or, a Mother's Trials." By the Author of "My Lady." London: Smith, Elder and Co. 1860.

been the favourite son. The epigraph of the book is, "Be sure your sin shall find you out;" and the manner in which the author works out her thesis is very well considered, and gives the story a high degree of interest. Crawford lives in constant dread that by some means or other his family will discover the stain upon his character, and he crushes his wife with the most desperate cruelty, to prevent her daring to take any of her new kind relatives into her confidence. His expectations from an old rich and eccentric uncle are great; he has always been brought up to look upon himself as heir to a property far larger than the family estate, but he knows that the slightest taint of dishonour would surely disinherit him. His fears and alarms are his constant chastisement, his apprehensions are so probable, and yet so melodramatic, that the reader is in constant fear of some commonplace catastrophe which, however, never arrives. Oppressed by a constant sense of insecurity, Crawford yet succeeds in all his undertakings, and with each success apprehends a yet further depth of disgrace should his crime be discovered. He enters Parliament and succeeds in the House; but his temper, soured by constant apprehension, has several times very nearly betrayed him, and his uncle cools upon him because he cannot explain some words he has given vent to in a passion against his sister, whom he suspected of a desire to supplant him.

During this partial estrangement, the uncle dies suddenly of apoplexy, and one of the finest and most highly-wrought parts of the story is the description of Crawford at Molyneux Hall, expecting that his death has been brought on by some sudden discovery of his dishonour, and that he will find, against every expectation but his own, that his uncle has left his property away from him. This, again, is not the case; he succeeds to that vast wealth, and his eldest son, Edward, the solitary disinterested affection of his life, has now a bright and altered prospect before him. How if this only beloved one should discover his father's disgrace, and turn his face from him to hide a blush; that would be more than he could bear.

The deserted child has been adopted by a well-to-do couple named Walkenden, who bring her up as their own child; so much Crawford has ascertained, but kept secret from his wife. His greatest anxiety is now to see his son married; for he dreads, with that ingenuity of self-torment which makes an accusing conscience more cruel than the most righteous retribution, that Edward should meet his sister and love her for her likeness to her mother. Of course he does meet her; his father is frantic, writes to him to leave Yorkshire, where he is staying at the time, and come home immediately: he receives in reply an enthusiastic love letter. The agonized father must now confide in his wife; they pursue their son to snatch him from his dangerous and fatal position; but the childless Walkendens after their adoption of Aprilie have themselves a daughter born to them, who, of course, turns out to be the one Edward is to marry: this is the last and crowning trial under which Crawford, or now Molyneux, is almost prostrated. The manner in which this secret crime follows and scourges Crawford through every turn of his life is most excellently worked out, the events of the

story are most natural, the anticipations and fears of the hero most harrowing, selfish, hard, and inconsiderate.

"Doing his own will and choosing his own way, he had only shown himself how, when God does not choose to use external means of punishment, He can take others, internal, unscen, invisible, which work more deadly havoc still. This man, who would have smiled with anybody at fire and brimstone, knew something—a little—by this time, or thought he knew—of that Hell where the worm dieth not. He shuddered at the dreadful simile, but on his deliverance and recovery, vowed to himself, if not to God, another Life."

The subordinate characters of the tale are well drawn and distinctly individualized. Of course, as in all lady's novels, there is an herculean parson, "a wonderful preacher, who has sounded his war trumpet of good against evil in that far-away corner of London so unmistakably, that people heard of it at clubs, though parsons and priests were by no means romantically appreciated there." So that she is enabled to endow him with twelve hundred a year in exchange for his forty pounds at Bethnal Green at the very moment his marriage becomes imminent with the most beautiful and brilliant woman in the book. It is affecting to observe how our lady novelists yearn over a man like Fielden with "his big, grand, generous Gospel and his manful human heart."

M. Francisque Michel, after a short preliminary mystification, in which, dividing himself between his wishes and his fears, he argues the question whether he can prudently publish *Escaurian Ballads*⁷ of his own, whether he can Macphersonize the subject from which he has already drawn a reputation for labour, patience, and learned investigation, and yet keep the genuineness of the ballads contained in his "Pays Basque" free from any suspicion, has yielded to his wishes, and presents himself to the public as a Basque poet, from the very closeness of his study of and lively sympathy with the country. The poems are written in a modulated prose, and present us the eager, inquisitive, and enterprising Basques in almost every characteristic attitude; the contrabandist, the lover, the home-sick Parisian *lionne* have all something about them which speaks of a strange and peculiar native soil. The story of the Seigneur of Urruty, the murderer of his mother and of his son, who is at last devoured by his own dogs, has a weird and yet naïve attractiveness, which must, we think, be rooted on some genuine tradition.

M. Michel, in his imaginary conversation with himself, which serves as preface to the volume, hints that he has struggled between the desire to write Basque novels and Basque history, and we evidently owe the present collection to his longing to bring some peace-offering to the altar of a frustrated tendency. He very boldly prints the ballads of Altabiscar and Abarca as a supplement to his songs, as a challenge to all who would deny that he has fully seized on the national tone; a challenge to which few, we think, will venture to reply.

Herr Prutz, formerly Professor at Halle, on his retirement from

⁷ "Escaurian Ballads—Le Romancero du Pays Basque." Paris: Didot. London: Williams and Norgate. 1860.

that university, settled at Stettin, and has for some time edited the *Deutsches Museum*; from that paper and from other periodical sources he has collected his biographical and critical sketches of his cotemporaries, which he now republishes under the title of *Cotemporary German Literature*.⁸ They bear on the title-page as motto a very descriptive passage from Freiligrath's "Zwischen den Garben," in which they are very justly described as the gleanings the last ears and wind-scattered straw of a field which has yielded up its harvest. As a handbook these volumes may be found useful for occasional reference; but as most of the persons treated of are still living, the notices are pervaded by a diplomatic tenderness of well-known susceptibilities, and by a lukewarm tone of general praise, that make them anything but refreshing reading; the best-known facts are alluded to in a vague and indeterminate manner, while of positive information the harvest is poor indeed.

We have to thank the custom of collecting scattered contributions to periodical papers for a volume of tales and novels by M. Hartmann,⁹ but our gratitude is not great; the tales are on equivocal subjects, and are told in a very flippant manner, without tendency or purpose, and making no justifiable pretensions to artistic treatment of the poor topics taken in hand. The author's reputation dates from the publication, in 1845, of his "Kelch und Schwerdt," and the popularity of his earlier works led to his election, in 1848, as a member of the Constitutional Assembly at Frankfort, where he acted with the extreme Left, and ultimately followed his party to Stutgardt, and became involved in their defeat. After wandering about Europe, Belgium, England, and the South of France, furnishing the *Cologne Gazette* with descriptive accounts of the countries he was staying in, he was at the outbreak of the Crimean war sent out by that paper as special correspondent. The actual seat of war, however, he did not visit, and he was for some years lost sight of, so that a report of his death was spread and believed. He however reappeared some years back at Paris, where he published an account of his wanderings ("Erzählungen eines Unsteten"), and resumed his connexion with the *Cologne Gazette*, in the feuilleton of which paper the contents of his volume have appeared.

Among the tales will be found one in which the unfortunate Count von Lichnowsky is brought upon the tapis as the hero of a frivolous intrigue in which the narrator is involved; the lady concerned is also described in a manner that seems to point at an individual, and though professedly under a false name, is so designated as almost to suggest the idea of a private revenge. There is a disagreeable moral taint about all these tales; the author's adventurous and often, no doubt, trying life has habituated him to live in the present moment only; but literature that springs from such inspirations should be allowed to perish with the daily bread which has been its final cause.

⁸ "Die Deutsche Literatur der Gegenwart, 1848-1850." Von Robert Prutz. Leipsic: Voigt and Gunther. 1859.

⁹ "Erzählungen meiner Freunde und Novellen" Von Moriz Hartmann. Frankfurt: Meidinger and Co.

THE
WESTMINSTER
AND
FOREIGN QUARTERLY
REVIEW.

OCTOBER 1, 1860.

ART. I.—NEO-CHRISTIANITY.

Essays and Reviews. Second Edition. London: J. W. Parker and Son. 1860

A BOOK has appeared which may serve to mark an epoch in the history of opinion. The latest phase of religion at length has developed its creed. The vigour and the candour of this volume would raise it above the dust of theological strife; but its origin gives it a place in the record of religious thought. The subject, the form, and the authorship are all alike significant. It is no work of a single or isolated thinker; nor of unconnected thoughts upon secondary questions. It is the combined work of several of the leaders of thought in our seminaries of religious and useful learning; and it deals (not without some method) with the central topic in which all religious inquiry is now summed up. In a word, it is a manifesto from a body of kindred or associated thinkers; if it be not rather an outline of the principles of a new school of English theology. But whatever be the intention of its authors, those who watch the progress of opinion must look upon its appearance, and still more upon its reception, as full of significance and instruction. When seven theologians, teachers and professors in our universities or schools, combine their strength to deal with the great questions of modern inquiry, the public may justly infer that it has a test of the progress of ideas within the pale of the Church.

We propose, then, to consider this book, not as if it were the work of one anonymous author, alone responsible for his opinions, but as fairly representing the ideas of a large body of the more vigorous minds within the Church. On the other hand, we must [Vol. LXXIV. No. CXLVI.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. XVIII. No. II. X

decide how far the solutions here offered satisfy the unfettered judgment; how far they possess the elements of fruitful and healthy growth. This "Review" at any rate ought not to be silent whilst so much courage and candour call for recognition and support. Nor can we lose the opportunity of insisting on this conspicuous triumph of the principle of free discussion. On the other hand, we should be wanting to our readers if we failed to point out the light which it throws on the position of official belief. When axioms of science and results of criticism, principles and theories for which we have long contended, are preached in the citadels of orthodoxy, we may welcome and proclaim the fact, whilst insisting that they be frankly adopted and pushed to their legitimate conclusions.

We speak of this book as a joint production, and not as a mere collection of essays; for such, notwithstanding its outward form, it undoubtedly is. We are quite aware that there is no formal connexion in the argument; and we read in the preface that it has been written without concert or comparison. But it cannot escape the most casual reader; first, that there is a virtual unity in the purpose of the whole; secondly, that each writer receives a weight and an authority from all the rest of his associates. Of the seven essays, four are wholly occupied in treating of the authority or value of Scripture; two of the other three deal chiefly with the same topic. A book like this is not a collection of pamphlets bound up into one volume; or the farrago of a few kindred minds. It would be equally idle to pretend that each writer is not morally responsible for the general tendency of the whole. We do not indeed suppose that each adopts the particular arguments or the statements of his associates—that Dr. Temple tells his boys that a portion of the Bible is "a late legend founded on a misconception"—or that Mr. Pattison is ever kindled into poetry by the genius of Bunsen. But each writer gives to the other an imprimatur of peculiar significance. It is in theological argument especially that this kind of sanction has peculiar force. And thus what each of the seven writers puts forward comes with increased power when it has the countenance of the other six. They at the very least are guarantees that the views contained in this book have in them nothing dangerous, insidious, or destructive. They at least bear witness that such opinions are an open question, and may be boldly avowed and usefully taught within the very precinct and sanctuary of the Church. Oxford and Cambridge, by some of their foremost teachers, proclaim this doctrine. It is for them to repudiate it if they think fit. They have not repudiated or ignored it. They have studied, pondered, and approved it.

If, again, we speak of this book as aggressive, we do so

advisedly. No fair mind can close this volume without feeling it to be at bottom in direct antagonism to the whole system of popular belief. They profess, indeed, to come forward as defenders of the creeds against attacks from without; but their hardest blows fall not on the assaulting, but on the resisting force. They throw themselves into the breach; but their principal care is to clear it from its oldest and stoutest defenders. In object, in spirit, and in method, in details no less than in general design—this book is incompatible with the religious belief of the mass of the Christian public, and the broad principles on which the Protestantism of Englishmen rests. The most elaborate reasoning to prove that they are in harmony can never be anything but futile, and ends in becoming insincere. All attempts to show that these opinions are in accordance with Scripture, the Articles, the Liturgy, or the Church have little practical value, and do no small practical harm. Such reasoning may ease the conscience of troubled inquirers; but is powerless to persuade the mass that *that* is after all the true meaning of that which they have been taught and have believed. Just as their instinct repudiated the ingenious attempts of the Tractarian writers to build a semi-Romish system on the dogmas of our Church; just so it will revolt from any attempt, however sincere, to graft the results and the principles of rationalism on the popular Christianity of the day. Is the crumbling edifice of orthodoxy to be supported by sweeping away the whole of its substructure; and Christian divines taught cheerfully to surrender all that the most exacting criticism assails? The mass of ordinary believers may well ask to be protected from such friends, as their worst and most dangerous enemies. Is it reasonable to suppose, that at this time of day the Christian world will consent to reconsider the whole of its positions; to developo its cardinal doctrines into new forms, and to remodel the whole structure of belief upon an improved theory? Will the complicated and time-worn mechanism bear so radical a repair? Can its pieces be reset and placed in new relations, and the rusted mediæval time-piece be restored into the shape of a modern watch? Has it been all a mistaken rendering that men have been believing so long? Is theology then due to a mere confusion of terms? Can religion be set right by sounder canons of interpretation, and the mystery of the unknown cleared up by a more accurate scholarship? Of one thing we may be quite sure, that the public can never be persuaded to make trial of the process. They, at any rate, will never be brought to believe that the Bible is full of errors, or rather untruths; that it does not contain authentic or even contemporary records of facts, and is a medley of late compilers; and yet withal remains the Book of Life, the great source of revealed truth, the standard of holiness,

purity, and wisdom. Yet all this our Essayists call upon them to admit, in the very name of Revelation and for the honour and glory of the Bible itself. Let our authors beware of such excessive candour, and rest assured that when the public once begin to read their Bibles in that spirit, they will soon cease to read them at all, and that the Hebrew Scriptures will take their place upon the bookshelf of the learned, beside the Arabian and the Sanscrit poets.

Nor again is it a more hopeful scheme to preach to the congregations in Church and Chapel, that the central notions of their creed, no less than the volume on which they are based, have been utterly misinterpreted and distorted; yet withal that the creeds must regain their influence under new forms, as the Scriptures, through their new expounders. The men and women around us are told that the whole scheme of salvation has to be entirely rearranged and altered: Divine rewards and punishments; the Fall; original Sin; the vicarious Penalty; and Salvation by faith are all, in the natural sense of the terms, repudiated as immoral delusions. Miracles, inspiration, and prophecy, in their plain and natural sense, are denounced as figments or exploded blunders. The Mosaic history dissolves into a mass of ill-digested legends, the Mosaic ritual into an Oriental system of priestcraft, and the Mosaic origin of the earth and man sinks amidst the rubbish of rabbinical cosmogonies. And yet all this is done in the name of orthodoxy, and for the glory of Christian truth. Nay, unwearied with destroying this great edifice of old belief, our writers enter upon the gigantic and incredible enterprise of rebuilding the whole again from its foundations, upon the same ground-plan but with stronger walls; and after forcing the simple believer to unlearn his well-conned creed, they sit down to teach it to him anew with altered words and remodelled phrases. An expurgated Bible resumes its place. Miracles, inspiration, and prophecy reappear under the old names with new meanings: the harmonious whole arises anew in loftier and softer outlines with the cardinal features—with a revised Atonement, a transcendental Fall, a practical Salvation, and an idealized Damnation.

What consolation can it be to the simple believer to be told that this inversion of his whole creed is all within the letter of the Articles, and the Liturgy, and the Scripture? All the bases of his creed are undermined; the whole external authority on which it rests is swept away; the mysterious book of truth fades into an old collection of poetry and legend; and the scheme of Redemption in which he has been taught to live and die turns out to be a demoralizing invention of men. And yet all this is done to him to strengthen his Christianity, to confirm him as a member of the Church, to give a moral power to his faith, to teach him the true spirit of the Gospel. It is done unto him not by the open foes

with whom he has long waged unequal battle to the simple watch-words of "No human reason," "The region of faith," and so forth ; but it is done unto him by doctors, professors, and divines, by those who breed up churchmen and clergymen—by men who teach those who teach him and his children. We can well imagine the bitterness of heart with which he must repudiate this system of cure. His mental constitution cannot bear so terrific a remedy. They may demonstrate the scientific necessity of the operation they propose ; but what if he feel certain of dying under their knives ? Old and infirm as he is, they would restore him in a Medean caldron. " Mine own familiar friend in whom I trusted hath lifted up his heel against me."

We are quite aware that this purpose is not the conscious intention of the several writers in this book. It is quite possible that it may not be that of any one of them. But it most assuredly is the spirit of the book itself. We are dealing now, not with the individual writers, but with their book. We are quite aware of broad distinctions between them. Some of them may shrink from going so far in the work of destruction ; and some, perhaps, have no desire to go so far in reconstruction. But these seven authors are responsible for the book, and the book is responsible for the general impression it creates. Each workman may single out a separate portion of the whole edifice of orthodoxy to undergo the process of demolition and repair ; but he could hardly complain if the whole body are supposed to be together pulling down the whole. If one essay in this volume repudiates any kind of miracle, another any kind of inspiration, another shows the cosmogony to be an undisguised invention, and another deals with the Bible as Niebuhr dealt with Livy ; is it too much to say that a book has appeared which at once repudiates miracles, inspiration, Mosaic history, and the authenticity of the Bible ? Surely, too, these writers must know that it is in theology that the catenary argument is so peculiarly untrustworthy. A chain of theological reasoning of all other chains is no stronger than its weakest part. What becomes of the Christian scheme when the origin of man is handed over to Mr. Darwin ; and Adam and Eve take their seats beside Deucalion and Pyrrha ? Of what use can it be to talk of articles and liturgy or of creeds to a Protestant Church which has been robbed of the written Word from which they are all deduced ? Again, not merely must each be supposed to support the words of those who mount the same pulpit as himself, but much less than explicit statements do their work when they fall from men in their position. An English divine must be in spite of himself an apologist, and must be always regarded as stating his case most favourably to the Church ; an Oxford professor must sanction revolt when he speaks of disbelief with

such amazing candour. When he speaks of the supernatural with such contempt, can he wonder if men ask themselves what is Christianity wholly divested of the supernatural? and if he speaks systematically of the very "Head of his Church" in the actual language of an Unitarian divine, does he expect his young followers to pause on the inevitable conclusion? Let each of these writers reflect how far in all theological reasoning the moral sanction of the reasoner must work. When a pious and learned divine, shaking his head, bewails some doubts he feels as to the truth of Scripture, his less deliberate hearers soon cease to have any doubts at all. There are some questions which, if left for a short space open, will shortly decide themselves; and creeds, like Cæsar's wife, cannot even bear to be suspected. Let each of these writers be assured that as far as moral influence goes, he has said all that each of the others has said, and it is not too hard to remind them, that each has implied some things which none of them have said.

Let us suppose that this was the case of political discussion. Let us imagine seven writers had published a volume upon the British Constitution. Suppose that each of them treated it as ready for an entire transformation and development. Suppose that one of these writers proved that Magna Charta was the work of an age long subsequent to King John; that the Bill of Rights had been systematically mutilated; that the whole Statute-book had been hopelessly interpolated and corrupted. Suppose that another regarded the whole principle of government by Kings, Lords, and Commons as a misconception of Blackstone and De Lolme; another attacked the system of balances and checks as a demoralizing invention, and that throughout the maxim of *Salus populi suprema lex* was demonstrated to be the essence of the constitution, which could not possibly contradict anything that political science might establish. Suppose that the mere existence of the House of Lords was treated as an open question; and the Head of the State himself spoken of in words which imply a popular Magistrate rather than an hereditary King: would such writers be heard to say that they had written "independently and without concert and comparison;" would it avail them to profess themselves true friends of the Constitution, defenders of our old institutions and conservative reformers? Would it be worth their while to prove that such views were grounded on sounder canons of interpretation of the old Norman French or Latin of our statutes, and microscopic discoveries in the charred fragments of the Charta? Lastly, and what is of far more importance, could such writers seriously expect that the public would ever come to adopt this new reading of their laws; and that their conventional respect for the old would be thereby fanned into devotion to the new Constitution? Such men would be justly looked on as working

towards a social and political Revolution, and such language would be regarded, from whatever tongue it came, as a sign of decay or disease in the State. But if it were heard from the lips of Privy Councillors, Ministers, and Statesmen, in the Senate and the Court, without answer or rebuke, he would be an observer of strange dulness or strange subtlety who should doubt that it portended a revolution in the State—a change, it might be peaceful, but unquestionably enormous.

Who are the teachers from whom this language comes? They are the pride, the directors, and the representatives of our ecclesiastical foundations. The first essay in this volume is contributed by Dr. Temple, once known as fellow and tutor of Balliol College, Oxford, subsequently as the head of a training college for schoolmasters, and who as the head of the most influential school in the kingdom, now sits in the chair of Dr. Arnold, and may one day sit on the episcopal throne of Dr. Tait. Few men possess in Oxford a higher credit or influence, and none have with more success put themselves at the head of all its most liberal action. The second essay is by Dr. Williams, a well-known tutor at Cambridge, who is now vice-principal of a training college for the priesthood, and thus adds to the character of vicar, that of an educator of the clergy. The third essay is by the late Savilian Professor of Astronomy at Oxford, in whose too early death the University deploras the loss of one of her very ablest and most learned sons—one who carried sound science and vigorous thinking into the very centre of a literary and traditional sphere; whose numerous writings found a large and attentive audience; whose many friends remain to perpetuate his memory and work. The author of the fourth essay, Mr. Wilson, adds to the character of an active clergyman that of one who has exercised the most powerful influence upon the intellect of Oxford. Chosen to deliver the Bampton Lectures, he produced a sensation still fresh in the memory, and implanted ideas which still live and work throughout the University. Chosen as Public Examiner, he was one of those who, with the last two essayists, gave the strongest impulse to its studies. The next essay is by Mr. Goodwin, a layman, but not the less distinguished for his philological and Biblical studies. The authors of the sixth and the seventh essays, Mr. Pattison and Mr. Jowett, have for years been mainly responsible for the education of their respective colleges. Both have been surpassed by few in the influence they have exercised over pupils and colleagues, and the part they have had in the action and progress of Oxford studies. Indeed as the foremost man of the foremost college, as possessing wide-spread personal influence, as the friend and guide of most of the ablest of the younger students, the Regius Professor of Greek might well be taken as

the chief and the mouth-piece of all the fresher and younger intellect of Oxford.

That the picture we have sketched of the contents of this volume is by no means overdrawn can easily be shown. With the principles and tendencies of the several essays we shall presently deal. We will, however, at once collect some of those statements scattered throughout the book, which place it in our judgment in radical antagonism to the whole system of popular belief. The first essay strikes as it were the key-note of the whole by reducing the teaching of the Hebrews to the level of that of Greece and Rome, each of which had "systems of law given also by God, though not by revelation" (p. 15). Its chief results are simply "the idea of monotheism and the principle of purity" (p. 13), a view which, we think, was earlier advanced by Mr. Francis Newman. The theory is adopted from Auguste Comte, without acknowledgment and possibly unconsciously, "that the human race is a colossal man," and "the creeds and doctrines, the opinions and principles of the successive ages, are his thoughts" (p. 3). That the details of the Mosaic ritual should be sanctioned by divine authority, "is utterly irreconcilable with our present feelings" (p. 8). Nor does the Christian dispensation fare much better than the Mosaic, for we learn that "had His revelation been delayed till now, assuredly it would have been hard for us to recognise his Divinity" (p. 24). The creeds "were evolved" by the Church (p. 40), which occupied six centuries "in the creation of a theology" (p. 43), but a number of these decisions "are practically obsolete" (p. 41), and "we may acknowledge the great value of the forms in which the first ages of the Church defined the truth, and yet refuse to be bound by them" (p. 44). Nor is Dr. Temple's submission to the Bible greater than to the creeds, by means of "the principle of private judgment, which puts conscience between us and the Bible, making conscience the supreme interpreter whom it may be a duty to enlighten, but whom it can never be a duty to disobey" (p. 45); so that if the Bible says, "As in Adam all die," and conscience revolts from such a sentence, conscience and not the Bible must be listened to. Are we to deal as freely with the second clause of this famous verse? After such a theory of interpretation of a Book of which it is admitted the narratives contain "occasional inaccuracy, and interpolations, and forgeries" (p. 47), it does seem strange to be told that "the immediate work of our day is the study of the Bible" (p. 48), to the utter exclusion of all "the other systems of law equally given by God."

The second essay subjects the Hebrew annals to the same "remorseless criticism" with which Gentile histories have been

dealt with. The words are put into the mouth of Bunsen; and Teucer discharges his arrows beneath the shield of Ajax. We are to notice "how nearly the ancient cosmogonies approach the philosophy of Moses" (p. 56), the half ideal, half traditional notices of the beginnings of our race "compiled in Genesis" (p. 56), and how the long lives of the first patriarchs are relegated "to the domain of legend or of symbolical cycle" (p. 57). The Exodus is historically accounted for "in connexion with the rise and fall of great empires" (p. 58), and "the avenger who slew the first-born may have been the Bedouin host" (p. 59). The passage of the Red Sea "may be interpreted with the latitude of poetry" (p. 59), "and the numbers of the Book of Judges most suspiciously proceed by the eastern round number of forty" (p. 59). As to the Pentateuch, "numerous fragments of genealogy, of chronicle, and of spiritual song go up to a high antiquity, but are embedded in a crust of later narrative, the allusions of which betray at least a time when kings were established in Israel" (p. 60). It is indicated "that there was a Bible before our Bible, and that some of our present books, as certainly Genesis and Joshua, and perhaps Job, Jonah, and Daniel, are expanded from simpler elements" (p. 62). Nor are the prophets exempt from the same criticism, "even Butler foresaw the possibility that every prophecy in the Old Testament might have its elucidation in contemporaneous history" (p. 65). The Messianic predictions are ruthlessly eliminated. The maiden's child, in Isa. vii. 16, is to be born in the reign of Ahaz (p. 69); the Hebrew word for Mighty God, perhaps means only mighty or strong one; and the famous prophecy of Isa. lii. and liii., "He is despised and rejected of men," &c., refers not to the Messiah, but to the Prophet Jeremiah (p. 72). The author of portions of Isaiah is the apocryphal Baruch, to whom also is due "a recasting of Job and of parts of other books" (p. 75); the book of Daniel was written in the reign of Antiochus by a "patriot bard" (p. 76); and the book of Jonah contains "a late legend founded on a misconception" (p. 77). "In fact the Bible is the written voice of the congregation, and we are not to call the sacred writers passionless machines, and Luther and Milton uninspired" (p. 78).

Having thus dealt with the Bible, it will hardly be surprising that the whole Christian system receives a new theory. Under Bunsen's system, in its Founder "is brought to perfection that religious idea which is the thought of the Eternal, without conformity to which our souls cannot be saved from evil" (p. 80); the plain meaning of which sentence needs no elucidation from us. Justification by faith means peace of mind, not "the fiction of merit by transfer" (p. 80). Regeneration "is an awakening of

forces of the soul" (p. 81). Salvation is "our deliverance, not from the life-giving God, but from evil and darkness" (p. 81). Propitiation is the recovery of peace—the eternal is the spiritual—the hateful fires of the vale of Hinnom "serve as images of distracted remorse" (p. 81). "Heaven is not a place so much as fulfilment of the love of God" (p. 82). The incarnation becomes spiritual. "The son of David by birth, becomes the Son of God by the spirit of holiness. What is flesh is born of flesh, and what is spirit is born of spirit" (p. 82). The Trinity is stated in language which is too long to cite, and which we shall not presume to interpret—indeed we should have thought it orthodox, since it is unintelligible and self-contradictory, were it not that we are assured that it is free from the prevailing error of destroying by inference the unity (p. 88). This, however, like the rest, is the view of Baron Bunsen.

Whilst Dr. Temple has thus reduced the national position of the Hebrews to the level of the Romans, and Dr. Williams has reduced the critical authority of the Bible to the level of Livy, we are raised to broader ground in the third essay. With the instinct of the man of science, the late Professor of Astronomy eloquently rejects the mere notion of miracle or violation of the laws of nature. What marks his view is the avoidance of all secondary discussion, and his hold of "the grand foundation conception of universal law" (p. 133). Miracles, indeed, in the popular acceptance of something at variance with nature and law, are repudiated not on the general objections of Hume and his school, but because intellect and philosophy "disown the recognition of anything in the world of matter at variance with the first principle of the laws of matter—the universal order and indissoluble unity of physical causes" (p. 127). "Christianity as a real religion must be viewed apart from connexion with physical things" (p. 128). We shall hereafter point out that this view of law is not carried far enough. It is sufficient now to observe that the whole supernatural element is eliminated from belief.

In the very able essay of Mr. Wilson we are carried to a still broader and firmer footing, in which we may "embrace in one panorama the whole religious history of mankind, of which Christianity then becomes the most important phase" (p. 158). We may admit that the authors of the Scriptural books have in certain matters, (as in original sin,) "represented to us their own inadequate conceptions, and not the mind of the Spirit of God" (p. 154). "Doctrines concerning salvation to be met with in it (the New Testament) are for the most part applicable only to those to whom the preaching of Christ should come" (p. 157). In respect of the heathen we must draw our conclusions "rather from reflections suggested by our own moral instincts, than from

the express declarations of Scripture writers" (p. 157). Indeed the authority of the Gospels is not placed high; for they are represented as not perfectly genuine and authentic, "nor without admixture of legendary matter and embellishment" (p. 161, n.). As to the Old Testament, it is put on the same level of authority as Livy, for "previous to the time of the divided kingdom the Jewish history presents little which is thoroughly reliable. The taking of Jerusalem by Shishak is for the Hebrew History that which the Sacking of Rome by the Gauls is for the Roman" (p. 170, n.). And we are taught that "one may accept literally or allegorically, or as parable, poetry, or legend, the story of the serpent tempter, of an ass speaking with man's voice," &c. &c., "the personality of Satan, and the miraculous particulars of many events" (p. 177). The evils of the indiscriminate use of the Bible are pointed out, in which the uneducated cannot distinguish between "the dark patches of human passion and error which form a partial crust upon it, and the bright centre of spiritual truth within" (p. 177). It is not merely the genealogies of St. Matthew and St. Luke which cannot be reconciled, or the chronology of the Holy Week, or the accounts of the resurrection, but "the aspects of the Saviour as presented to us in the first three Gospels, and in the writings of St. Paul and St. John" (p. 179). But Mr. Wilson's speculations rise far above philology or historical criticism. That which distinguishes his view is the strength with which he grasps the social aspect of the question. He sees religion in its relation to the State and to nations. It is in this spirit that he repudiates "an isolated salvation, the rescuing of one's self, the reward, the grace bestowed on one's own labours, the undisturbed repose, the crown of glory in which so many have no share, the finality of the sentence on both hands—reflections on such expectations as these may make stubborn martyrs and sour professors, but not good citizens; rather tend to unfit men for this world, and in so doing prepare them very ill for that which is to come" (p. 196). It will be wondered by most men how these are eliminated from the Gospels. It is done by the agency of Ideology, a weapon of tremendous power. By it the facts are eliminated, the ideas remain. "The spiritual significance is the same of the Transfiguration, of opening blind eyes," &c., &c., whether, in fact, it happened or did not. Again, respectfully but firmly we ask, does or does not this apply to the Incarnation, the Resurrection, and Ascension?

After all this, the defenders of the Mosaic cosmogony scarcely needed or deserved so remorseless an exposure as is contained in the fifth essay. It is sufficient for us to mention that the objections brought against it are "not that circumstantial details are omitted, but that what is told is told so as to convey to ordinary

apprehensions an impression at variance with the facts" (p. 231), and it is dismissed as the "speculation of some Hebrew Descartes or Newton" (p. 252). Such a view is indeed suggestive, and is capable of unlimited expansion. The sixth essay forms an admirable page in the history of doctrine. Nothing but good can result from an inquiry so patiently and candidly conducted. Being, however, purely historical, it does not share directly in the general scope of the volume, nor can our objections to that fairly apply to this essay. It is remarkable, first, as expressing the discredit into which the Analogy of Butler has lapsed in Oxford; secondly, as an unanswerable and suggestive repudiation of a long line of conflicting apologists. The last essay expands and illustrates the principle of the first. "*Interpret the Scripture like any other book,*" says Mr. Jowett. Some of the results of such a method are the following. It condemns those who deny "the discrepancies of narrative," "the failure of prophecy," or who "interpret the language in which our Saviour speaks of His own union with the Father by the language of the creeds" (p. 343). The Old Testament attributes to God actions at variance with the higher revelation of the Gospel (p. 347). In the latter we have variations of fact. We are to be prepared for the discovery that man spread from many centres, not from one, and for new conclusions respecting the origin of man (p. 349). Some of the texts respecting the Divinity of Christ are discredited or qualified (p. 352). St. Paul "does not speak of Him as equal to the Father, or of one substance with the Father" (p. 354). We are not to suppose that "He was and was not tempted," &c., &c. (p. 355). But a Unitarian interpretation is no less deceptive than a Trinitarian (p. 355). The Personality of the Holy Spirit "is spoken in a figure" (p. 360). Original sin rests on "two figurative expressions of St. Paul" (p. 361). Indeed, it is implied that Christianity is at variance with the intellectual convictions of mankind (p. 376). This antagonism the writer hopes may be removed, "when it is considered whether the intellectual forms under which Christianity has been described may not also be in a state of transition and revolution" (p. 420); which can only mean whether the creeds may not be remodelled as occasion may require. Thus, in a word, from one end of this book to the other the same process is continued; facts are idealized; dogmas are transformed; creeds are discredited as human and provisional; the authority of the Church and of the Bible to establish any doctrine is discarded; the moral teaching of the Gospel remains; the moral sense of each must decide upon its meaning and its application. Now in all seriousness we would ask, what is the practical issue of all this? Having made all these deductions from the popular belief, what remains as the residuum? How

far is the solvent process to be carried? Are all formulæ whatever discarded, or what materials remain to form new? In their ordinary, if not plain sense, there has been discarded the Word of God—the Creation—the Fall—the Redemption—Justification, Regeneration, and Salvation—Miracles, Inspiration, Prophecy—Heaven and Hell—Eternal Punishment and a Day of Judgment—Creeds, Liturgies, and Articles—the truth of Jewish history and of Gospel narrative—a sense of doubt thrown over even the Incarnation, the Resurrection, and Ascension—the Divinity of the second Person, and the Personality of the third. It may be that this is a true view of Christianity, but we insist in the name of common sense that it is a new view. Surely it is waste of time to argue that it is agreeable to Scripture, and not contrary to the Canons.

From the general extracts which we have made, we think it will be seen that this book does radically destroy not a part, but the whole of the popular belief; and that it is designed with very considerable accord and unity of purpose. It will be necessary, however, in order to form a true view of its object, to consider the leading theories and principles put forth in the various essays, and to follow them to their legitimate conclusions.

The essay of Dr. Temple, with which the volume opens, strikes us as at once the strongest instance which the book contains of fatal concessions distorted into specious apology. He starts with the pregnant idea of the gradual development of the human mind. He reads in history each age incorporating into itself the results of the preceding, and transmitting them in new and fuller forms to its successor. He sees the spiritual unity of the human race. In a word, as we have said, he adopts the positivist conception of mankind as a colossal man possessing life, and growth, and mind. This principle we regard as the most profound truth contained in this entire volume, and we ask no other with which to judge it and to test it. But we cannot say that it leads us to the same conclusions which are seen in it by the Head Master of Rugby. If this is in any sense the grand conclusion of history, is it not clear that no single race, or age, or system, can be raised into exclusive prominence, be it Jewish, Christian, or Ecclesiastical; that the worst disturbance of this whole is anything which breaks this series, or disjoins this unity, or violates this harmony; that no theory of religion can be sound which does not comprehend all these human forces, societies, and histories? And does Dr. Temple pretend that this is done by a meagre classification of the four great Educators of the human race, the Hebrews, Rome, Greece, and Asia (*i. e.* Babylon and Assyria), whilst the Church, combining the teaching of the four, is, in its growth, the development of the human race? Certainly these are the only

portions of mankind whose existence is recognised officially in colleges and schools ; but surely these are meagre proportions for the colossal man. This is no adequate theory of universal history. Were not the Egyptians as much as the Jews "pioneers in civilization?" Were no primeval societies raised in the plains and valleys of Asia? Are Confucius and the infinite millions who have lived and died under his dispensation drops in the ocean of humanity? Did Buddhism do nothing for "the principle of purity," or was Mohammed a feeble teacher of "the idea of monotheism?" To ignore so much in the past may be the singular result of a classical education ; but to drop out of mankind the vast majority of the human race is an astounding proof of the narrowness of the Christian teacher. The stupendous theocracies of the past and the present, the countless masses who have been and are held together in the faith of Islam, the infinite myriads of Buddhist societies, the polytheistic and fetishist races sown broadcast over the whole earth, each have their great prophets, play their part in the destiny of the race, and form real elements of its life. The old faith consigned them to hell ; the new, it seems, reserves them for annihilation. The colossal man shrinks into one tenth of the human kind ; the development of the race is another term for the growth of the Church.

Again, supposing that the educators of mankind are reduced to four great systems or races, is it clear that the Hebrews exercise so overshadowing an influence? We are told that the main results of their teaching were the "idea of monotheism, and the principle of purity." Does that alone place them above and apart from the other three? Did no others contribute even towards these results? Did Plato teach us nothing concerning monotheism, or Aristotle nothing concerning purity? Or let us grant that the Greeks taught, but did not practise ; can the noble elevation of the Roman citizen be compared with the inhuman exclusiveness of the Jew? Surely there are negative results of the Jewish influence. The spirit of persecution, extermination, and narrowness is not Greek. Is Calvinism derived from the Roman or the Jewish temper? Whence come the notions of hell and damnation, of the God of battles, of Pharisaism, and Bibliolatry? Nor are these things trifles, if nothing can be so repugnant to the notion of the unity of man, no temper so pernicious of the progress of the race, as the spirit of cruelty, of pride, of isolation, and of formalism. Yet these are the educators chosen out for a sacred prerogative, their leaders specially honoured, their writings specially studied, their spirit specially imitated. We repudiate them in the world, but we consecrate them in the Church. Finally, to put all these considerations aside, and taking the view of Dr. Temple himself, "that the

Hebrews may be said to have disciplined the human conscience, Rome the human will, Greece the reason and the taste, Asia the spiritual imagination ;" is it a reasonable conclusion from this "that the immediate work of our day is the study of the Bible?"

Again, supposing the "idea of monotheism" evolved by the Jews raises them high above all ancient nations, and throws Mohammedanism into utter obscurity ; at least there has been one phase of faith even superior to that. The Church itself is here represented as the combined result of the Greek, Roman, and Eastern systems ; and this view we have no desire to dispute. All that we dispute is, that it is co-extensive (actually, morally, or spiritually) with mankind. But if the Church, gathering up the results of the past systems, adds to them and combines with them, the whole essence of Christianity, the growth, the teaching, the spirit of the Church, must be by far the greatest fact in the history of religion. It must present by far the most perfect system ; it must itself go on to develop those truths more fully and more nobly. "If the creeds and doctrines, the opinions and principles, of the successive ages are the thoughts of the colossal man," and "if he grows in knowledge," surely his newest thoughts, his latest creeds, after the long process of education and reflection, must be the loftiest and the soundest. It must be the growth of the Christian Church, at least, which we must study. If it be not a state of society which retrogrades, its latest manners must be its noblest. Or even supposing that no definite period can be fixed, at the very least it must be Christian literature which must be our Bible. It must be the Catholic ages which must be our standard, and the Fathers of the Church our teachers. Why read Isaiah, when Dante prophesies of a still nobler monotheism, made brighter than the Jew's with every Christian grace ? Why look only to St. Paul, when St. Bernard preached, not to the infancy, but to the manhood of Christian societies ? Why do our congregations chant daily fierce war-songs from the Psalms, rather than the tender prayers of Kempis, or the solemn invocations of Milton ?

It must be admitted that the writer, whilst insisting in the main on the gradual development of the human mind, does seem to imply two very potent exceptions, or disturbing causes—viz., an external Revelation, and a miraculous Incarnation. It might be sufficient to point out that the principle on which these rest is surrendered in nearly each of the other essays. But, apart from that, it is utterly irreconcilable with any real theory of development. When once the idea is grasped of continuous advance in the human mind, it excludes that of arbitrary breaks and unnatural illuminations ; he who understands the meaning

of law, whether laws of matter or laws of mind, treats with contempt the notion of miracle in either. When once it is seen that successive phases of thought in the individual, or the race, are evolved in logical sequence from the ideas which precede them, the mind shrinks from the mere contemplation of external revelation. In short, once admit that Jew and Gentile, Roman and Churchman, have each contributed their share to the common teaching of the race, and formed not merely our politics, but our religion, the idea of a special supernatural revelation, through any one of the joint teachers, becomes a puerile anomaly. If the Babylonians were "selected to teach the Jews the immortality of the soul," and the Jews to teach us the idea of monotheism, how does the revelation vouchsafed through the Jews differ from that vouchsafed through the Babylonians? If the Babylonians "evolved" the one idea, may not the Jews have simply evolved the other? Once grant both to be parts of one whole, and each is as much or as little inspired as the other. (Once place them in a common series, and it is impossible to attribute the one to known laws of the mind, and the other to arbitrary interposition; the code of Manu to a great man, and the code of Moses to God.

But if the supernatural altogether is rejected the moment the idea of intelligible law or continuous life in the history of the human mind is admitted, most of all irreconcilable becomes the great crown of the supernatural—the Incarnation itself. What is the relation which that doctrine bears to the theory of the unbroken life of the race, and the gradual development of its mind? Can any break in the personal identity of the colossal man be more entire? Is it possible to conceive the same stream of life flowing on by regular and natural laws, after, as before that stupendous crisis? Did this human organism, fraught with the vast results of ages, and big with a life which stretched over myriads of years, once, by some mystery, bear within itself for a brief span the Maker of itself and all things, and then again renew the slow toil of its growth, according to the same regular laws, and with the same painful efforts? Or, if that be too strict a reading of the doctrine, did it in any sense once become illumined with Divine wisdom and holiness, and then forget the lesson no less miraculously than it previously had learnt it? In a word, is it rational to conceive the human race as one living and growing whole, and yet believe that it once contained a man who did not receive his knowledge or his character from any earlier teacher, or by any natural process, and who communicated and communicates his thoughts and wishes by other than the ordinary means? It would be as easy to conceive a human being, a part of whose body was exempt from

the laws of his physical nature, or a part of whose life had been that of a totally distinct species of animal.

The fact is that the whole essay is a mere mystification. Dr. Temple does not adopt, and scarcely, perhaps, comprehends, the notion of the life of the human race, or its growth by invariable laws. His view of the colossal man is a mere rhetorical phrase, recklessly borrowed and loosely adapted. We spend so long upon it for two reasons. In the first place, it is a flagrant instance of the habit now prevalent amongst Churchmen (though rare in this book) of snatching up the language or the ideas of really free-thinking, and using them for their purposes in a way which is utterly thoughtless or shamefully dishonest. The pedantic education and the shuffling morality of the Universities, too often leads them to adopt the principles of hostile criticism, in the spirit of the rhetorician or the sophist. They turn criticism into apology by a trope, and twist an axiom of science to support a popular error. How this has been done with the first chapter of Genesis the world now knows, and the Church knows also to its cost. But the identical process discredited for the cosmogony still flourishes for the rest of the Bible; and day after day we see the latest conclusions of philosophy and science travestied into Hebrew phraseology, to defend the pretensions of an official Church.

In the second place, the view put forth in this Essay is important, because it is that which runs more or less through the whole volume. We are far from attributing to the other writers the same audacious inconsequence, and the same spirit of glib adaptation, but we find in each of them the same leading principles. The notion of a progressive development of religions, of the evolution of creeds according to known laws of the mind, of the unbroken sequence of human thought, is present to all. All look to an ultimate transformation of the very framework of belief, reduce the Jewish and the Christian dispensations to portions of one stream of thought and faith, and the Jewish and Christian Scriptures to parts of the common literature of mankind. To all which we answer generally, that the notion of continuous development not only excludes that of mysterious revelations under any disguise, but excludes any possible theory of a perfect, or even a superior, light having been seen in the past, or an ideal, or even a desirable, standard having ever yet been attained or conceived by man. We need scarcely add that it repudiates the exaltation, much more the consecration, of any book or set of books representing a single phase of belief, and one peculiar section of the race; much more so, if such phase be very old and very imperfect, and such book be proved to be hopelessly corrupt and quite unauthentic.

The latter link in the argument is adequately supplied by the second essay in the volume. Dr. Williams gives us an able summary of the best results of Biblical criticism, and the conclusions of modern Hebrew scholars. Of his work we desire to speak with much respect, whilst we shall push his arguments to their logical deductions, from which his position, or his special studies, perhaps, incline him to abstain. After the extracts already made, it will be sufficient to say, that it subjects the entire Scripture to a process which combines that pursued by Niebulur upon Livy, with that of Wolf upon Homer. In short, the truth of the narrative and the identity of the authors disappear together. It becomes a medley of legend, poetry, and oral tradition, compiled, remodelled, and interpolated by a priestly order centuries after the times of its supposed authors. And this applies to the New Testament (though in a much less degree) just as to the Old. The process with which classical scholars are so familiar is renewed. The bits of old songs or laws are skilfully picked out of the Pentateuch, which is shown to have been put together under the kings by the priesthood, who recast, and perhaps fraudulently invented whole books. The prophecies become sermons of every variety of spirit and purpose. The Psalms become a sort of Hebrew anthology of every possible merit and date. Thus, the Old Testament is reduced to a very fragmentary and very untrustworthy collection of the literature of a certain Arab race. The grand spirit of Moses grows as dim in the dust of centuries as that of Numa. Sinai moves us as little as the cave of Egeria. The primeval poems are distorted into prose by some college of pontiffs or augurs; and the war-songs of old heroes are hammered out into dreary narratives by the designing ingenuity of a caste.

The process does not, of course, go so far with the New Testament, though it must suffer from the proximity of such a neighbour. The first three Gospels were put together from the floating and variable traditions of the Early Church, no man knows how or when. As much might be said for the "Lives of the Saints." The fourth Gospel, on which so much is rested, is very late, and certainly not by St. John. Indeed, the only thoroughly authentic portion of the whole Scripture seems to be the Epistles—those of St. Paul, that is to say, for many of the others are very suspicious. In the writings of St. Paul, then, we do reach a firm point, of which author, date, and genuineness are certain; but even these, unfortunately, contain corrupt readings and additions, or call them forgeries, on cardinal points, made in the early days when the Church "was creating its theology."

Was ever a literature so provokingly unreliable? The mind wanders over the waste of waters like the dove seeking dry land.

We listen for the true words of the great ones of old, but they strike a dull and confused utterance on the ear. Is this the book, or rather collection, which these writers place in the hand of every peasant and every child? Is this the world-wide source of life and truth—this the surest, noblest outgrowth of ages, and the volume that they consecrate for all time and all races?

They answer, Yes; and they direct us to the sublime poetry of Isaiah, the touching love of the Gospel, and the noble devotion of St. Paul. The world will be in its dotage when these are undervalued or forgotten. But is this enough to consecrate the volume in which they are contained, where so much is uncertain, so much contradictory? Will the ignorant and the poor turn only to those pages, when they are told the others have so much less value? Will it be still Revelation to them, when they know not of what or whom Isaiah may be speaking, when they cannot be sure that they are reading the true words of Christ, and when the doctrines of St. Paul may possibly be spurious, and are comparatively unimportant? These writings will still be read, as the poems of Milton or the allegory of Bunyan will be read; but in what sense will they remain an exclusive standard of belief and a supreme guide of life? It is possible that, had these books been first represented in this character as great but unequal works, they might have been thrust by habit into an exclusive respect, but having been once invested with a mystical sanctity, they must descend from their place of authority (if at all) to one even below their due rank. The mass break idols they no longer worship; they repudiate the guides in whom they had placed an extravagant trust. Our new teachers point out that their idol is but wood and stone, but wish them to retain it on the altar for its beauty and its age. They discredit the veracity of the oracles, and think mankind will still consult them for the poetry of the responses.

These writers, indeed, seem utterly to misconceive the entire question. Their task is not to show that these writings have sublime beauties, teach eternal truths, and are tolerably genuine, but to show why (not being mystical), and being so very unequal and so utterly uncertain, they should take their place above all other writings, consecrated, canonized, and venerated. It is rather hard to have the Hebrew records shown to harmonize with the full stream of human thoughts, for the mere purpose of placing them over and outside the whole current of which they form part. We are asked to venerate the old prophets, not as seers, but as poets, and then are told to venerate no other poets like them. We are desired to see in the Jewish nation the purpose of ages moving onwards through their history, and then asked to

ignore the purpose of ages moving through the history of far nobler and greater nations. It is not that Hebrew poetry is not great, but that Christian poetry is greater; it is not that there is nothing to be learned in the history of the Jews, but that there is more to be learned in the history of the Romans; or if any insist on the spiritual life of nations in the history of the Church. Man for man, race for race, the comparison is hardly possible, and Dante towers above Isaiah as much as St. Bernard above Samuel.

If this be true, the maintenance of that race and its literature in unnatural prominence under any pretence, or with any theory of interpretation, is an evil and a delusion. We do not want canons to interpret Scripture—we want to know what makes Scripture at all; we do not wish to learn how far or how little it agrees with science—we wish it to take the place that science shall assign to it. In the meantime we desire that if the Bible or any part of it be retained as Holy Writ, it be defended as a miraculous gift to man, and not by distorting the principles of modern science. Let them be assured that there exists no middle course, that there is no inspiration more than natural, yet not supernatural; no theory of history agreeable to science, though not scientific; no theology which can abandon its doctrines and retain its authority. The position of Scripture either rests on external authority, or is a thorough perversion of a sound estimate of literature. The Bible can hold its place either by a divine sanction or by glaring injustice to the other writings of mankind. The question is not whether, stripped of that sanction, it is worthless, but whether other books are not equally valuable. The fact is, that it retains its hold upon many cultivated minds by its literary power, but that by no means proves that it will do so with the uneducated mass to whom it has so long been an inscrutable law. In short, the plan is one which reduces the whole Bible to the position of the Apocrypha. In them we have books which claim no very high authority, and are not used to establish any doctrine, “but which the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners.” There are fine things in these books, and they possess indirectly a sacred character; yet the mass of mankind about us know nothing of them, never read them, or are guided by them. They have sunk into the same neglect as the Catholic legends or the spurious epistles and gospels of the Church. The world even gives a very harsh sense to the term “apocryphal.” Here, then, we have the actual case of portions of the Hebrew records preserved for their value, but shorn of their authority. If this is the position which Scripture is to hold in men’s minds, its claims are undoubtedly placed singularly low.

But there is no necessity to consider what would probably happen in such a case, when we have the identical situation already in history. At the Reformation, the whole Catholic literature and apparatus, long venerated as divine, having by degrees lost its practical influence on man, was openly attacked as untrue and unauthentic. The Protestant people to whom its want of authority was shown, rudely rejected the whole with disgust and scorn. Yet there were noble things in that literature and that art; they were the work of holy men, and produced in ages of intense spiritual life. But that could not rescue them from the popular indignation. They were shown to have spoken falsely to men, to have claimed an inordinate place, and, in part, to have been manufactured for personal motives; and they were trampled under foot. What would it have availed men to come forward to show the fervour, the devotion, the poetry of these legends, to have shown that the lives of the saints had, not indeed a literal, but an ideal truth, or if handling the very strings behind the winking images of saints, they dilated on the devotional feeling of a statue or a picture? The mass of mankind cannot easily forgive to have been deceived, and they have been deceived in this case, whoever may have been the cause. There is no reason to fear a reaction of similar violence. The natural indignation of the Protestants was increased by fanatical and political excitement. Men are now wiser and rather less earnest. The Catholic legends now would be preserved as noble remnants, the pictures of the Madonna enshrined in museums if no longer in chapels, and the annals of martyrs, saints, and heroes still read and cherished with love and pride. But it would be irrational to ask men to retain all these in the old post of rank, to be still the authoritative voice of the Church, still the comfort of men's lives and the guide of their actions and their hopes. It may indeed be said that the Reformation, whilst sweeping away the Catholic literature, still contrived to retain the Bible with even increased authority. But in the first place its authority was never supposed to rest on the same footing as the "Lives of the Saints." The word of God was always a different thing from the word of the Church, and the attack then was on the latter. In the second place, there is no portion of the Scripture—not even the Gospels—which they now save from a devouring criticism. They do not say that certain books are not inspired, but that there is no inspiration. They yield not the authenticity of parts, but the authority of the whole.

There is, however, a totally different side of this question. After all, the really fatal objection to the Scripture is not that it is deficient or occasionally superfluous, and does not contain much of great value which other writings do (as our authors

readily admit), but that much—nay, very much—of what it does contain is actively injurious and positively repulsive. This objection, indeed, is now, through moderation and good feeling, not often insisted upon, but it must not be supposed to be abandoned. There is no desire now for violent iconoclasm, and the savage and even brutal attacks of the last century have produced perhaps too strong a reaction. It may again become a duty to hold the same argument with a gentler temper and more guarded words. He who feels keenly the baneful influence diffused through the inmost fibres of social and private life, cannot tolerate that it should be prolonged in the very name of society and morality. And if advantage be taken of the very moderation of our language, it is time to point out the powerful substratum of truth in the fierce invectives of Voltaire and Paine. With regard to the Hebrew portion, indeed, it is allowed that it can do nothing more than represent the spirit and life of the Jews, and perhaps does very scant justice even to that. Now, in spite of their monotheism, which they held in common with other oriental races, the Jewish national character abounds in repulsive features. The very orthodox believer admits it in order to heighten the miracle of inspiration. It is not enough to say that they were surpassed by the Romans in this and the Greeks in that virtue; it must be shown that they were free from fatal defects. We ask whether morbid pride, egotism, and ferocity, inhuman hate and frantic fanaticism, superstition and hypocrisy, went for nothing in the national character? And then we go on to ask if this spirit does not and through ages has not shed its blight upon men, and if so, through what agency? Why, all history scarcely shows a race whose character was distorted by such hateful vices. And is it not true that their character, such as it is, runs through every page of their literature, as, indeed, could not be otherwise? It poisons their wild mythology and their sanguinary annals, it stiffens the Mosaic ritual into a debasing formalism; their national songs choke with the thirst for vengeance, and the warnings of their prophets are veiled in a gloomy horror. *Again we say we yield to none in honouring what else they have—much that no other books in the world equally possess. What we insist on is, that it is mixed up with an immense percentage of evil. This is not a matter to be dismissed by a parenthesis or a metaphor. It is hardly fair to talk of “flaws” and “patches,” nor does it meet the question to call all this an imperfect revelation. It is trifling with us to say that the Mosaic ritual was given for the “hardness of men’s hearts,” and some impracticable vision is a “counsel of perfection.” We say that evil is evil, and are not willing to adopt the view of Mr. Emerson, that it is a lower form of good. What

we maintain is, that the book which they insist on retaining on the altar and the hearth, for reading in the congregation, and for meditation in secret—the book for *all*—for white and black men, for the poor, the sick, and the child, contains inwoven into its fibre some of the very principles of a bad heart and narrow head. Is it possible to give a moral interpretation to all the legends of Genesis? How many pages are occupied with the upholstery of the temples and the finery of the Levites? Are not the wars of Israel as dreary as those of the Samnites, and far more shocking? Are the turbulent annals of the Judges and the Kings the most edifying things in all history, even supposing them true in fact? Even the golden words of David and his son contain much dross. They are no little discredited by their lives, and distorted by frightful imprecations and a cynical worldliness. Through the loftiest exhortations of the prophets, and far more through the whole history of their lives and actions, there runs a savage fanaticism and occasional instances of sheer monomania. What we want to learn is, in what way this burden of Judaism may be lifted off the conscience of the people. How shall their public and private life be purified from this? Not, we think, by any explanation of difficulties and canons of interpretation—not by still thrusting before their eyes and dinning into their ears with free comments the legends of Dinah and Tamar, the dreary catalogues of Numbers and Leviticus, the maledictions of the Prophecies and Psalms, and the erotics of the Song of Solomon.

We must not stop here; but not farther to wound honourable feelings, we will be brief. The Bible is one; and it is too late now to propose to divide it. We shall only point out that even the moral value of the Gospel teaching becomes suspicious, when the whole miraculous element is discarded. If the signs and wonders are figures of speech, and certain cardinal facts in the life untrue, it discredits, at least in some degree, even the honesty of the dispensation which asserts them, as is always urged with undeniable force against the Koran. We certainly do think that the Gospels assert a miraculous incarnation, resurrection, and ascension; and that the Epistles teach original sin, and a vicarious sacrifice. If this be doubted by our authors, it is sufficient for us to say that such is the impression they have created on all ages of Christians; and thus, intentionally or not, they are responsible for the ideas. At least, we are sure that the notions of eternal punishment and final judgment, of individual salvation, of arbitrary grace, and of spiritual ecstasy, pervade the very spirit of the whole.

It is very easy, indeed, to say that mankind turn to the brighter, never to the darker pages. But is this really so? Are not

rather the two mingled together? It may be easy to say that the cry of the "sword of the Lord and of Gideon," is obsolete, and the spirit of persecution dead. These tempers no longer take the form of outward violence; but they still produce a moral degradation. That which almost stifled the political genius of Cromwell, still makes bad citizens; and the literalism of Knox still hardens many hearts. The missionary still looks on himself as Elijah amidst the priests of Baal; and the whole evangelical world still nurses its pride upon the language of the chosen people. In a word, the cruelty of Calvinism, the hypocrisy of Protestantism, and the bigotry of the Church, are Jewish to the core.

What would these writers say if we proposed to them to elevate the Koran into the rule of life, or, not to be too precise, to adopt it into the canon? In the Koran we have all the qualities which seem to be required by their theory of inspiration. It contains the grandest possible conception of monotheism; sublime poetry; and noble morality. It has been the scripture of myriads of mankind; and the law of mighty nations and conquering empires. It embodies the profoundest thoughts and most venerable remnants of an ancient race, and even the results of oriental Christianity. Lastly—which is its highest claim—it forms the basis of the social, moral, and political systems of peoples who have played a great part in the history of mankind. Would all this suffice for the recognition of the Koran? They would shrink from it with horror. We should be told that it was blood-stained, impure, and extravagant. We should hear that it justified polygamy, slavery, and extermination. We should hear of nothing but its strange legends, fantastic visions, silly miracles, and trivial ceremonial. We should hear this from these Hebrew scholars, but we should not hear from them, that it was not in the main authentic and genuine. But, however authentic or genuine it might be, it would avail with them little to insist upon its transcendent belief and trust in God; its burning devoutness; its moral earnestness; and its practical genius for organization. They would think us mad if we asked them to place it as the guide of life in the hands of the peasant and the child.

This reflection brings us to what is in fact the very essence of the discussion. The question is not, what is the true theory of revelation? but, what is its true extent? We desire to know not only the true meaning of the term, but how much it comprehends; or (as the technical jargon has it), not only what it denotes, but what it connotes. Not only must we learn the true conception of Scripture; but what makes certain books Scripture. Now we maintain that Scripture, as such, has either a supernatural basis, or none at all. Any theory of inspiration which ceases to be

miraculous, unaccountable, and arbitrary, annihilates it. Any other possible definition either includes too much or too little. It either includes an immense amount beside the given books; or it excludes an immense amount that is in them. All the theories of our essayists in fact do both. The problem is a very simple one. Here is a collection of books formed (by the hypothesis) neither by accident, caprice, nor authority, but by wise and rational choice. The task is to show that it contains none that a wise choice would exclude, and all that a wise choice would select. Have these essayists proved that? The problem is obviously hopeless when so stated. There are two elements equally necessary to the ordinary notion of inspired Scripture. The first is an arbitrary selection of the writers; the second is a mysterious or, at any rate, inexplicable value in the writings. The moment one or other of these elements is removed, the retention of the Scripture becomes an irrational anomaly. This volume has been written with the direct object of repudiating both these elements. They have found such a position no longer tenable. The result is obvious. We will follow out this idea in detail. They insist that the writers of these books were not speaking machines or miraculously illuminated; they were great and good men, teachers and priests of men; the educators of the race; the poets who transmuted into sacred song the heart and the brains of myriads and of ages. Let us put their qualities as high as language can reach. Let us imagine any elevation in their characters, contrive any definition of their superiority, until we almost touch the forbidden limit of *superhuman* wisdom. Still they remain men—great men; deriving their insight by and through their fellow-men, transmitting their thoughts by the ordinary channels of persuasion and example. Now does the world show no other great teachers, none equally, or at all comparably great; absolutely none; not even one? Or is not such a notion preposterous? Mohammed is summarily rejected; still others remain. Let the mind pause and ponder on the long catalogue of great names, over the whole extent of earth, and the whole range of history. Let it survey mankind from China to Peru; from the earliest record of Egypt to the latest around us. Does the eye, looking down the vista of ages, and across continents and oceans, rest on no forms but those of these old Arab sheiks, warriors, and bards? Do they tower above all times and all mankind? We put aside all intellectual, political, or poetic greatness. We speak now only of spiritual teachers, the founders of religions, who have taught myriads how to have peace within and with their fellows—Zoroaster and Confucius; the Brahmans and the Buddhists; Numa and Odin are scarcely more dim than Moses. Is it certain that they are utterly unworthy of comparison? Mohammed is a form, certain, distinct, and im-

posing. Is he too utterly beneath the standard of the prophets? If we were speaking to the hardened Pharisees of the day, who see nothing good outside their tribe, it would be useless to continue. But our essayists have deep learning, broad sympathy, and noble candour. They do not condemn all these great spirits to the limbo of foul superstition and debasing priestcraft. They recognise their moral grandeur. They admit that these men, too, gave to their people a dispensation and a law, and led weary hosts into their promised land. For the Christian to consign them to hell, is to condemn his own religion. For the scholar and the thinker to consign them to oblivion, is to sell and prostitute his learning.

Well, but it is said, let these men be honoured to the full; be their history and their writings studied. Still they did not form part of the central current which led up to the Gospel. They did not found that society in which we live; or sow the seeds of that rich harvest which we gather. They are not *our* moral and spiritual ancestors. In the first place, this is not true. Our essayists abundantly prove how much the great oriental systems acted on the Jews; how much, in short, the Bible indirectly owes to Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian, and how much Christianity itself owes to the religious mind of the Roman and the Teuton, and the intellect of the Greek. Besides which, such an argument at once surrenders the whole theory of the "Education of Mankind." It narrows the teachers of the race down into *our* teachers; and can only escape from the dilemma by the monstrous assumption that the "progress of the Church is the development of mankind." In short, to assume that God is educating his creatures, and then that the history of that education is that of the education of the people of Europe, is the exact counterpart of the blind egoism of the Calvinist, who sees no salvation out of the clique of professors. But be it true or false, such an argument is worthless, because it proves too much. If our spiritual and moral ancestors are the inspired authors of Scripture, where is the place in the canon of Plato and Aristotle, of Cicero and Epictetus? Or if these be rejected as teachers of mere human morality or as unspiritual masters, where (since the old Hebrews led *up* to the Gospel, and rudely prepared the way or saw it afar off), where in the canon is the place of the great Christian priests, teachers, and prophets, who led *down* from the Gospel, inspired with its purest light, carrying its message over all lands and into all tribes, and ringing out its simple words into matchless hallelujahs of song?

What are those gates which open to some nameless Levite and some obscure catechumen, and are shut to the great founders of

Christian churches and the lawgivers of Christian congregations? Where is this sacred circle of the blessed, where sit beside the great Moses scribes and copyists, without name or history—some Jonah, Micah, Nahum, and Habakkuk; and beside the great Paul unknown converts and evangelists, or some James or John or Jude; and whence are rejected as unworthy Augustine and Aquinas, the St. Gregorys and St. Bernards, the St. Bonifaces and St. Benedicts, Dante and Milton, à Kempis and Bunyan, Calvin and Luther, Borromeo and Bossuet? Is it *because* the catalogue of Christian martyrs, prophets, and saints is so rich that it is to be utterly excluded; and the whole history of the church ignored, *because* it is so grand and copious? Does the story of the Hebrews teach so much of God, and this nothing? Is the spirit of the Gospels so pure, and of these men so earthly? Is the sacred poetry so lofty, and the profane so tame?

It is the great honour of the Anglican party to have seen this necessity, and to have insisted on it with such zeal, that it is now become impossible, even within the Church, to resist its legitimate conclusions. It will be said against us, however, that it is impossible to admit all these, and irrational to call so incoherent a collection a Scripture. We are far from proposing anything of the sort. We only ask what becomes of a Scripture professing to represent the ideas of our spiritual ancestors, which not only rejects all these, but takes absolutely no more account of them or of the system under which they lived than if they had never existed? We reply that such a Scripture is an anomaly. But we are told the whole history of the Church, the principles, the teaching, and the poetry of the whole Catholic ages, are adequately represented in the Gospels; the germs are there—the rest is the outgrowth. There is the fountain, the standard, and the law. The chiefest utterances of the whole Church are morally, or ideally, or potentially contained in these pages of the New Testament. Now this will hardly suffice when we reflect that there is bound up with this book another many times larger, which is certainly, if not unchristian or antichristian, at any rate prechristian. In what sense does the old Jewish tradition, society, and law represent or harmonize with the Catholic; the Talmudic with the mediæval legends; the fierce old chieftains with the early saints; their war-songs with monastic prayers? Is not the mere presence of so singular a nationality enough to neutralize the power of the whole book as an expression of the spirit of the early Church? Or if this objection appear small, can it, in any sense, be said that the Gospels virtually express the highest utterances, and the truest ideals of the whole subsequent Christian world? They preserve, it is said, the true and pure image of the life and mind of our

moral and intellectual ancestors; or in the oriental hyperbole of Mr. Jowett, "The Bible is Christendom." But it must be plain that we live and act under influences, moral and spiritual, which date from much later ages, and are in no sense represented or even foreshadowed in those books. Surely the whole influence of Catholicism, as well as of Protestantism, can scarcely be summed up so briefly. Let us reflect what we owe to these organizations. The mighty framework of the feudal church; the abolition of slavery; the honoured rank of women; the cultivation of sacred art; not to speak of all the practical and political institutions of all Christian societies, together with the whole system of ritual liturgy and practice with which our daily life is interwoven; and the whole chorus of sacred poetry, fiction, and meditation, is certainly not to be discovered even in germ in the Scriptures by the most ideal interpretation. Yet to do justice to our moral and spiritual ancestors, it should be so. Why, upon the very lowest footing to answer this theory, the Prayer Book should form a substantive part of Scripture. The Liturgy at any rate must be inspired—nay, on the theory proposed, even more than the Gospels; as the invocations of Isaiah teach a "fuller law" than the ritual of Moses which gave them the germ.

But if all history did not protest against being thus idealized, it is equally irrational to suppose such an arbitrary limit of inspiration. These authors take pains to show, that there is through all Hebrew history a growing and regular movement; nothing fortuitous or stationary; all moves on with intelligible and admirable order. The Mosaic dispensation rises out of still earlier and dimmer theocracies; its formalism is succeeded by the riper conscience of the prophets; they are expanded by the new lessons of the captivity. Thus the spirit of the Jewish race rises higher and richer as it lives. Then the new dispensation is attached to the old; all without break, without chance, and without miracle. The Jewish law develops into the Christian, the soul of Isaiah is purified and expanded into that of St. Paul. He, too, takes a broader, grander view of his mission than St. Peter; and the Catholic Church rises up before the dying eyes of the last of the apostles. Let us remember that all this is not taking place in an isolated and exceptional corner of the world. It is carefully shown how all this harmonizes with the great scheme of man's destiny through all ages and races. Greece, Rome, and Asia have each in the meantime been developing their stream, and in the Catholic Church the many streams are combined in one full tide. It neither grows sluggish nor turbid. It swells on in increasing majesty. The Catholic ages rise to new conceptions, and form nobler institutions. Its task widens with its strength. It is bound by the trammels of no law; it bears the spirit of truth in

its own bosom. It goes on ever proclaiming in loftier tones the purpose of God running through all ages. Such is the high argument of this book; but how does it square with the canon of Scripture? We are told that this canon embodies the best forms and utterances of this spirit as it moves onwards. For a time it may be said in some measure to do so. From Moses to St. Paul, the teaching of the long succession of prophets may be said to be represented. Why, then, does it suddenly stop there? The current of sacred inspiration itself does not pause; why, then, this abrupt cessation of its words? It would hardly satisfy us if the Jewish roll were half unopened, and the prophets and the poets rejected as uncanonical; nor if the prophets were divided from each other, or the sacred story closed before the time of Ezra. How much more would it be intolerable that the Gospels themselves should be excluded? or if we were told that the new dispensation was ideally present in the old, and the Hebrew Scriptures were adequate embodiments of the life of Christian societies? Such a suggestion sounds preposterous. But it is not thought preposterous to close the canon in the lifetime of the apostles, and to confine the eighteen centuries of many-sided Christian energy in the scanty formulæ and thoughts of times when not a Christian society existed, and a Catholic Church was a faint vision even to the greatest of the apostles.

The effort to prove that, although inadequate as a representation of succeeding ages, the Scripture surpasses all subsequent writings in intensity and elevation, may for a moment succeed. But such an argument is in the long run terribly suicidal. Directly it is urged, under any possible theory, that the highest and most distinct utterances of the Church were made eighteen centuries since, and stand above and marked off from all later words, the inevitable conclusion rushes in that the Church does not in reality advance, that if it grows in extent it does not rise in true strength or spiritual life—in short, that it does not develop. Such an argument is urged with fatal force against the Catholic Church when it appeals to the purer ages of the faith. Such a view our essayists for their own Church repudiate. The whole spirit of their teaching contradicts it. They tell us how “through the ages an increasing purpose runs.” They insist it is not the growth of the Church alone they see, but of the races of mankind. Ages accumulate and concentrate their store. Conflicting nations are fused into a broader whole. And with all this as a theory of history and religion, they offer to all races the standard and ideas of one, and hold up before the eyes of the present the moral measure of the irrecoverable past.

We now quit this question of inspiration, which is the leading subject of this book, as it is the critical question of our time.

Excellent theories of inspiration are given by our authors, with none of which are we much disposed to differ. Be it the highest utterance of mankind, or the teaching of God to man through man's heart and mind; be it the guiding principle of human life, or the voice of the congregation—all these phrases used in their full and natural sense express a reasonable and probably a sound theory. Such a theory, however, under no reading, can establish the position of Scripture. It rejects much in it, and it requires much beside it. It is not, moreover, a mere question as to the use of a particular book; we are not willing to quarrel about words. And some of our authors, when talking of Scripture, may surrender the consecration, the authority, and even the exclusive use of it as a sacred book. That concession would hardly satisfy our want. The real evil would remain even if the book were not read daily in the congregations and multiplied by the million. To teach in its spirit, to think in its ideas, to use its language, and to judge by its standard, is, we maintain, equally contradictory to a sound view of human history, and not much less injurious to the actual progress of society. This latter purpose at the very least, we think, our authors have avowed; and it is for this that we feel bound to ask all who are thoroughly free to think to reject their teaching. There is little use in denouncing bibliolatry in order to encourage bibliography.

One word as to the moral aspect of this controversy. Of the spirit and tone of this book it is impossible to speak too warmly, nor in refusing to accept the final issue of its argument, would we be wanting in respect to the candour of its authors. "Amicus Plato;" "they are our friends who have introduced this doctrine of ideology." But we cannot but point out the fatal moral aspect of this new defence. The history of the defence of the Bible singularly and sadly resembles that of the defence of the Cosmogony. Exactly the same process is repeated: of constant retreat, ever shifting positions, and industrious extenuation. Science steadily advances and covers the abandoned ground. The Catholic Church thought that the "round world was so fast it could not be moved." Then came Galileo. The Calvinist surrenders Joshua's command; the orthodox Churchman speaks of the "ages," not the days of creation. Then a Buckland or a Miller surrenders the actual, but retains the ideal truth of the whole. Lastly, comes a broader Christian, who looks on the whole Hebrew cosmogony as an unscientific invention. Step by step the Scripture is similarly surrendered. The parallel holds good in detail. First, the accuracy of trifling facts in narrative is doubted. Then prophecies become poetry, and glaring improbabilities are figures. Then candid Churchmen read many miracles and narratives in a spiritual light. Then come earnest,

bold, and learned thinkers, like our essayists, who, laying down an entire scheme of history, make the Scripture fall into its place; and prodigally use every hypothesis of "vision," and "ideology," and "partial revelation," "the spiritual aspects of natural laws," and "the purposes of God in history," and all the well-known apparatus of elaborate and ingenious concordance. Such are, we maintain, exactly in the Hugh Miller stage of the Bible controversy. In the way he strove to defend the cosmogony, they defend the entire Bible. There is one step further to be taken. What they have done to Hugh Miller must be done unto them. They can see in him the futile and fatal nature of his task. They can charge him with representing his Bible as a "series of elaborate equivocations." They can tell him that he cedes the point in dispute, and "admits that the Mosaic narrative does not represent correctly the history of the universe;" that the real difficulty is, "not that circumstantial details are omitted, but that what is told, is told so as to convey to ordinary apprehensions an impression at variance with facts." We might transcribe the whole essay. We might compare it with this volume sentence by sentence. Let any fair mind study it with this view, and read for cosmogony, the Scripture, and for physical facts, historical, moral, and spiritual truths, and he will see a deeper and wider meaning in the sentence than their author originally intended: "The spectacle of able, and we doubt not, conscientious writers engaged in attempting the impossible, is painful and humiliating." They can see that the first chapters of Genesis are "the work of some Hebrew Newton," why hesitate to admit that the rest are the work of some Hebrew Livy? They would hesitate to teach mathematics by the use of the Mosaic Principia; but do not hesitate to teach morality out of some oriental Niebelungen Lied, or the whole duty of man from some Pauline or Petrine Golden Legend.

Such is the manner in which it has been found necessary, by the most advanced thinkers within the orthodox pale, to explain and modify the doctrine of inspiration. It will be of use to inquire, what is the power which has driven them to this necessity? We may answer, that it is the advance of the conception of development. Step by step the notion of evolution by law is transforming the whole field of our knowledge and opinion. It is not one order of conception which comes under its influence, but it is the whole sphere of our ideas, and with them the whole system of our action and conduct. Not the physical world alone is now the domain of inductive science, but the moral, the intellectual, and the spiritual are being added to its empire. Two co-ordinate ideas pervade the vision of every thinker, physicist or moralist, philosopher or priest. In the physical and the moral

world, in the natural and the human, are ever seen two forces— invariable rule, and continuous advance; law and action; order and progress, these two powers working harmoniously together, and the result, inevitable sequence, orderly movement, irresistible growth. In the physical world, indeed, order is most prominent to our eyes; in the moral world it is progress; but both exist as truly in the one as in the other. In the scale of nature, as we rise from the inorganic to the organic, the idea of change becomes ever more distinct, just as when we rise through the gradations of the moral world the idea of order becomes more difficult to grasp. It was the last task of the astronomer to show eternal * change even in the grand order of our solar system. It is the crown of philosophy to see immutable law even in the complex action of human life. In the latter, indeed, it is but the first germs which are clear. No rational thinker hopes to discover more than some few primary axioms of law, and some approximating theory of growth. Much is dark and contradictory. Numerous theories differing in method and degree are offered, nor do we decide between them. We insist now only upon this, that the principle of development in the moral as in the physical, has been definitively admitted; and something like a conception of one grand analogy through the whole sphere of knowledge has almost become a part of popular opinion. Nothing could more strikingly show how deeply this has penetrated, than the consideration of the two books which of late years have excited the most lively interest in English thought. Just as Mr. Darwin has introduced the principle of growth, in one of the most rigid laws of the physical world; so the reception given to the book of Mr. Buckle has proved that public opinion was ripe for the admission of regular laws in the moral. Whatever may be the value of his particular theories, no candid mind could have watched the controversy they evoked without seeing how far men were ready to acknowledge discoverable laws in society. Most men shrink from any broad statement of the principle, though all in some special instances adopt it. It surrounds every idea of our life, and is diffused in every branch of study. The press, the platform, the lecture-room, and the pulpit ring with it in every variety of form. Unconscious pedants are proving it. It flashes on the statistician through his registers; it guides the hand of simple philanthropy; it is obeyed by the instinct of the statesman. There is not an act of our public life which does not acknowledge it. No man denies that there are certain, and even practical laws of political economy. They are nothing but laws of society. The conferences of social reformers, the Congresses for international statistics and for social science, bear witness of its force. Everywhere we hear of the development of the consti-

tution, of public law, of public opinion, of institutions, of forms of society, of theories of history. In a word, whatever views of history may be inculcated on the universities by novelists or epigrammatists, it is certain that the best intellects and spirits of our day are labouring to see more of that invariable order, and of that principle of growth in the life of human societies and of the great society of mankind, which nearly all men more or less acknowledge and partially and unconsciously confirm.

But this conception of law is not confined to the visible results of society; it equally invades the whole province of the invisible action of successive generations. We are just as familiar with the idea of development in the history of the intellect and the heart, of philosophy and of conscience, as in the history of the earth or of society. Systems of science, of concrete or abstract speculation, of logic or of metaphysics, are all invariably represented as moving on in a regular series. A history of the inductive sciences or of psychology, which offered no link of concatenation, would be regarded as a tiresome absurdity. No man could write now without adopting the accretion and transmission of the results of thought. Nor could he rest without at once pointing to the changes, and yet explaining the sequence. An abrupt break, or an unintelligible perturbation would utterly confound and neutralize his theory. To exhibit a uniform aberration or a prolonged stagnation of the stream of thought, would be either to condemn his own theory or the thinkers whose ideas he was recording. If he found that Kant had not adequately received the conceptions of Leibnitz, or that Leibnitz had added nothing to those of Descartes, he would suspect some unsoundness in the Cartesian basis. If the followers of Spinoza had done worse than not improve upon his doctrine, he would be a bold writer who should ask us to go back to pure Spinozism. Lastly, if a man proposed to start *de novo* with ontology upon the metaphysical basis of Aristotle, it would be a strange preparation to show that Aristotle himself could not be brought within the laws of the growth of thought; but that his scheme, after working through the brains of twenty centuries of thinkers, had issued in nothing clearer or surer, but rather had been utterly distorted and misconceived.

The same view holds good equally, but less obviously, in the spiritual as in the intellectual domain. All men more or less acknowledge the development of morality. None, at least, deny a steady movement in the main in public conscience. Most call it the advance of civilization, and they do not mean merely the improvement of material life. Call it what we please, it is the growth of the spiritual, or highest or directing power of the human character. It is an elevation of conscience, an increase

of virtue or goodness, of faith or religion. The term signifies little; the rate, the mode of advance is unimportant. Very few would admit this to the full. Some growth of moral stature all men recognise. Modern States, on the whole, are purer than ancient. The loftiest tones of the old moralists are, on the whole, beneath our level. Plato and Aristotle have their repulsive and their cold tempers to our minds. The Academy degraded women; the Stoics bought slaves. We need not stop there. The history of ages of Christendom is one long story of persecution. St. Bernard condemned Abélard; Calvin, Servetus. Much of the noblest of the reformers is repulsive to us. The solid morality of Butler leaves much to be supplied. All this is obvious. All, indeed, openly accept the notion of *moral* growth. They even go farther. They admit a growth in the conscience; the whole theory of man's duty. Let us consider what this implies. It means an improvement, not only in the practice, but in the conceptions of right and wrong; the growth of man into a nobler being; his rising to a purer and truer sense of his destiny. Surely this is not merely moral growth. It is spiritual, it is religious advance. This, we doubt not, is a hard saying. What, then, is the element in man's moral being which does not advance, and which is not subject to laws? Is it faith? Is it hope? It certainly is not charity. In that we advance. We love our neighbour more wisely and more truly than our ancestors. Is it said that we do not love God more wisely and more truly? Not when we read nobler lessons in His infinite creation, and feel a wider and purer love for the greatest of all His creatures. The line to be drawn, if at all, must be left to others. Let them show some part of our spiritual nature which moves not with our moral, and discover an essential difference, and not an arbitrary distinction. Certainly it will not be done by our essayists. From one end of their book to the other, the notion runs of the growth of the spiritual life of man. Their view is a proof of the strength of this general tendency in opinion; but it is an admirable expansion of it. Indeed, the whole world is ready to talk at all times of ages of faith, or decay of belief, or revivals of religion. The flourishing of churches, or the purification of congregations, testify to the same idea. These views may, indeed, suppose only partial or exceptional rises and falls. But they adopt some notion of sequence and order in spiritual life. The principle once implanted may be left to itself. Their fancies of periodic motion may be left to take their place beside the recurring cycles of Vico. It was a great deal when he saw orderly movements in history. Let us be satisfied that they see methodical revolutions in belief.

Such a confined theory of the growth of spiritual life is cer-

tainly not seen in our essayists. They, at any rate, proclaim the continuous development of religion. From the first page of the first essay, which insists on the advancing movement of the whole spiritual world, to the last essay, which contains a most eloquent expansion of this idea, it is continually present. In the beautiful words of Mr. Jowett, "the end is yet unseen, and the purposes of God towards the human race only half revealed." He feels "that the continuous growth of revelation which he traces in the Old and New Testament is a part of a larger whole, extending over the earth, and reaching to another world." In a word, the history of religion shows a progress by intelligible laws. The analogy of the material and the intellectual domain is extended to that of faith. Such a conception, as we have said, involves two elements. It involves that of advance and that of regularity. Both these ideas, in our opinion, force them to conclusions not only not found in their book, but vigorously contradicted by its entire language and spirit. They are zealous, indeed, in showing their willingness to surrender the notion of violation of physical law, or the mere analogy of the order of the universe. We have no desire to press this further, or to point to their distinctness upon Balaam's ass, or the herd of swine, and their silence on more cardinal miracles. Be it enough that they repudiate all miraculous, supernatural, or arbitrary disturbance of the laws of nature. Science must determine on all *facts*; criticism upon all *events*. We forbear to ask them whither all this tends, and to put one simple and cardinal question—*φωνάρα συνεροῖσι*. It is, however, a graver duty to ask them why this vigorous repudiation of all disorder in the material world, whilst insisting on stupendous perturbations in the moral? Why are all facts contrary to science rejected, and theories contrary to history retained? Why are physical miracles absurd, if spiritual miracles abound? Why does history look forwards, and religion backwards? Why are there no suspensions in the laws of matter, yet cardinal suspensions in the laws of mind? Why use rhetoric to confirm the grand analogy of physical nature, and then use it in the next breath to confound the grander analogy of human nature? Their language is adequate for the one, why not apply it to the other? They see "the grand foundation conception of universal law," "the invariable operation of a series of eternally impressed consequences, following in some necessary chain of orderly connexion." Such a law, we insist, is read more or less distinctly in all human history, life, and spirit. And whatever may be the degrees of precision or extent in our knowledge of these laws, the great principle of an analogy in the order of society pervades all educated minds. That principle our essayists admit, and indeed eloquently express. They do not pursue it to its logical

deductions. We tell them that the whole science of human nature may be very far from presenting a definite system, or a complete theory; but what we are quite certain of even now, is that the whole analogy of history condemns, not merely miraculous events, but stupendous violations of order in the growth of moral and spiritual life. It condemns not merely all stationary forms of faith, but all attempts to train the moral and spiritual life of the present by the light, or in the spirit, or with the hopes (much more than by the words) of one distant and peculiar phase of the past.

The extent to which scientific criticism has undermined the whole framework of doctrine, is sufficiently manifested by the appearance of this book. The manner in which this decay is met is its characteristic feature. It surrenders, in fact, not merely the various points of the doctrine, but the necessity of retaining any system of doctrine at all. This spirit, indicated throughout the volume, culminates in the concluding essay of Mr. Jowett. It is as difficult to say how many of his young hearers this essay will lead away, as it is to say whither it will lead them. The tone of earnestness, tenderness, and courage that breathes through it will prove very fascinating to their open hearts. It possesses, indeed, most of the qualities requisite for a religious revival. Its sympathy for the spirit of Scripture never runs into servility to the words. It is candid to the present, and throws a halo over the selected portion of the past. It brings down all the influence of grand and hallowed phrases upon minds enfeebled by a long training upon sentences and words. It offers imposing theories of mankind made musical with poetry and text to the young brains who are just constructing their first or second "Philosophy of Being." It offers them a bright, not too systematic view of human goodness, and it frees them from the thralldom of intellectual convictions.

That such a view should have success in such an atmosphere is natural enough. We deny, however, that it can have a chance of success with the men and women around us, or that it bears the remotest resemblance to religions or faiths which sustain societies and nations. It acknowledges in sad and eloquent words the prevailing antagonism between our intellectual convictions and our religious professions. It hopes to mitigate the evil by thrusting the intellectual behind the moral element of the belief. The doctrine it leaves as possibly erroneous and comparatively unimportant; it sums up the Gospels in the practice of the Christian life. This is a widespread and very attractive modification, but it is one in which most faiths have eventually terminated. The old polytheism, undermined for ages, ended in the visions of Neo-Platonism. Hypatia confronting Cyril could

show the beauty and the soul of the ancient faith, and surrendering the mythology, interpreted its meaning. The later Buddhism and Sufism of India show the same dilution of the doctrines of Sakya and Mohammed. The Quietists spiritualized Catholicism into a moral perfection, the Wesleyan spiritualized Protestantism into an ecstasy of the soul. Around us the same process is renewed. Presbyterians, Quakers, and Unitarians are casting off the dead frame of their tenets, and seeking to re-vitalize the essence. It seems strange in the present day to be insisting that religious societies must be held together by common opinions, convictions, and schemes of belief, and not by common feelings or practices. Every religion which ever flourished did so by the strength of a body of doctrine and a system of definite axioms. Nothing else could give unity and permanence to its teaching. No collection of maxims or rules of life can last very long when deprived of dogmatic basis and common intellectual assent. The whole teaching and influence of every religion has rested ultimately and entirely on cardinal propositions universally received as true. The authority of the Catholic priest rested mainly on the sacraments—these latter on the scheme of redemption, and that on the divinity of Christ. St. Bernard knew how much his moral power rested on the notion of Transubstantiation; it was through that very dogma that the whole Catholic system was attacked. Nothing but such a basis can satisfy the mind of the inquirer or give coherence to the social body. Moral principles have been found to lead to strife when made the foundation of communities. They cannot be preserved from distortion through every character which receives them, and put no check on intellectual superstructures which utterly overwhelm them. Endless attempts have been made towards union in an ideal life. They have ended invariably in chimera and confusion. It is far from a new thing to propose as a religion the following of the Christian life. It has been done before by orthodox mystics and protesting Waldenses, by Moravians and Latter-Day-Saints, by a Kempis, by Fox, by Fenelon, and by Wesley. Indeed, this is so obvious, that it will hardly be thought possible that our authors can have forgotten it. We are far from saying that they have fallen into the mysticism which has misled many admirable spirits; but what they maintain is built upon the same unstable basis. In this last essay at least there is a deliberate attempt to admit the doctrine as uncertain and transitory, and to bind together the faithful by the imitation of one great ideal. Creeds are discredited as accidental and variable, principles as essential and eternal. The moment one cardinal dogma is surrendered as uncertain or even as provisional, the whole intellectual framework gives way. All the repose, the unity, all the permanence which

rest upon undoubted truths are gone. The unguided feelings, the variety and fluctuation of moral conceptions, take their place in endless agitation and discord. Such a work, indeed, undoes the labour of St. Paul, brought to perfection by the Church. He taught Faith, Hope, and Charity, insisting, indeed, chiefly on the moral truth, but resting it on a system of immutable doctrine. He preached a life of righteousness in this world to be followed by certain glory in the next. He preached "Christ, and Him crucified." Once doubt the certainty of the story or the reality of the sacrifice, and to what will the preacher appeal? He will be left to the truism, "To be good, for it is good to be good." It is useless now to repeat that the whole martyrology itself, stripped of miracle or fable, is left in hopeless perplexity. It is of more use to point out how far that ideal is made up (as, for instance, in the Sermon on the Mount) of those "counsels of perfection" and of that "personal salvation" which are in this book rejected as impossible or immoral. Subtract, indeed, from that all hyper-Christian precepts and the whole theory of the life in heaven, and what remains as a residuum? Not assuredly a religion—a picture of humility, gentleness, and love, a body of beautiful maxims, the ideal of tender hearts and spotless consciences. It is not this which can bring order out of the intellectual anarchy around us, control the whole moral energy of the present, and heal the deep diseases in societies and states.

Our account of this book would be incomplete unless we were to point to the reception it has received. It has passed through two editions, it has been read and discussed within and without the Church, with the hesitation of reflection or the pleasure of surprise. Nowhere has there been seen or heard a sign of official repudiation. These professors, tutors, principals, and masters still hold their chairs and retain their influence. No authorized rebuke has been put forward. They have been left to the bark of the toothless watchdogs of orthodoxy. The authorities of the Universities are paralyzed, and incapable even of a protest. They have had the pain of seeing nearly all the brain and heart of their foundations ranged on the other side; they have issued an order of the day "to ignore so painful a subject." In the meantime, many of the younger members have received it with welcome and assent, many also with welcome, but with slight assent. Indeed, no one that knows the religious state of the Universities could doubt that such a book would be eagerly welcomed, but welcomed only as a partial instalment. Few, perhaps, are aware how far the decay of belief extends beneath those walls.

These are not the days of metaphysical atheism or pedantic logic (at least, out of the ranks of official apologists). It is the

ablest, the sincerest, and the best who feel their faith giving way beneath them. The Church is losing now at once the best heads and the best hearts. It is character, influence, and sympathy with mankind, which now mark those who stand aloof. Are not these seven authors worthy representatives of the best of their order? Others as high in place and influence have spoken less, but have not therefore thought less. Perhaps, if they have been silent, they have found it still more difficult to speak. This volume draws a sad picture of the prevalence of intellectual doubt within those cloisters. That picture is far short of the reality. "Smouldering scepticism," indeed! When they are honeycombed with disbelief, running through every phase from mystical interpretation to utter atheism. Professors, tutors, fellows, and pupils are conscious of this wide-spread doubt. In silence they watch and respect each other's thoughts, and silently work out their own. Above them sit unconscious dignities and powers vaguely condemning pantheism and neology,* or piecing the articles together with scraps of accommodating texts. Such are those seminaries of the Priesthood and the Church, and he who has passed through them has seen the circles of an intellectual purgatory. How long shall this last? The vague intellectual craving, the waste of moral purpose, the sense of blank indifference, are felt even more strongly there than in the world around us. Few indeed now hesitate to see the ultimate source of nearly all social confusion in this severance of reason and religion—this gulf which divides the highest thinking from the highest feeling. It is made far more deadly by the hypocrisy of concealment or the torpor of indifference. It must be a profound evil that all thinking men should reject a national religion. It is almost worse that they should falsely pretend to accept it. In what a network of contrary influences is our daily life passed. All the tenderer and holier of our ties lead one way; all the stronger and more rational, another. The home, the school, and the Church touch chords in our hearts. Life, thought, and society nullify and dispel their teaching. The newspaper, the review, the tale by every fireside, is written almost exclusively by men who have long ceased to believe. So also the school-book, the text-book, the manuals for study of youth and manhood, the whole mental food of the day; science, history, morals, and politics, poetry, fiction, and essay; the very lesson of the school, the very sermon from the pulpit. And all this is done beneath a solemn or cynical hypocrisy. How long shall this last? How long must there be bitterness of heart in every household, and a hardened despair in

* Murmuring at each parody of the absent philosopher a drowsy "damnumus," like the Bishops at the Council of Sens.—*Vide* Milman, "Lat. Christ.," iii. 265.

every vigorous brain? How long shall the mother's words fall coldly on the ear of the son—the prayers of the wife be unmeaning to the husband,—the grey hairs of the preacher scarcely save him from contempt? And (far worse) the masses lie in brutal heathenism, whilst great minds run to seed in selfish, because irreligious efforts? Until men have the courage to bury their dead convictions out of sight, and the greater courage to form new. All honour to these writers for the boldness with which they have, at great risk, urged their opinions. But what is wanted is strength not merely to face the world, but to face one's own conclusions. It is well to say what one really believes. It is better to believe what one really thinks. Even more necessary now than courage in act is honesty in thought. We need that rectitude and tenacity of mind which abhors to deceive itself; and works out the issues of its reasoning without flinching and without fainting. We know the cost. The sense of despair, the shudder of the mind, the tearing up of dear associations, the agony of the family, have darkened the picture of every religious convulsion. It must be endured. Let every one with hearts and brains concur in the inevitable task. Let each who has thought and felt for himself ask himself first what he *does not* believe, and then, if wise or needful, avow it. Next let him ask himself what he *does* believe, and pursue it to its true and full conclusions. Let violent attack be avoided, but the mask of conformity cast off. May no honest mind be disturbed, but hollow peace rejected. If we have spoken strongly, few of our readers are likely to be quite at rest, whilst many are being drawn towards a premature compromise. Let such reflect that no half-measures will succeed. Neither loose accommodation nor sonorous principles will long give them rest. It is of as little use to surrender the more glaring contradictions of science as it is to evaporate a discredited doctrine into a few vague precepts. Religion, to regain the world, must not only be not contrary to science, but it must be in entire and close harmony with science. Not with one science only, but with all. Not only must it have a place beside philosophy, morals, and politics; but it must guide and elevate all these. Religion, to have strength, must have a doctrine; and a doctrine, to endure now, must embody the outgrowth of human thought. If it be not distinctly proved therefrom, it must at least flow from and sum up the whole. Its intellectual basis must be broad and unimpeachable. The highest efforts of the brain must guide the best promptings of the heart. That end will not be attained by our authors, by subliming religion into an emotion, and making an armistice with science. It will not be obtained by any unreal adaptation, nor by this, which is of all recent adaptations, at once the most able, the most earnest, and—the most suicidal.

ART. II.—THE NORTH AMERICAN INDIANS.

Seven Years' Residence in the Great Deserts of North America.

By the ABBÉ EM. DOMENECH, Apostolical Missionary, &c. &c. Illustrated with Fifty-eight Woodcuts by A. Joliet; Three Plates of ancient Indian Music, and a Map, showing the actual situation of the Indian Tribes and the Country described by the Author. 2 vols. London. 1860.

“TWO centuries ago the Indians of North America numbered about 16,000,000 or 17,000,000 souls, without including those of Mexico.” The present Indian population, comprising that in the British possessions, is estimated by the Abbé Domenech, apparently on good grounds, at 2,000,000. Such, in the New World, has been one of the results of Anglo-Saxon civilization. Neither the religion, nor the science, nor the morality which distinguish this portion of the white race, has proved adequate to avert the usual fatal consequences of the juxtaposition of the superior and inferior Man. Since the period indicated, European civilization has deprived the native Americans of two-thirds of their territory. The policy of the Anglo-Saxon has been to dispossess and destroy the Red Indian tribes. Cherokees, Creeks, Delawares, and Seminoles have all been despoiled of their lands by the cupidity and violence of the white race. Forced emigration, alcoholic liquor, sickness, and epidemic disease are the principal agents in effecting the personal and collective ruin of the Red Man. The approaching extinction of all the large game is an evil still more irremediable. The buffaloes and roebucks are rapidly decreasing. The produce of hunting and fishing is less abundant. Driven from river to river, and from forest to forest, the Red Indian, whom Cooper has celebrated* and Campbell has sung, buries himself in profound deserts, and there “sustains the remnant of a miserable life ever ready to escape him.”

Before the last Indian has killed the last buffalo, before the red race is absorbed by intermarriage with the white, or exterminated by famine, disease, and intestine conflict, the enterprising and courageous missionary, from whose volumes we derive our numerical statement, has penetrated into the depths of his wild retreat, has observed his manners, his costume, his religious rites,

* “Cooper’s descriptions,” says M. Domenech, “are faithful as regards the United States, but not as regards the vast and thickly peopled countries in the West, of which he had no knowledge.”

has watched him in the animating dance, or at the absorbing game, has sighed with him as he muses by his fathers' graves in the far West, or pities him, as he sits on the threshold of his picturesque cabin sucking the red pipe of the *Sacred Fountain*. The result of seven years' explorations and inquiries is given in part by the Abbé Domenech, in his pictorial description of the "Great Deserts of North America;" a book indicating careful research, long-continued and patient observation, and a devout and tender spirit. The exhaustive recital of his wanderings among the Indian tribes is reserved by our traveller for a still more comprehensive work, to which the present is intended to serve only as a "detailed programme." The object of the present elaboration is to give "an exact idea of the great wildernesses of America and of the Indian tribes they contain." In our summary of the interesting facts recorded in these volumes, we shall follow the order of subject thus prescribed by the author himself.

Far from the American plantations, far from the whisky bottle and the small-pox, the primitive type of the Indian with his native faculties and original habits, must be sought in the midst of gloomy and poetic scenery, in the "deep solitudes comprised between Texas on the south, the valley of the Mississippi on the east, the British possessions on the north, and the Pacific Ocean on the west." The central part of North America is divided into two zones. The eastward or forest zone extends, with but little interruption, from the Atlantic to a distance of three hundred miles beyond the Mississippi. In Texas the forests make way for the prairies, which, ascending from south to north, are lost to the west in the waters of the Pacific Ocean. This zone, doubly traversed by the range of the Rocky Mountains and that of the Sierra Nevada, is at once the most remarkable and the least known region of the New World. It is this part of America, the westward or prairie zone, which our author has selected for special elucidation.

The striking pictures of the Desert which we find in these volumes remind us a little of the masterly descriptions given by Baron Humboldt in his "Cosmos." Not that we think Domenech's delineations equal to Humboldt's either in scientific accuracy or in poetic colouring; but they share with them the unusual merit of a real knowledge of nature, and of a vivid emotional expression of that knowledge. The subjective element enters into but does not exclusively predominate in these scenical presentations. Like Humboldt, our Abbé is fond of contemplating nature in its relation to human feeling. To him, and to that still greater traveller, "the physical world is reflected with truth and animation on the inner susceptible world of the mind. Whatever

marks the character of a landscape, the profile of mountains which in the far and hazy distance bound the horizon; the deep gloom of pine forests; the mountain torrent which rushes headlong to its fall through overhanging cliffs, all stand alike in an ancient and mysterious communion with the spiritual life of man."

Deeply impressed with this peculiarly human and poetic sentiment, our wandering missionary penetrated into the northern prairies of Texas. These prairies, some of which are sixty miles in length, are intersected by countless rivers and streams, skirted by a double border of forests composed of cedars, magnolias, sycamores, plane trees, ebony, tulip trees, maples, &c. Day after day, the traveller advances through a wilderness, where nothing marks a beginning or an end, and where all is mute and motionless. He sees only yellow grass or flowers faded by the heat; or the careless-lying deer that prick up their ears as he passes. Bleached bones, rare tumuli, and sepulchral mounds are the sole memorials of man's sojourn here. To the west of Texas, between the Rio Seco and the Rio Blanco, are two plains, broken up into gentle ridges that resemble little waves caused by the ebb and flow of the tide. Over one of these plains a few clusters of acacias are capriciously scattered, like motionless shadows bending over a petrified sea covered with algæ. Grass and flowers grow here in profusion. Partridge, quail, wild turkeys, and deer select this spot for their favourite dwelling. Unhappily rattlesnakes, scorpions, and tarantulas are equally attached to it. In these solitudes the tick or prairie bug sorely persecutes the traveller; the savage Comanche assails him with his arrow, and sometimes he perishes from want of water, the characteristic torment of the great desert.

* The Red River and the lofty table-land of the Llano Estacado constitute the northern boundaries of the province of Texas. Before entering the great prairies of the south-east, the river flows through a wood, called Cross Timber. Over a fertile valley 400 miles in length, graze the mules and horses of the Kioways and Comanches. A little above Fulton may be traced a succession of long, narrow lakes, the consequence of the periodical inundations of the Red River. Each of these sheets of water has its girdle of grass brodered with rainbow-coloured flowers; gorgeous insects, butterflies with emerald and topaz wings, beetles with sapphire breasts are reflected in their liquid mirrors; humming birds, rocked by the breeze, balance themselves carelessly over splendidly-tinted flowers: while, from amid the trees, the dove sends forth her plaintive note, and the mocking-bird whistles his eccentric song.

Three miles below the junction of the two branches of the

Red River may be descried the Wichita mountains, with their blue outlines delineated on the horizon. The plains from which they ascend are enriched with splendid specimens of chalcedony, jasper, and agate. The mountains themselves, which are composed of many-coloured granites, are singularly picturesque and beautiful. Further on, from the summit of a labyrinth of sandy mamelons, which bound the north of a vast plain, may be observed the table land of the Llano Estacado, with a local elevation varying from 1000 to 1500 feet. In these regions of unequal atmospheric pressure, the phenomena of the deceitful mirage are displayed with unusual magnificence. The imaginary lakes and aerial cities over which the fairy Morgana presides here assume their softest outlines and their loveliest hues.

The southern arm of the Red River is famous for a construction more real, but scarcely less singular—the stupendous village of the dogs of the prairie! This village is no less than twenty-five miles in length, and as many in breadth. It consists of subterranean galleries, sometimes nine feet deep, and from four to five inches wide, and of a superstructure formed of the earth, thrown up by these dog-voiced but squirrel-resembling architects. “Towards the end of October, when the dogs of the prairies feel the approach of winter, they fasten up with straw and stems of flowers all the passages leading to their burrows; then they fall asleep until the return of spring.”

From the southern deserts of North America we pass into the great solitudes of the New World. “These immense regions begin at Fort Smith, on the Arkansas, near the Mississippi, and extend as far as the Gulf of California or Vermilion Sea, occupying about 1893 miles of territory almost unknown to Europe.” Following the route traced by nature in forming the valley of the Canadian, a tributary of the Arkansas, you enter the deserts of the south-west at Fort Smith, built on a hill of a micaceous and dark greystone. Undulating plains covered with ash trees, elms, black walnut trees, willows, &c.; prairies dotted with fields of Indian corn, or clothed with pastures on which graze numerous herds of oxen and horses belonging to the Chactas, Shawnees, and Delawares; well-cultivated farms, with orchards and gardens, diversify this magnificently-wooded and splendidly-irrigated region.

Past the Antelope Hills, with their five separate eminences, which serve as landmarks in the southern deserts; past a succession of natural tumuli and insignificant streams, at 157 miles westward of the Dry River, we enter a narrow valley, called the Rocky Dell. In this sequestered spot we may pause to examine the grotto cut in a perpendicular rock, and formed by the Indians into a kind of gallery of fine arts. The floor flags are curiously

sculptured, and the walls adorned with hieroglyphical drawings and paintings. This "savage museum" is pronounced very interesting by our author, who suggests that we may be enabled by its means to recover a few pages of the else unrecorded history of the Indian tribes of these latitudes. Descending the Canadian river, and advancing along the banks of the Rio Pecos, you reach at length the valley of that name, the resort of the ancient tribe of the Teguas. In this delicious solitude, the starry jay is heard from morn to evening. This sociable bird accompanies the passing traveller, flying from bower to bower, and singing all the while, as if to beguile the weariness of the journey. The village of Old Pecos is celebrated as the quondam residence of a peculiar Indian race which legend reports to have offered in their temples human sacrifices to an immense serpent. At Pecos, too, the sacred fire kindled by Montezuma was preserved. It was here that that ill-fated king is said to have planted a great tree upside down, predicting that when that tree should disappear, a foreign race would rule over his people, and that rain would cease to fall; but predicting, also, a final triumph over their oppressors, his own return to the kingdom, and an ultimate supply of fertilizing showers. The prediction, say the Indians, has been thus far fulfilled. "The country has become dry, arid, and deserted; the tree of Pecos fell the very day the Americans entered Santa Fé, and the last priest who guarded the sacred fire died at the same period." To this hour many Indians live in expectation of Montezuma's return. At the village of St. Domingo a sentinel ascends every morning at sunrise to the roof of the highest house, and looks towards the east for the arrival of the divine chieftain, who is to give the sign of deliverance. Thus is it that a kind of Messianic anticipation ever repeats itself among conquered and oppressed nations. The Welsh still cherished the "Breton hope" that "Arthur would come again;" while the people of Charles the Bold refused to believe in the death of their prince, and confidently expected that he would soon reappear to them, so that, even ten years after the defeat at Nancy, "the merchants delivered goods without pay, on condition that they should receive double when the great Duke of Burgundy returned."

Twenty-eight miles from Pecos is the picturesque town of Santa Fé, with its low, square houses, embosomed amid fields of maize—*framed*, to use the vivid language of our author, with a triple belt of mamelons, mountains, and variously-coloured meadows. Santa Fé is the capital of the central district of New Mexico, which is divided into three counties. The northern district has two counties, whose capital is Loceros. The third, or south-eastern district, whose capital is Valencia, is also divided

into two counties. Of its numerous towns, twenty-one, founded before the period of the conquest, are exclusively inhabited by Indians. Beyond this circle, the Nevajos' country occupies an extent of about 15,000 square miles. West of the Nevajos are situated seven towns belonging to the Moquis. To the west and north-west of the Rio Virgen lie the villages of the Yampais. Near the volcanic mountains of San Francisco, and as far as the great Colorado, live the Cosminos. The Tontos occupy the borders of the Rio Verde and the range of the Aztecs; while four tribes find their common home in the valley of the Colorado. The entire ascertained population distributed between 34° and 36° north latitude is estimated at above 149,000. It is in general remarkable for sobriety, industry, honesty, and the conjugal fidelity of both sexes.

Passing through the country of the Zunis and the Mohaves, and crossing the chain of the San Bernardino, near Mount Gabriel, we advance through the garden-like grounds and auriferous regions of California, till journeying in a westerly direction through the valley of the San Joaquin, we arrive at last in the imposing presence of the Sierra Nevada, with its volcanic peaks rising 12,000 and even 17,000 feet above the level of the sea. Scaling this gigantic wall, forty miles east of New Helvetia, where its height does not equal half that number of feet, and following the course of the "Salmon Trout," you arrive at the Lake of the Pyramid. Here, rounding the Great Basin, you can visit the Columbia, Oregon, and the finest deserts of the north-west; traverse forests of pines with cones half a yard long; enter the valley of the Fall River, where the Indians periodically resort for salmon-fishing; listen on the bank of the Columbia to the death-chant of their women at dawn and twilight; or observe the traces of submerged forests of pines along its borders, or the shadowy isles on its bed; or the torrents and streams that roll down the heights or leap from cascade to cascade, "forming at the same time a thousand graceful undulations like gauze streamers;" or descend the *dalles* when the waters are low; or, finally, luxuriating in the delightful climate of Clarke Fork, speculate with our author on the future commercial glories of that promising region.

Crossing the Blue Mountains (so called, perhaps, from the bluish tint thrown over them by the resinous trees that grow there), you penetrate into the great basin—one of a succession of basins of a very singular character; for the rivers and water-courses here do not discharge themselves into the sea, but disappear in the sands of the Great Desert or in the Salt Lakes. The country here is unusually sterile. There is little wood or pasturage anywhere to be seen, and the Indians who inhabit this

strange and melancholy region live in separate families or in small distinct societies, emigrating from place to place in search of the miserable roots that form their only nourishment.

On diverging from the valley of the Bear River, we approach the banks of the Great Salt Lake, constituting with the Lake Utah one of the most curious features of the Great Basin. The Great Salt Lake, which has an elevation of 4200 feet above the level of the sea, extends seventy miles in length; as its briny waters evaporate, they cover the rocks with a saline substance, which forms into incrustations often two inches thick. To the east of the lake lies a vast plain with mountains rising from its centre like islands set in a sea of saltpetre. Beyond this point commences the Sodom-like Desert of the Seventy Miles. The district at which we have now arrived possesses for the social philosopher a peculiar interest. It was close to the river which connects the Utah with the Great Salt Lake that in 1847 the earlier adherents of a religion which, "like other religions, has its martyrs," constructed their now celebrated city. These votaries of a creed which, though a palpable imposture, "is believed by hundreds of thousands, and has been made the foundation of a society in the age of newspapers, railways, and the electric telegraph," flying from persecution, established themselves in this remote desert. On their first arrival they were, excluding women and children, but 143 in number. The Mormon Church now counts upwards of 100,000 members. Advancing in the useful arts and industries, too powerful to be intimidated by the few soldiers whom the United States could oppose to them, with their beautiful and important capital of Utah, and their incipient towns of Paysan, Monti, and the City of the Cedar, the Abbé predicts that this "polygamous community" will long remain the sovereign masters of the territory which they have appropriated. This retrograde step in civilization, to refer once more to Mr. Mill's essay on "Liberty," is surely a fact as instructive as it was unexpected.

From the Rocky Mountains venerated by the Indians as the bridge of the world, in one of whose eminences they place the residence of the Master of Life, and where the Land of Souls, their ideal paradise, their joyful and invisible hunting-ground is situated, our traveller descended into the Great Prairies by the valley of the Sweet Water River, bordered with granite rocks and overgrown with artemis as far as the Devil's Gates. A journey of three hundred miles, through a fertile region often mistaken by novelists and tourists for the far-famed solitude which succeeds it, conducts the wanderer by the eastern side into an immense territory which extends along the Rocky Mountains on the west, Upper Missouri on the north, the Mississippi on the east, and

Texas on the south, and is called the Desert of the Great Prairies. The country is irrigated by numerous rivers. It is only on their borders, or near the watercourses, that the forests of the romance-writer are now to be seen. In the plains covered with a hard herbage, or with heath, wormwood, and artemis, intermittent or bilious fever constantly prevails. The shores of the streams are peopled with myriads of gadflies and mosquitoes, the formidable enemies of men and horses, who, however, happily find an avenger and protector in the dexterous and voracious starling. Calcareous mountains, frightful ravines, the graves of the gold-seeking emigrants, the bone-heaps of innumerable slaughtered buffaloes, a broad and grassless roadway "in the middle of an ocean of verdure whose enormous waves ever follow one another in their eternal mobility," the wind-swept avenue over which, in Indian dialect, "the entire nation of whites emigrating towards the setting sun," passes to the gold-mines of California, are the startling characteristics of this desert region. Rarely is the monotony of these solitudes interrupted. Almost always the traveller finds himself in the midst of an "immense circuit of which he is the centre. All around he sees the same landscape, the same weeds, and the same flowers, and every evening it seems to him that he sleeps on the very same spot where he had rested the previous night." Like the lotus-eater in Tennyson's poem,—

In the afternoon he comes into a land
In which it seemeth always afternoon.

The monotony, however, is sometimes broken by a rich and beautiful flora, by fantastic rocks, by the sandstone peaks of the Black Mountains, where from his throne of thunder-cloud the Spirit of the Storm looks down on plains that "enjoy a perfect calm and a brilliant sun; by thermal waters, sulphureous fountains, volcanic cones, fair valleys shaded by the elm, the cedar, the fir, and cotton-tree: by the *Terres Blanches*, tracts of land white with the slimy deposit of the river, and hardened by the glaring sun, but rich in the fossil remains of the mammoth, the mastodon, antediluvian tortoise, &c., or finally by the small circular places, stripped of vegetation, which wanderers have called the "Circles of the Prairies."

This vast wilderness is the abode of a race, or mixture of races, which has, we believe, no parallel on earth. The heterogeneous population which it shelters is wild, nomadic, murderous, and predatory. In it may be found adventurers of all classes and all countries: the Spanish and Mexican fugitive, the French and American trapper, the dispossessed, infuriated, and vindictive Indian.

Such is the mysterious dwelling-place of the Red Man. A sin-

gular harmony prevails between this desert home and its aboriginal occupant.

The entire Indian population, computed in the annals of the "Propaganda of the Faith" to be no less than 4,346,803, and by Mr. Schoolcraft to be no more than 423,229, is estimated by other writers, as well as our author, to amount in reality to 2,000,000. This aggregate is distributed into nations and tribes. The nation consists of several tribes, who recognise as their principle of union the bond of a common descent. The total number of these tribes is 610. Most of them, however, are all but extinct, being now represented by a few families. The tribes are divided into bands or villages. The bands are composed of from 100 to 500 lodges, wigwams, or tents. Each lodge contains on an average ten persons, of whom every fourth or fifth man is a warrior. Tribal confederations are sometimes formed with a view to mutual protection, and sometimes a tribe is broken up by accidental detachments of individuals, in war or the chase, from the principal corps.

At the end of the fifteenth century, the Indians of North America, according to Mr. Schoolcraft, were distributed into seven principal groups—Appalaches, Achalaques, Chicorees, Algonquins, Iroquois, Dacotas, and Sheshonees. From the Iroquois, the Sioux, and certain members of the Algonquin stock, are derived, says Dr. Latham, the current and popular notions of the American Indian or Red Man; and to one or other of these three primary divisions the Professor refers nine-tenths, and perhaps a larger proportion, of the Indians of the United States. To the classification of Mr. Schoolcraft, M. Domenech attaches little importance. Following an opposite method, he presents us with an alphabetical arrangement of the divisions and subdivisions of the primitive Americans, with a specification of their characteristics, moral, physical, political, and historical. Among them we find the once powerful Algonquin nation, with its nine tribes, formerly inhabiting the country north of the St. Lawrence, and the southern part of Upper Canada; the Apaches, with its eleven tribes, the most important of the Indian populations of New Mexico, but cruel, addicted to plunder, and little amenable to the control of the American Government; the Chactas, numbering from 20,000 to 25,000, a truth-loving and honest people, and neither sanguinary nor cruel; the Creeks, whose territory half a century ago extended from the north of Florida to the States of Alabama and Mississippi; the Dacotas, called by the French Sioux, the parent stock of many important tribes, and with a population still estimated at 40,000 or 50,000; the Moquis, who since their revolt from the Spaniards in the seventeenth century, have contrived to retain possession of their

own beautiful valleys, and who are distinguished by industrial skill and energy; the Shawnees, whose modern history is connected with that of the War of Independence, and who count among their celebrated chiefs, Tecumseh, the patriotic enemy of the Whites; and the Sheshonees, who are settled principally in the Rocky Mountains, and who include among their numerous subdivisions the most miserable of all—the root diggers, the Pariahs of the wilderness.

Such are some of the more prominent nations. Among the more famous *tribes* we may mention the Cherokees, the most civilized and the most suffering of all the Indian populations; the Chippeways, who have best preserved and improved the art of pictography; the Ojibbeways, who reckon eight centuries since they began to move from the Atlantic to the Mississippi; the hospitable, Arab-like, buffalo-eating Comanches, who fight, hunt, smoke, eat, drink, sleep, bid their wives do all the work, and think themselves the lords of the universe; the handsome, long-haired, well-clothed, and aristocratic Crows; the Delawares of the Mississippi and the four great rivers, whose most renowned offshoot was the tribe of the Mohicans; the Iroquois, first the allies, then the deadly foes of the Delawares, to oppose whom they formed the confederation of the Six Nations, about the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth century, and whose government is described as a modification of that of the United States; the Mandans, or Pheasant* People, the traditional legatees of the armorial bearings of Prince Madoc, and the first people created by the Great Spirit; the Natchez, sung by M. de Châteaubriand, but who scarcely exist now save in story; the Blackfeet Indians, with their dark-coloured mocassins and wildly rich costume, broad-shouldered, high-chested, cruel, warlike, and predaceous; the Seminoles, or fugitives, who emigrated to Florida, and waged so long and ferocious a war with the United States; the Senecas, so called from the lake of that name, once the most numerous of the six nations of the Great Indian Confederation (the Mohawks, Onondagas, Cayugas, Oneidas, Tuscuroras, and Senecas), but now numbering scarcely three thousand; and the Zuñis, with their piercing eyes, sometimes blue, and hair, whose colour, generally black, adapts itself to the azure light of the eye. Of the remaining tribes many are known by significant names sufficiently grotesque, as Dog-ribs, Blue-muds, Herring-ponds, Leech-river, Redwind, &c.

The origin of the Indian populations is involved in mystery. Our author agrees with certain American writers who reject the autochthonical theory, basing such rejection on an alleged resem-

* This bird, which is quite unknown to the Mandans, is abundant in Wales.

blance between the religious faith and ceremonial of the Indians and those of the Persians, the Chaldæans, and the Hebrews. On this grave subject his conviction is, "that North America was peopled by the voluntary or accidental emigrations of Scythians, Hebrews, Tartars, Scandinavians, and Welsh; that those individuals or families, after having multiplied, met, and united with each other, and that by the intermarriages of the divers races, the difference of the climates, the change in their mode of living, and several other reasons of a similar nature, they lost their primitive character, and formed this heterogeneous combination of colours, habits, tastes, languages, and religions, which baffles science and the antiquary's researches."

To establish or illustrate this theory, the Abbé refers us to the indications of variety of origin, afforded by historical, physiological, and religious documents, and by the traditions, antiquities, and customs of the red race.

M. Domenech finds, or fancies he finds, in the religion of the Indians, many traces of biblical tradition. Most of the North American tribes believe that the earth was once covered forty days by the waters of the deluge, and that a mountain exists in the east on which a canoe landed, carrying the one white man who was to repeople the world. The wide prevalence of the diluvian myths may, we think, be easily accounted for, without having recourse to the hypothesis of a common Semitic origin. We need not necessarily hold with the rationalizing Bunsen, that they are reminiscences of a real historical flood in Mesopotamia, current among the descendants of a primæval Asiatic people; for they may be, as Humboldt intimates, only fanciful productions of fiction. Given similar geological phenomena, and the same unscientific and imaginative mind to interpret them, and a general resemblance in these mythical beliefs of mankind seems to us to be a natural and even inevitable consequence. Thus, the flood of Noah, the ship of Deucalion, the ark of Aramea Kibotos, the adventure of Manu on the peak of Himalaya, and the deluge of the Mexican Coxcox, are not necessarily legendary derivatives of one primitive tradition, but so many varying forms, in which a fanciful, intellectual activity embodies its childlike and spontaneous notions on analogous and recurring phenomena.

The historical documents, in general, to which M. Domenech refers us, are, in our judgment, of little or no value. Indeed he does not estimate some of them very highly himself. Who will guarantee us the authenticity of the "Chronicles of Eolus," or vindicate the purity of the legendary history of Votan and his travels, collected by Nuñez de la Vegar? More plausible would seem to be the conclusions of M. de Guignes and M. Paravey,

the former of whom attributes Peruvian civilization to the East Indies and China, while the latter identifies Mexico with Fu-Sang, described in the Chinese annals, and known in the fifth century of our era. An argument in favour of the Asiatic origin theory is suggested by the resemblance existing between the Buddha and Brahma religion and that of the Mexicans. In each the Supreme Being is adored under a triple form, and many other points of analogy accord with the conjecture that the worship of Quetzacoatl in Mexico and Manco-Capac in Peru, with that of Fo in China, Buddha in Japan, &c., "are only branches of the same trunk, the roots of which were in Asia."

In this view of an Oriental Immigration our author is not without valuable, nor in one instance, recent support. M. de Humboldt was of opinion that the Toltecs derive their origin from the Huns. Mr. Wilson, the author of the "Religion of Mexico," suggests a Phœnician origin for its population, and, in the archaeological portion of his work, M. Domenech refers the monumental remains with which the American soil is strewn from Florida to Canada, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, not to an Indian race, but to a numerous and civilized people, who abandoned these relics of the past about a thousand years ago, and are now fused in the actual race of the Red Indians who wander in the solitudes of the wilderness, as an example to the world of the vicissitudes of nations and empires. In fact, M. Domenech is very far from believing in an American or Indian community of origin. Convinced, however, that both the accidental and natural "characteristics of the Indian type in North America, such as the colour of the skin, the shape of the cranium, and the structure of the bones, bear a closer analogy to those of the Oriental Asiatics than to any other nation inhabiting the earth," he associates the Indians with other members of the great human family created by God in Eden. The route principally traversed by these emigrants of the Old World was either that which joins Asia and America at Behring's Straits, or else that formed by the two insular chains of the Kowries and the Alecutines, which connect Kamschatka to the Alaskan Peninsula in Russian America. Another line of emigration lay through the North of Europe—through Ireland, Greenland, and Iceland; and a fourth by the Canary Islands to Central America. To demonstrate this Asiatic origin of the American Indians, our author instances the analogy which exists between the Mexican calendar and the calendars of nations of Tartar origin. The signs of the Tartar zodiac are very similar to those of the Mexican zodiac. In Mexico, as in Eastern Asia, such names as tiger, dog, monkey, or rabbit have been given to the days of the week since the seventh century; while the date of the year is designated by a word which has the same signification in Mongolian, Chinese,

Japanese, and other eastern languages. Thus there really seems some reason to suppose, with Humboldt, that the natives of these two continents drew their notions of astrology from a common source; or, with Domenech, that the zodiacs of the Toltecs, Aztecs, Mongolians, Thibetans, &c., were originally invented in the same part of Asia.

Another presumption in favour of this identification is derived from the affinity of American idiom. No fewer than 438 languages and 4000 dialects are extant among the 10,000,000 Indians scattered over the New World; and all of these, according to Humboldt, though glossarially differing, have the same grammatical physiognomy. It is said that Hebrew and Gaelic names have been found among the idioms of the Red Skins. The Powhutan language is supposed by our author to be of Celtic origin; that of the Wyandots possesses several Latin words; while "it is a positive fact," that many Hebrew and Gaelic words, syllables, and sounds are to be found in those Indian idioms that are most probably of Scythian origin. The study of Indian philology, on the other hand, is too little advanced for us to attach much importance to these ambiguous indications of a linguistic Asiatic origin. The Eskimo tongue, which in its grammatical structure resembles the other American languages, is very unlike the better known languages of Europe and Asia. Yet, again, while the American Indian is not Mongol in physiognomy, physically the Eskimo is a Mongol and Asiatic.* None of the Indian languages, according to M. Domenech, is arbitrary in its construction. Like all primitive tongues they are essentially figurative. The words themselves are often onomatopœic. Every word indicates a concrete or abstract idea, and in every combination of syllables the fundamental root is preserved. Stripped of its accessories, this root is usually reduced to a monosyllable, or is, at most, dissyllabic. Among the Red Skins the expression of thought resembles a "polysyllabical stem forming a group of curious, primitive, sonorous, and expressive objects." Some of the Indian languages have no auxiliaries, but substitutes or modifications. The pronouns are blended in the verbs; substantives are sometimes formed into adjectives by changing their termination. All the plurals are formed in the same way, but those of the animate nouns differ from those of the inanimate. The Indian vocabulary is poor, but the genius of the language seems extremely poetical. Thus the names of men and women are emblematical: as the Red Bear; the Reclining Flower; the White Cloud. Similarly the names of the months have a natural significance: as the Moon of the Strawberries; the Moon of the

* See the "Natural History of the Varieties of Man," p. 292. By Dr. Latham. 1850.

Green Leaves; the Moon of the Buffaloes. Though hard, coarse, and uncouth sounds abound in the language of the Red Skins, yet, like all the Indian languages, speaking generally, it has musical cadence, energy, variety, simplicity, and eloquence. The only tribe that possesses an alphabet are the Cherokees. The other Indian tribes, in lieu of a written character, resort to hieroglyphical pictography.

The Indians have a natural talent for oratory; they cultivate also a spontaneous taste for narrative; the professional storyteller is always well supplied with amusing legends, and aged sachems recount, by the light of the stars or the blaze of a blue wood fire, their entertaining moral fictions. Their poetical compositions are not without merit; they are distributed into many varieties—love songs, sacred chants, hunters' songs, war songs, cradle songs, fables, and satires. The Indian chants are characteristically sad, monotonous recitations. The musical conceptions of the Red Skins are more or less mimetic; the cry of the wild beast, or the chirping of a bird, or the sighing of the leaves, or the crash of a tree, are so many practical lessons in melody. Among their musical instruments are included drums, horns, flutes, flageolets, and war-fifes.

In general, Indian life is one of continued idleness; the indolent monotony is broken only by the excitement of hunting, fishing, playing, or dancing. In an earlier period, the Indians, like the ancient Greeks, had their athletic exercises; the manly pastimes of wrestling, boxing, &c., have all been abandoned for games of hazard and grotesque dancing. The latter diversion is the favourite amusement of the Red Skins, by whom it is regarded as a religious rite, and for whom it forms the principal interest in all public ceremonials. Their primitive ballet admits of but four steps or distinct dances, which assume a pantomimic variety, with change of figure, costume, or place. The War dance, the Beggar's dance, the Scalp dance, the Slave dance, and the dance of the Medicine of the Brave, are examples of the affluent invention of the votaries of the Indian Terpsichore. Among some of the tribes, the women are permitted to dance after the men, and out of sight; but usually all amusement is forbidden to Indian ladies—their allotted portion in life, on the universally admitted principle of an equitable division, being that of the proverbially dull Jack, "all work and no play;" while the red lords of the creation find their equivalent responsibilities in the converse arrangement of "all play and no work."

Far from equalling the men in beauty, the Indian women are usually inferior to them in personal appearance. Tattooed, painted, and with hair cut short, to denote their moral and physical subordination, they pursue the deer or antelope on

horseback with the courage and skill of their warrior husbands. On them, for the most part, devolve the labours of the field; they build the wigwam which shelters the family; they construct the canoe, with the aid of the men; they prepare skins and furs, and dry meat and roots for the winter provisions. The privilege of buying and selling, on the other hand, is exercised solely by the men. Sugar, maize, buffalo tongues, horses; the skins of the musk rat, the doe, badger, beaver, bear, otter, &c.; an oil extracted from the porpoise, feathers, lead, and wax, are among the commodities which the Red Men exchange for the old clothes, whisky, metals, and stuffs of the Whites. In their eagerness to facilitate commercial operations, the Pale Faces (we are ashamed to say) make the Indians drunk with spirits, and steal their furs. We learn, however, with immense satisfaction, that in the reciprocal contest of interest and cunning, in which both engage, the advantage more frequently lies with the savage than with the civilized cheats.

“The general costume of an Indian consists of a tunic, drawers, or rather leggings, a pair of mocassins or sandals, and a cloak.” The tunics are sometimes embroidered or fringed with locks of hair from enemies’ scalps. The dress of the women nearly resembles that of the men. In the western and northern tribes the female toilet is made with a really artistical coquetry.

Nearly all Red Indians wear the hair long, binding it with a riband, or letting it flow loosely over the shoulders. Their usual head-dress is a tuft of eagle or crow feathers mixed with coloured horseshair. Sometimes scalps of bears and panthers, buffalo horns, and ermine caps are substituted. The Comanches wear little clothing, but are tattooed and painted all over. They stick feathers and beads in their hair. A mat or garment of wild beast skins, or sheep’s wool, protects the men from the cold or rain; while the women, in addition to the skin vests worn by their lords, have short petticoats made from the bark of the cedar or platted grass thread. Absolute nudity, except in children, is, like cannibalism,* very rare, being the result of extreme destitution, and not of ignorance or inclination.* The Indian life is mostly contemplative; when not engaged in hunting, fishing, or dancing, the Red Skins “get up smoking parties as we give tea parties.” They marry young—that is, from ten to twenty years of age. Three sorts of marriage are recognised among them; marriages of inclination, purchase, and servitude. In the Indian, as in the European, Vanity Fair, those by purchase are the most common. Polygamy depends less on morals than

* Kohl’s “Kitchi. Ganni.”—Among the Hare, or Slave Indians, Cannibalism is said to exist to a frightful extent. See Latham’s “Varieties of Man,” p. 300.

on money; for, as marriage is expensive, poor Indians can afford but one wife. Several Indian tribes, however, are monogamous. Conjugal infidelity is nearly unknown among them, and is considered very dishonouring. Even among the Natchez, the young wife is a model of propriety, though before marriage love of the freest kind is not only tolerated, but encouraged, in the portion-seeking beauty. Contravening the right of prior occupancy, the polygamous Navajos install the last wife as the mistress of the house. In the interest of certain experimental moralists in Europe, we note that their matrimonial pluralizing prototype in America generally prefers sisters, because he thinks he can thus secure more domestic peace. The unlimited right of divorce possessed by the Indian husband is said to promote tranquillity in the wigwam, and renders the wives submissive.

The character of the Indians in their primitive state is the subject of panegyric with the Abbé Domenech. Originally they were modest, timid, discreet, and inoffensive. They are still simple and light-hearted, hospitable to a degree, truthful, slaves to their word, courageous beyond expression, implacable in their vengeance, sincerely religious, but at the same time profoundly superstitious. Immediate contact with white men, who overreach and illtreat them, tends, however, to make them false, suspicious, covetous, and cruel. Contracting, in their corrupt neighbourhood, the faults and vices of civilization, the Indians have lost their individuality, and become a species of cross-bred Americans. The true Indian type is only to be found far away from the frontiers of the United States. The real Indian is remarkable for a stoicism, which is not a natural endowment, but the acquisition of a strong will and unconquerable patience. He is sensitive and impressionable, but vigilant and self-commanding. As a husband and father he is affectionate, caressing, and, when unobserved, even demonstrative. The genius of this people is singularly mimetic. Their readiness in copying each other's peculiarities, accounts for the apparent homogeneity in race, customs, and dress, which assimilates all the Red Indians to children of the same family. A remarkable acuteness of observation distinguishes the wild tribes of North America; their judgment is, in some instances, as accurate as it is immediate. Of natural science they are, of course, all but ignorant. Two of the Indian tribes, the Creeks and Muskogees, believe that the earth is flat, stationary, and composed of an animated substance; that the sky is a semicircular solid mass, whose extremities do not touch the earth; that the moon is inhabited by a man and a dog; that a solar eclipse is caused by the dog's occasional deglutition of the sun; and, lastly, that this luminary is a hot substance, which revolves round the earth. If the

Indians, however, are poor astronomers, they are excellent practical botanists. Their acquaintance with the vegetable world often helps them to find their way through the desert, and furnishes them with numerous remedies for maladies and wounds. The art of medicine, too, is cultivated by them with considerable success. The Comanches are skilful in curing gunshot wounds and the stings of venomous reptiles. Among the Natchez, phlebotomy and hydropathy were habitually practised. The Dakota doctors even possess some slight knowledge of anatomy, acquired by the habitual dissection of animals; and their pharmacopœia seems far from despicable. On the other hand, incantation and exorcism seem to be the invariable preliminaries of their therapeutic system.

The social organization of the Indian tribes is by no means complicated. Naturally upright and generous, the Red Man needs no official coercion. Family quarrels and disputes about property rarely, if ever, occur. Crimes are seldom committed. Manslaughter and murder are expiated by a present or a public penance. Adultery is punished by death, mutilation, and beating. In all these cases the judge is public opinion or the culprit's family. The Indian husband has power of life and death over his wife, but seldom avails himself of the privilege.

The type of government recognised by the Indians is patriarchal. The power of the chiefs is measured by their personal qualities. If their merits are not equal to the dignity of their position, they are virtually superseded in war or the hunting expedition. Respect for age and experience, and the force of public opinion, are the sanction and support of law. When a question of general interest is to be determined, representative assemblies are held; the decision formally rests with the majority, but the opinion of an influential chief often actually prevails. In addition to these general assemblies, each village has its particular councils. Wisdom, dignity, and decorum are said to characterize their popular conventions. A single detected falsehood in a rising orator is avenged by the eternal withdrawal of public confidence. Before their violent expulsion from Georgia, the Cherokees had a national legislature modelled on that of the United States. Among the Comanches the democratic principle forms the basis of the government; the Selishes have no systematic polity; in the Dakota tribe command has recently, according to tradition, become hereditary. The *Totem* ties do not constitute a physical or moral power, but a kind of chivalrous brotherhood or clanship, actuated by the spirit of the old French motto—*Noblesse oblige*.

The religion of these children of the Great Deserts is the natural product of infant speculation and superstitious fancy. "The Indians,"

says the Abbé Domenech, "place heaven and earth, the forests, the water—in short, all the creation, under the safeguard of some special divinity, who protects or animates them. The animals, the breeze that blows, the water that murmurs, the thunder that rolls, become, through the poetic imagination of the savages, intelligent beings, having a certain influence over the events of human life, and speaking the language of the divinity." Our author affirms that all the savages of the New World, without exception, believe in the existence of a Supreme Being, whom they call the Good or Great Spirit. This affirmation would seem at once too general and too precise. Too general, for if we may credit the testimony of Mr. Cornwallis and that of the United States exploring expedition, the Tahkali or Carrier Indians have no distinct idea of God or the existence of the soul; and too precise, for, according to the German traveller Kohl, the one Great Spirit celebrated in the Ojibbeway festivals, fares little better than the "Optimus Maximus" of the Romans, while the Sioux of Missouri—and here we follow our author—entertain so little exalted an idea of their Supreme Being, that they represent him, in a pre-Adamite era, as indulging in the not over-Godlike habit of killing buffaloes and eating them on the prairie hills. The Columbia River tribes, however, recognise, we are told, a beneficent and all-powerful Spirit by whom all things were made, but the value of this theological conception is seriously diminished when we learn that this omnipotent deity takes the form of a bird who lives in the sun, and who, when he desires to see what is going on in the world, converts himself into a kind of flying detective, and if he observes anything he does not like, manifests his indignation by the infliction of disease or the tempest. The Gehza Manitoo* may possibly be, and, indeed, probably is, the Supreme Manitoo, but at most in no higher degree than the Homeric Zeus was the supreme deity of the ancient Greeks. In fact, the Monotheistic ideal seems to us most imperfectly realized in the creed of the North-American Indians. The theology of the Poto-watomies recognises two Great Spirits—a good principle and evil principle, with nearly equipollent influence, but with a slight excess in favour of the virtuous Deity. The belief in a Bad Spirit, so widely diffused among the Indians, is paralleled by the Abbé with the belief in the devil in the Christian theology, while the antagonism between the two Indian principles is compared to that between the two Asiatic principles—an illustration, however, only remotely applicable. A descriptive statement will suggest

* An Algonquin word, which, when not joined to another, merely signifies *magisterious or spiritual power*—a power which, in some degree, even men may acquire.

the differences. The Gehza Manitoo of the Indians is generally symbolized as a colossal bird, or by the sun. In the tradition of the Delawares, the Great Spirit is said to have placed a snail on the bank of a beautiful river. At the end of twelve hours, the snail produced a man with a red skin. The man married the daughter of the beaver, whom he encountered, and with whom he quarrelled. Such was the origin of the first Delaware. Many Indian tribes, again, consider themselves descendants of some animals, but in general they regard the earth as their mother. The Sacs and Foxes say that the Great Spirit first created two men, then took from each man a rib, of which he formed two women. Of these two couples the Indian race is the offspring. All men at first formed one family, but when they grew wicked, the Great Spirit gave them the knowledge of many languages, and thus separated them. M. Domenech notices an analogy between this account and that in Genesis. The resemblance, however, may be accidental, or the legend attributable to European influence. As a crowning fact in the history of the Great Spirit, take the following:—One day when he had left his nest in his character of eagle, he saw a serpent crawling towards it, to eat the eggs which were in it. Hurrying to the spot, he took up a stone to throw at the intruder, but suddenly changing his mind, he transformed the stone into a man. The serpent, according to M. Domenech, was no other than Matchi Manitoo, the Evil Spirit, often represented under this form. Beyond this predilection for fresh eggs, and his addiction to petty larceny, we find no details of his attributes or occupations. He seems to have acquired an unenviable reputation for mischief; but luckily, like the fat boy in "Pickwick," he is nearly always asleep. The Potowatomies see in him the personification of evil, and worship him conjointly with his benevolent antagonist, who, though goodness itself, plunged the whole world for its perverseness and wickedness into an immense lake, and drowned all its inhabitants:

The sun, the clouds, the sky, and even hell, are variously assigned as the residence of the Great Spirit. With the Iroquois, space is allotted as an abode to the supreme divinity. In space, too, they domicile Neo, the master of life; Michabou, the guardian of the firmament; Agreskoe, the spirit of battle; Atahocan, the master, and Atahentsic, the mistress of heaven.

Creative power is not exclusively the attribute of Gehza Manitoo. Celestial beings were produced by Atahocan, and Menaboju or Hiawatha, as we learn from Herr Kohl, assisted Indian omnipotence in the creation of the world. The first Comanches, moreover, are said to have owed their existence to a secondary spirit, who unluckily forgot to teach them manners, and was sent on earth a second time to repair this omission.

Surrounded by dangers from which they can rarely defend themselves, the Red Indians invoke the protection of the tutelary deities with which their emotional and imaginative nature has peopled the forest, the lake, the river, or the prairie. The adoration of these secondary spirits, according to M. Domenech, is very different from that which they accord to the Supreme Being—a distinction which we should like to see illustrated. Among these inferior Manitoos, the Storm Spirit and the Fire Spirit are the most formidable. To rescue him from the perils of the burning prairie, presided over by the latter, the pious Indian directs his prayer to the Shades of the Brave.

The belief in a future life is a constituent part of the Red Man's creed. The posthumous existence of the Indian is, our Abbé assures us, one of retribution, according as men's actions have been good or evil, whereas the German writer already mentioned maintains that with the Indians dexterity rather than virtue is the passport to felicity, and that it is an open question with them whether the Great Spirit makes any distinction between good and bad. We place these counter-statements here in juxtaposition, without, however, forgetting that M. Kohl treats principally of the Indians of Lake Superior, while the French author's remark applies generally to all the Indians of the New World.

We are unable to illustrate, as we could wish, the religious ceremonial of the North American tribes, or to examine the mysterious fables and cosmological histories, which embody the faith of these strange populations, on the origin of the world and the destiny of man. We can but refer to their fasts, sacrifices, tortures, and mutilations, their belief in dreams and auguries, their worship of springs and fountains, their medicine men, their Montezuma worship, their funeral ceremonies, their expiatory and commemorative feasts, and particularly the festival of the Deluge.

To these pictures of Indian life and Indian scenery, called up before the mind's eye in our ideal wandering with the original photographer, we subjoin a final comment on the present position and future prospects of the savage children of the desert. The problem of Indian civilization has been rendered increasingly difficult through the conduct of the Anglo-Americans. Forced sales of land and forced emigrations have inflicted great misery on the semi-civilized tribes of the United States' frontiers. The Indians are hunted from river to river, and forest to forest. No sooner have their own exertions enhanced the value of the land allotted them, than they are dispossessed by the perfidious manœuvres or violent encroachments of their white rivals. Humiliated and despairing, or exasperated and vindictive, they

have naturally no great love for their American civilizers. If the Indians have great virtues they have also great vices. They are often incredibly cruel, brutally sensual, and ruinously intemperate. To render any scheme of Indian amelioration practicable, an important preliminary condition must, it appears, be secured—the disuse of alcohol and destructive weapons. To attain this object, our author calls for the enactment of severe penalties, to be inflicted on the merchants who sell the deadly arms or the besotting liquor. Without this penal legislation there is, he tells us, no chance of success. The double question then occurs, whether this prohibitory policy is feasible, and whether, if it be, a race that thus requires to be protected against itself can be saved or is much worth saving. Yet, perhaps, we should distinguish between the reclaimable and irreclaimable, or between the agricultural and nomadic tribes, leaving to the latter such an euthanasia as we can accord them, and seeking to extend to the former—for instance, the Cherokees, Delawares, and Moquis—the advantages of European civilization. This civilization, however, as M. Domencch judiciously observes, must not be a pedantic or academic civilization. The regenerators of the Red Indian must be satisfied with a modification of his mental and physical habits, and not demand an immediate intellectual and moral metamorphosis. The individuality of the Red Skin must be respected. On this principle the missionaries have acted. Introducing some elements of European industry into the rude life of the desert, and accepting old or convenient usages, these wise and earnest men have so far modified the social development of the Indians, that war has become rare among those tribes where their beneficent exertions have not been paralysed by the counter-influence of the demoralizing whites. The civilization of at least a portion of the red race can hardly then be pronounced impossible.

If the final disappearance of this variety of the human family from the New World is announced by our author, it is not as the result of either an organized or spontaneous destruction, but of a gradual amalgamation with the white race that he predicts it. Will this absorption be for the advantage of the dominant and highly cultivated population? If we are not ourselves sanguine as to the result of the experiment of this species of intermarriage, which some reflective men regard as our most powerful expedient for the improvement of humankind, we willingly concede that the prospect of amelioration which this physiological speculation suggests, ought not to be prematurely excluded.

Meanwhile thus much is certain. There is in those vast North American deserts space enough for the Red Man to inhabit, and work enough for him to do. He may long be advantageously

employed as the pioneer of the white in reclaiming those picturesque solitudes. He may for ages yet to come be valuable in a utilitarian sense, as well as available for ethnological exploration. Every race, every tribe, every man is a portion of humanity, and we know not what may be lost to the whole by the unnecessary destruction of a part. If there be races of inferior susceptibility for improvement, and if, as such, they are ultimately destined to extinction, it is not for us to anticipate the slowly exterminating processes of nature. The moral ideal to which our conduct more and more tends to conform, compels us to recognise the bond of a common humanity in the red and the black, as in the white man; and in the noble words of William Humboldt, quoted in the "Cosmos," to "treat all mankind, without reference to religion, nation, or colour, as one fraternity, one great community, fitted for the attainment of one object, the unrestrained development of the psychical powers."

ART. III.—ROBERT OWEN.

1. *The Life of Robert Owen*. Written by himself; with Selections from his Writings and Correspondence. 2 vols. London. 1857.
2. *The Book of the New Moral World*. By ROBERT OWEN. London. 1854.
3. *Robert Owen and his Philosophy*. By WILLIAM LUCAS SARGANT. London. 1860.

AMONG the many extraordinary men who appeared in this country during the latter portion of the eighteenth century, by no means the least remarkable was Robert Owen. The present generation is apt to remember him merely as the founder of an obscure sect of Communists, as the opponent of all established doctrines in religion and morality, or, as he unhappily was in the last few years of his long career, the advocate and supporter of spirit-rapping. This is but a sorry estimate of his character and merits. Notwithstanding his many errors and delusive hopes, he was an active practical philanthropist, a thinker of no mean capacity, and one of the first great manufacturers who apprehended the importance of his social function, perceiving as he did the necessity for some reorganization of the industrial system—a necessity only now beginning to be generally recognised. At one period of his life he held an important place in public opinion; at another he seems to have been wholly

forgotten. Now crowned heads and cabinet ministers consult him upon questions of grave national importance, and the most celebrated philosophers in Europe conspire to do him honour; and now, when as a feeble and white-haired old man, he attempts to propound his views at a public meeting, the audience will not listen to him, but upon learning his name, imagine that he must be the son of the notorious Robert Owen of their childhood. He had fulfilled the hopes of his enemies and disappointed the expectations of his friends; he had outlived his intellect and his fame, and the memory of his good deeds was buried before him.

Justice has never yet been done to Robert Owen or his theories. He and they have been attacked by opponents who were alike blind to his virtues and to the truths which his opinions contained, whilst, on the other hand, he has been defended by supporters who were equally incapable of seeing his failings and detecting his errors. By turns the victim of dogmatic Christians and Conservatives, or the idol of no less dogmatic Atheists and Socialists, his character and views have never been calmly considered in the impartial spirit of rational inquiry. Avoiding, then, anything like the tone of advocacy, this deficiency we shall attempt to supply, and we find this no easy matter, for it will be our task to condense the history of an eventful life of nearly nine-tenths of a century, and the discussion of many important questions, into a few pages of this Review.

In the spring of 1771, Newtown, in Montgomeryshire, was the scene of Robert Owen's birth; in the winter of 1858, it was that of his death. There had he commenced the battle of life—there did he end it; and in the same place in which he uttered the first cry of infancy, he breathed the last sob of age. Eighty-seven long years had intervened between these two events; it is our province to give a sketch of them. Robert Owen's father was a saddler, and his mother was the daughter of a respectable farmer named Williams. At an early age he was sent to a school in the neighbourhood of his native town; at seven he had obtained all the regular education which he ever received; and at ten he was apprenticed to a linendrapér at Stamford, on the confines of Lincolnshire. The name of his master was M'Goffog, and he describes him as an honest, frugal, and industrious man, who, having commenced life as a hawker, was now a well-to-do tradesman. Whilst Owen was with him, a circumstance occurred which excited religious doubts in his mind. M'Goffog was a Scotchman and a Presbyterian, his wife was an Englishwoman and an Episcopalian. Instead of indulging in theological disputes, they alternately attended the Church and the Kirk. Owen

accompanied them: the pastors who presided at the rival establishments invariably preached against each other, and the consequence of the dangerous latitudinarianism of the youthful apprentice was a conviction of the error of both the contending parties. At Stamford he indulged in a good deal of irregular and miscellaneous reading, and seriously set himself at work to discover the true religion. This, unfortunately, he did not find, and when he was between thirteen and fourteen, he became convinced that all religions were false. We must quote his own description of this, for he arrived then at two of his leading doctrines.

“Before my investigations were concluded, I was satisfied that religions, one and all, had emanated from the same source, and their varieties from the same false imaginations of our early ancestors—imaginations formed when men were ignorant of their own nature, were devoid of experience, and were governed by their random conjectures, which were almost always at first, like their notions of the fixedness of the earth, far from the truth. It was with the greatest reluctance and after long contests in my mind, that I was compelled to abandon my first and deep-rooted impressions in favour of Christianity; but being obliged to give up my faith in this sect, I was at the same time compelled to reject all others, for I had discovered that all had been based upon the same absurd imagination, that each formed his own qualities, determined his own thoughts, will, and action, and was responsible to God and his fellow-men. My own reflections compelled me to come to very different conclusions. My reason taught me that I could not have made one of my own qualities, that they were forced upon me by nature, that my language, religion, and habits were forced upon me by society, and that I was entirely the child of nature and of society. That nature gave me the qualities, and that society directed them. Thus was I forced, through seeing the error of their foundation, to abandon all belief in every religion which had been taught to man. But my religious feelings were immediately replaced by the spirit of universal charity—not for a sect or party, or for a country or a colour, but for the human race, and with a real and ardent desire to do them good.”*

Thus prepared, with the education of a parish boy and the library of a pedlar, he determined to reform mankind. With M'Goffog he remained four years, and then, by his recommendation, he obtained a situation with Messrs. Flint and Palmer, linendrapers, in London. Finding the work there too hard for him, he became shopman to a Mr. Satterfield, another linendraper, in Manchester, and with him he remained until he was eighteen years of age.

* Among other articles sold in Mr. Satterfield's shop were wires

for the foundation frames of ladies' bonnets. The maker of these was an active-minded man of the name of Jones. When he brought his weekly supply of wires, he used to tell Owen of the wonders of the new machinery which had just then been introduced cotton-spinning, and said that were he enabled to obtain the requisite knowledge, he was sure he could drive a prosperous trade in its manufacture. Jones at last succeeded, and was only in want of capital to commence work. He persuaded Owen to join him in partnership, and supply him with the necessary funds. These he borrowed from his brother, who was a saddler in London, and in a short time they had more than forty men at work making *mules* (as the machines are technically termed), having obtained wood, iron, and brass for their construction upon credit.

Owen soon found that Jones was an ignorant mechanic, without a notion of managing workmen, or of conducting a considerable business, and he was therefore only too glad to accept an offer from him for dissolving the partnership. His old master, M'Goffog, now requested him to join him in business, but his aspirations pointed to another destiny than that of a linendraper at Stamford; he therefore refused the offer, and setting up a factory (then a new name) for himself in Ancoat's Lane, Manchester, he, with only three mules and three workmen, made on an average six pounds a-week. *

This was the heroic age of cotton-spinning—the commencement of the vast industrial activity which has distinguished England for the last seventy years. Sir Richard Arkwright, once a barber, had just invented the loom, and had established a factory in Manchester. Mr. Drinkwater, a very wealthy foreign merchant, followed his example, and established another for finer cotton-spinning, under the management of Mr. Lee, a man of high scientific attainments. The latter was now offered an advantageous partnership, which he accepted, and Mr. Drinkwater was left without any personal acquaintance with cotton manufactures, and no one to manage his factory. Under these circumstances, he advertised for a manager for his mill. Owen heard of this casually, and he says:—

“I put on my hat, and proceeded straight to Mr. Drinkwater's counting-house, and boy and inexperienced as I was, I asked him for the situation for which he had advertised. The circumstances which now occurred made a lasting impression upon me, because they led to important future consequences. He said immediately, ‘You are too young;’ and at that time being fresh-coloured, I looked younger than I was. I said that was an objection made to me four or five years ago, but I did not expect it would be made to me now ‘How old are you?’—‘Twenty in May this year,’ was my reply. ‘How often do you get drunk in the week?’ (This was a common habit with almost all persons in Manchester and Lancashire at that

period.) 'I was never,' I said, 'drunk in my life' (blushing scarlet at this unexpected question). My answer and the manner of it made, I suppose, a favourable impression, for the next question was, 'What salary do you ask?'—'Three hundred a year,' was my reply.—'What!' Mr. Drinkwater said, with some surprise, repeating the word—'Three hundred a year! I have had this morning I know not how many seeking the situation, and I do not think all their askings together would amount to what you require.'—'I cannot be governed by what others ask,' said I, 'and I cannot take less. I am now making that sum by my own business.'—'Can you prove that to me?'—'Yes, I will show you the business and my books.'—'Then I will go with you, and let me see them,' said Mr. Drinkwater.*

He found that what Owen had stated was true, and since inquiries concerning him proved satisfactory, the bargain was closed. At nineteen he found himself the manager of a factory, with five hundred hands employed, and in the receipt of three hundred a year, which he had made for himself by his own industry and audacity. Up to this time he says that he had been thoughtful and retiring, diffident of his own powers, conscious of the deficient education he had received, and unable to speak to a stranger without blushing, especially to a woman. Added to this, he had never seen the whole of the machinery employed in making thread from the raw cotton, and hardly, indeed, any of it at all. His modesty was put to a sore trial in the factory, for he was left there to manage entirely by himself. But in six weeks he had become at home in his new place, and his *diffidence* did not survive the ordeal it then passed through.

The experience which Owen had gained as a linendraper now proved of inestimable value to him, for the article which it was his business to manufacture was yarn of extreme fineness. He had acquired a delicacy of touch in handling fine fabrics which gave him a great advantage over others not so trained. It had been considered a triumph in the factory, whilst it was under the management of Mr. Lee, to produce cotton of 120 hanks to the pound, but Owen in a short time raised it to 250, and subsequently to 300 hanks. Here he worked up the first bags of North-American cotton imported into this country, and whilst the stock made under his direction sold off rapidly, that which had been made under his predecessor's remained unbought. Mr. Drinkwater soon became aware of these improvements, and heard also on all sides that the workpeople whom he employed were not only well disciplined, but contented. At the end of six months he sent for Owen, and an agreement was signed between them, by which he was to receive four hundred pounds for his second year of management, five for the next, and at the expiration of that

* Autobiography, vol. i. p.37.

period he was to become a partner with Mr. Drinkwater and his two sons, receiving one-fourth part of the whole profits of the business. After this he did not lessen his assiduous attention to his management. He had been regularly trained through life to habits of industry, and here he was always the first in the factory in the morning, and locked the doors himself at night.

Owen now for the first time associated with educated men. Dr. Dalton, who was even then feeling his way to the atomic theory, and Mr. Winstanley, were assistants under Dr. Barnes in the Manchester Unitarian College. These were among his friends. They met often, and discussed grave questions of theology and ethics. Samuel Taylor Coleridge (then an undergraduate at Cambridge) joined their circle, and Owen was also acquainted with Dr. Ferrier, and Mr. Henry, the chemist. In 1794 he was lodging in the same house with Robert Fulton, who was lost in a labyrinth of mechanical speculations, which ended at last in his great application of steam to the purposes of navigation. For some of his projects, which proved failures, Owen advanced him money, which was never repaid, but Owen's generosity forbade him to regret his loss.

When the three years of his probation were nearly over, an occurrence took place which again changed the course of his life. A manufacturer of some eminence aspired to the hand of Mr. Drinkwater's daughter, and as he desired to combine the two firms, he was anxious to keep both in the family. Owen's agreement interfered with this plan, and Mr. Drinkwater again sent for him. After explaining the case, he said to him,—

“‘If you will give up your claim to the partnership, you may name your own salary. You have now five hundred a year, and whatever sum you will name you shall have.’ He appeared very anxious to have my reply. I said, ‘I have brought the agreement with me, and here it is, and I now put it into the fire, because I will never act with any parties who are not desirous to be united with me; but under these circumstances I cannot remain your manager with any salary you can give.’ And the agreement was consumed before him. He was not prepared for this decisive proceeding; and it was an act of feeling and not of judgment on my part.”*

When he left this factory, Owen had the reputation of being one of the ablest cotton-spinners in Manchester, and he therefore had many offers of partnership. In 1797 he, in conjunction with Messrs. Borrodale and Atkinson, of London, and Messrs. Barton, of Manchester, established the Chorlton Twist Company. This was completely under his management, but among his other duties he had that of visiting his customers in the North of

* Autobiography, vol. i. p. 41.

England and in Scotland. Upon one occasion he went as far as Glasgow, and finding that a lady with whom he was acquainted in Manchester was staying with the family of a Mr. Dale, about thirty miles from Glasgow, he paid her a visit. The place at which she then lived was called New Lanark. He thus describes his first visit to the village which was ultimately destined to make his name celebrated :—

“When I inspected the establishment which was called the New Lanark Mills, and which then consisted of a primitive manufacturing Scotch village and four mills for spinning cotton, I said to my friend, as I stood in front of the establishment, ‘Of all places I have yet seen, I should prefer this in which to try an experiment I have long contemplated and have wished to have an opportunity to put into practice,’ not in the least supposing that there was the most distant chance that the wish would ever be gratified.”*

Mr. Dale was at this time one of the most considerable merchants and manufacturers in Scotland. His wealth and munificence had made him known throughout the country. He was also a zealous lay preacher of a sect of Independents, the patron of more than forty chapels, and the pastor of one which he regularly served each Sunday in Glasgow. For some time he had been left a widower with five daughters, the eldest of whom, who was then about nineteen, superintended his household in her mother's place. Owen met this young lady, and a mutual attachment sprang up between them. His prospects were now so prosperous, that he had contemplated for some time the propriety of finding a wife. A second and a third visit to Scotland were the consequences of the interview with Miss Dale, with whom he had now become well acquainted. They used to take morning walks together, accompanied by her younger sisters, who, however, kept at a respectful distance. At last, during one of these dangerous exercises, he declared his passion. The response was satisfactory, as far as the lady herself was concerned, but she said, “You must find means to obtain my father's consent, or you can never obtain mine;” and this she seemed to think would hardly be granted.

Owen was left to contend with this difficulty himself. He had never seen Mr. Dale, and he did not quite understand how he was conveniently to make his acquaintance. Mr. Dale was rarely at New Lanark, but in this dilemma Owen conceived a stratagem by which to gain the desired object. He called upon Mr. Dale at his place of general business, and told him that he had heard in Glasgow that New Lanark was for sale. Should the rumour be true, he desired to know what he would take for it. Mr. Dale received him coolly and suspiciously, said he looked too young for a pur-

chaser of so considerable a property, and seemed to see that there was something in the business which did not appear upon the surface. Owen explained that he was in partnership with older men with large capitals, that he belonged to a considerable firm of cotton-spinners in Manchester, and to a certain extent removed the merchant's doubts. At last Mr. Dale desired him to inspect the mills at New Lanark carefully, to consult his partners, and after having done so to inform him of the result. He obeyed these instructions, and, whilst he was in Manchester, Miss Dale acquainted her father with the real state of affairs. He was opposed to the match, called Owen a land louser, and sanguinely said that he wished to be succeeded in his business by an honest Scotchman, who should likewise be his son-in-law. Two of the partners of the Chorlton Twist Company inspected the mills at New Lanark. They liked the property and were willing to purchase it, and with this view they called upon Mr. Dale. Owen graphically describes the interview :

“ We called at his hour of appointment, and Mr. Dale said, ‘ I am now satisfied of your respectability (he was himself at this time the chief of the two directors of the Bank of Scotland in Glasgow), and I am willing to treat with you for the land, village, and mills at New Lanark, with everything as the establishment now stands.’ We inquired the price at which he valued this property. He said he was really at a loss to put a value upon it. His half-brother and a Mr. William Kelley managed it for him. He himself was seldom there, and only for short periods, as his chief business was in Glasgow. But he said, Mr. Owen knows better than I do the value of such property at this period, and I wish he would name what he would consider a fair price between honest sellers and buyers. I was somewhat surprised and nonplussed at this reference to me, with all its responsible consequences, taking into consideration the position of all parties. My estimate of the establishment, from having taken only the very general inspection of it which I had had an opportunity of doing, was such that I said, it appears to me that sixty thousand pounds, payable at the rate of three thousand a year for twenty years, would be an equitable price between the parties. Mr. Dale had long been known for the honest simplicity of his character, and as such was universally trusted and respected; and as a further proof of it, to the surprise of my London and Manchester commercial partners, he replied, ‘ If you think so, I will accept the proposal as you have stated it, if your friends also approve of it.’ And equally to my surprise, they said they were willing to accept the terms, and thus in these few words passed the establishment of New Lanark from Mr. Dale into the hands of the New Lanark Twist Company.” *

Owen now openly asked Mr. Dale for his daughter in marriage, encouraged, we presume, by the great confidence which he

* Autobiography, vol. i. p. 53.

had already reposed in his honesty and judgment. Most men are more willing to part with their daughters than with their property, but Mr. Dale seems to have been an exception to the rule. Miss Dale declared that her choice was only between celibacy and Owen; objections were overcome, and in September, 1799, they were married. In January, 1800, he entered upon the management, or, as he ambitiously (perhaps more correctly) terms it, the government of New Lanark.

Had Clive recorded the foundation of our Indian empire, or had Wellington described the humiliation of France, they could not have expressed more heartfelt, probably more just, pride than does Owen in reporting his bloodless victories at New Lanark. For a quarter of a century his achievements at this place called forth the admiration and wonder not only of England, but of the civilized world. Latterly it was visited by more than two thousand persons annually, and among these were the most distinguished men of the age. Robert Owen could have shown a collection of complimentary letters from kings, ministers, and philosophers, unrivalled by any in Europe. New Lanark was Owen's only success, all other of his projects terminated in failure and disaster; but it was such a success, and it has had so great influence upon this country, that his claims to public notice may well rest upon it. From this village the important system of *commandite* partnerships took its rise, and here originated the infant schools which have done so much to improve the condition of the poorer classes. It is useless to deny that the happy results attained by Owen at New Lanark are more due to the peculiar circumstances of the case—to those events which he considered obstacles—than perhaps to any exclusive merit of his own. His social theories were here never completely developed; he himself said that, taking his idea of perfection at twenty, at New Lanark he had only advanced two points. The necessity of attending to pecuniary considerations, and the mercantile caution of his partners, prevented his enthusiastic benevolence from hurrying him into those extravagances which produced his subsequent discomfitures. We are justified by the facts in coming to this conclusion, because the only difference between New Lanark and New Harmony was, that in the former case he was restrained by the influence of others, whilst in the latter he was independent of control: in the former case he succeeded, and in the latter he failed.

The development of the manufacturing system in this country produced a change so stupendous in the constitution of society, that it stands alone in the history of our civilization. Perhaps the suppression of the monasteries bears some resemblance to it in its effects upon the lower orders of the people. The In-

dustrial System is now the great motive power in the affairs of men, and to it all those other systems which once influenced the world are becoming more and more subordinated. The first of its results, and the one which was most obvious and important when Owen commenced his labours, was the collection of populations round a new centre, drawn from the power of those institutions which had previously held them together, and living in a state of anarchy. Before this time they had dwelt in parishes and towns, where institutions formed in the course of ages had exercised a control over their minds and conduct; but in the manufacturing village the people were suddenly left without guidance, like sheep without their shepherd. They had no church, no school, no magistracy, no police, no public opinion to encourage them in right or deter them from wrong. The manufacturing chiefs generally did not perceive the dangers of such a condition; it is Owen's great merit that he did, and that he attempted to correct the inevitable evils which attended it—his success was complete.

In the year 1784, Mr. David Dale and Sir Richard Arkwright built the cotton mills at New Lanark. They were placed near the Falls of the Clyde for the sake of the natural water-power. It was necessary to find workmen. The country around was uncultivated, the inhabitants were poor and few in number, and the roads in the neighbourhood were bad. To supply labour for the new establishment, a population had to be gathered around it. The Scotch peasantry would not work in the cotton mills, and there were only two ways of obtaining the requisite labour; firstly, to procure apprentice children from the various public charities of the country; and secondly, to induce families to settle round the works. To provide for the first, a large house was built, which ultimately contained five hundred children. They were clothed, fed, and educated at the cost of Mr. Dale, but to defray the expenses it was necessary that they should be employed in the mills from six in the morning until seven in the evening, both in summer and winter. The directors of the public charities insisted upon sending the children to Mr. Dale's establishment at the ages of six, seven, or eight, and he compelled to take them thus young, or to stop the manufactory he had just begun. Their education, commencing after working hours, was very defective, and their apprenticeship was so odious to them that they sometimes ran away, and upon its expiration they invariably left. To tempt families to settle round the works, a village was built, and the houses were let at a low rent to such as could be induced to accept employment at the mills; but so great was the general dislike of the occupation at that time in Scotland, that with few exceptions only persons destitute of

friends, intelligence, and reputation were found willing to try the experiment. It was even deemed a favour on the part of these to live at the village; and when taught the trade, they became so valuable to the establishment that they were independent of all control. Mr. Dale was generally absent, and the management was left in the hands of various uninterested servants with more or less authority.

The consequences of such a state of affairs may easily be imagined; morally and physically these people were in a condition about as bad as was possible. Drunkenness and immorality of every kind reigned supreme, and theft was so general that the property of Mr. Dale was considered almost as public property; added to this, the corruption of the place was whitened over with an hypocritical pretence of sanctity and attention to the outward forms of religion. When Owen assumed the management of New Lanark, he was determined to transform this pandæmonium into a community of sober, industrious, and honest workmen.

"There were two ways before me," he says, "by which to govern the population. 1st, By contending against the people who had to contend against the evil conditions by which, through ignorance, they were surrounded, and in this case I should have had continually to find fault with all, and to keep them in a state of constant ill-will and irritation; to have many of them tried for theft, to have some imprisoned and transported, and, at that period, to have others condemned to death, for in some cases I detected thefts to a large amount, there being no check upon any of their proceedings: or, 2ndly, I had to consider these unfortunately-placed people, as they really were, the creatures of ignorant and vicious circumstances, who were made to be what they were by the evil conditions which had been made to surround them, and for which alone society, if any party, should be made responsible; and instead of tormenting the individuals, imprisoning and transporting some, hanging others, and keeping the population in a state of constant irrational excitement, I had to change these evil conditions for good ones, and thus, in the due order of nature according to its unchanging laws, to supersede the inferior and bad characters created by inferior and bad conditions, for superior and good characters to be created by superior and good conditions."*

He adopted the latter course, but in adopting it he had many difficulties to overcome. The former managers would not assist him, and the people distrusted him. His partners looked upon New Lanark merely as a commercial undertaking, and, bearing this in mind, he was determined, not only to ameliorate the condition of the people, but also to make the business pay. Pursuing these two objects he made himself odious to every one.

* Autobiography, vol. i. p. 58.

The workmen imagined that he was only bent upon gain; and the manufacturers, that he was only anxious to carry out his philanthropic reforms. Under these circumstances little progress could be expected, and until 1806 hardly anything had been done. In that year diplomatic differences between Great Britain and the United States induced the latter to lay an embargo on their own ports. The greater portion of our cotton trade was suspended. Cotton rose in the markets to so high a price that the manufacturers had to determine whether they should stop their mills and discharge their hands, or whether they should work up the cotton, expensive as it had become, and run the risk (in case of a speedy removal of the embargo) of ruin. Some took one alternative and some the other. The New Lanark Twist Company was now very largely in the cotton trade, and to have proceeded in their operations would have been very hazardous; on the other hand, to have discharged the workpeople would have interfered with the manager's visions of reform.

"I, therefore," he says, "concluded to stop all the machinery, retain the people, and continue to pay them their full wages for only keeping the machinery clean and in good working condition. I continued to do this as long as the embargo was maintained. It was four months before the United States Government terminated the embargo, and during that period the population of New Lanark received more than seven thousand pounds sterling without a penny being deducted from the full wages of any one."*

This generosity won the hearts of the people, and Owen set himself earnestly to work to discover and correct social evils at New Lanark. To prevent stealing, such checks were introduced as rendered its detection almost inevitable. In one department in which it was very rife, and was easily performed with success, a plan was adopted which dispensed with counting, and yet marked each case of delinquency. Every opportunity was given for obtaining profitable employment, so as to make honest industry more gainful than illicit practices. Drunkenness, the great enemy of health and morality, was undermined and discouraged. The liquors and other provisions which had hitherto been sold in the village, chiefly upon credit, had been bad in quality and high in price. Superior stores were now introduced, in which were retailed, for ready money and at cost price, commodities bought in the best markets and of the best description. The people were

* Autobiography, vol. i. p. 64. The greater share of our admiration for this conduct should be given to the other partners, since they had no favourite schemes to further by such a proceeding, and by far the larger portion of the seven thousand pounds came out of their pockets.

by these means enabled to save a fourth part of their former expenditure, and to procure better things. An attempt was also made to interest the community in their government. A number of adjoining houses were formed into divisions, and the heads of the families elected once a-year delegates, who, in their turn, elected a jury of twelve to meet the managers once in a week, to consider cases of misconduct which might be brought under their notice. In the latter portion of his career, Owen used to speak as if all punishment had been dispensed with at New Lanark, but in truth he adopted a system of fines* and of moral compulsion, which was as fatal to his theory of the irresponsibility of man as imprisoning and hanging could be. The intention of all punishment is exemplary and corrective, and it matters not of what kind or nature it may be as long as it tends to reform the guilty and deter others from the commission of crime. Drunkenness and fornication were punished by pecuniary exactions—things of which none but the most tyrannical governments take any notice; and the general good conduct of the workers in the mills was to be secured by an absurdity called the *silent monitor*. Owen's description of this machine is very curious; we will give him the credit of its invention:—

“The silent monitor,” he says, “consisted of a four-sided piece of wood about two inches long and one broad, each side coloured, one side black, another blue, the third yellow, and the fourth white, tapered at the top, and furnished with wire eyes† to hang upon a hook with either side to the front. One of these was suspended in a conspicuous place near to each of the persons employed, and the colour at the front told the conduct of the individual during the preceding day, to four degrees of comparison. Bad, denoted by black and No. 4; indifferent, by blue and No. 3; good, by yellow and No. 2; and excellent, by white and No. 1. Then books of character were provided for each department, in which the name of each one employed in it was inserted in front of the succeeding columns, which sufficed to mark by the number the daily conduct day by day for two months; and these books were changed six times a year, and were preserved, by which arrangement I had the conduct of each registered to four degrees of comparison during every day of the week, Sundays excepted, for every

* “*Inquisitor*. What, govern the population of the world without punishment! and solely by knowledge of human nature, charity, and love.

“*Robert Owen*. These are the only true weapons for forming the true character and governing the populations of all nations of the earth. And they are competent, wisely applied, to put and keep them all in permanent prosperity, harmony, and happiness.”—Introduction, *Autobiography*, p. xxvii.

“The same principles were applied to correct the irregular intercourse of the sexes; such conduct was discountenanced and held in disgrace, fines were levied upon both parties for the use of the support-fund of the community.”—*Second Essay, Autobiography*, vol. i. p. 281.

† Hooks and Eyes, remnants of the linsdraper phraseology.

year they remained in my employment. The superintendent of each department had the placing daily of these silent monitors, and the master of the mill regulated those of the superintendents in each mill." *

As promotion was given in the mills according to character, we see that Owen was reduced to the necessity of ruling, like others, by means of punishments and rewards. At the very outset he disregarded one of the most important of his magniloquent propositions. A common fund was established for the support of the sick and the aged, and measures were adopted for the better education of the children. No more were taken from the parishes and charities, and none were employed in the mill under ten or twelve years of age. The effect of all these arrangements was soon perceived in the improved condition, morals, health, and appearance of the people.

For eight years he patiently worked at the development of his system of reform, and during that time he had the advantage of the advice, assistance, and sometimes opposition, of Mr. Dale. We are inclined to think that Owen does not adequately estimate the effects of his father-in-law's influence in the improvement of New Lanark. A sincere friendship had, notwithstanding their differences of opinion, sprung up between them. They seem to have had several disputes, however, but Mr. Dale, when Owen expressed any of his peculiar views, was wont to say, with a smile, "Thou oughtest to be very right, for thou art very positive." When he died, Owen declared that the world seemed a blank to him; and from that time commenced his more serious quarrels with his partners, and the more glaring errors of his administration.

In 1809, finding the households of his people unfitted for carrying out his views of education, he determined to establish an institution for the formation of character, in which the children were, from their earliest infancy, to be subjected to the influence of good "surroundings." He had already shown his enthusiasm in the cause of education by subscribing fifteen hundred pounds to the schools of Lancaster and Bell; but when he now introduced his own plans to the notice of his partners in London and Manchester they objected to them. They, however, were willing to give him a hearing. They came to New Lanark, were sufficiently pleased with the progress which had been made and the actual state of affairs. They presented him with a piece of plate, attentively listened to his schemes, but remained unconvinced of their policy or necessity.

"Each of your propositions," said they, "is true individually, but

as they lead to conclusions contrary to our education, habits, and practices, they must in the aggregate be erroneous, and we cannot proceed on such new principles for governing and extending this already very large establishment."*

After this quiet assumption of infallibility on their part, Owen refused to act with them any longer, and it was finally decided that he was to buy the establishment for eighty-four thousand pounds. He could not command so large a sum himself, and as certain Messrs. Campbell (relations of Mr. Dale) were anxious to join in the concern, a partnership was formed between them and Owen. The profits of the New Lanark Twist Company were to be divided into five unequal shares, of which he was to receive the largest, besides a thousand a-year as manager.

For a short time everything went on smoothly, but this was merely the calm before the storm, which ere long burst with sudden fury. It was soon found by the manager, that partners living thirty miles off were much more troublesome than those who had lived three hundred. Domestic differences also arose to make this propinquity more disagreeable to him. The partners now found fault with everything; they carped at the wages of the artisans, and were for cutting down the salaries of the masters and superintendents, which, both from policy and principle, had been fixed upon a liberal scale. Endless differences of opinion ensued, and at last it was decided that New Lanark should go into the market for sale. "Fair and fause, like all the Campbells,"† the partners were determined that Owen should have no light task in getting persons to succeed them in the undertaking. They circulated reports calculated to deteriorate the value of the property; they declared that he was engaged in visionary schemes, which must terminate in failure and ruin, and that although they had but lately given eighty thousand pounds for New Lanark they would be glad to sell it for forty.

In this conjuncture of affairs, Owen was called away to London. He had written four essays upon his new views of society, and now, in 1813, he proceeded to town for the purpose of printing them. About this time, too, the education of the lower classes was attracting much public attention, and the Campbells, aware of the interest which he took in that subject, imagined that Owen was absorbed in his literary project, and in furthering the plans of Bell and Lancaster. They forgot that if he was a dreamer, he was one of the shrewdest and most practical description. Long before this, he had conceived the idea of putting New

* Autobiography, vol. i. p. 86.

† This old Scotch proverb has been immortalized by Sir Walter Scott. In this case we think it applicable, although it is not in accordance with our experience of the distinguished clan of Campbell.

Lanark upon a different footing—of making it more of a philanthropical than a mercantile establishment, and he sought now to carry this idea into execution. He circulated a pamphlet declaring his views, and showing that a reasonable profit might be expected upon the capital embarked, after the payment of all necessary expenses in their realization. His appeal met with a response, and a company of seven persons was formed with the avowed object of purchasing New Lanark for the purpose of trying his experiments. A capital of 130,000*l.* was subscribed in thirteen shares of 10,000*l.* each, and of these Owen took five. Three of the new partners were Quakers, but among them was one of the most illustrious philosophers of modern times. In Manchester, Owen had in early life become connected with Samuel Taylor Coleridge; it was now his fortune to be even more intimately brought in contact with Jeremy Bentham. Between the views of these two remarkable men, the thought of England has oscillated throughout the present century, and it is impossible to over-estimate their influence upon the development of English Philosophy. Neither of them had, it would seem, a very high opinion of Owen, and he was quite incapable of appreciating either.*

Jeremy Bentham had long lived in retirement, both on account of his incessant labours and his great nervousness of temperament. The dislike which he entertained to making new acquaintances amounted almost to disease, and the meeting between him and Owen was arranged very much in the fashion of the audience between the American Ambassadors with the Tycoon of Japan.

“After some preliminary communication with our mutual friends, James Mill and Francis Place, his then two chief counsellors, and some correspondence between him and myself, it was at length arrived at that I was to come to his hermit-like retreat at a particular hour, and that I was upon entering to proceed upstairs, and we were to meet half-way upon the stairs. I pursued these instructions, and he, in great tre-

* Of Coleridge, Owen says:—“Mr. Coleridge had a great fluency of words, and he could well put them together in high-sounding sentences; but *my* few words directly to the point generally told well; and although the eloquence and learning were with him, the strength of the argument was generally admitted to be on my side.”—Autobiography, vol. i. p. 35.

We are not bound to believe this. Of Bentham he observes:—“Jeremy Bentham spent a long life in an endeavour to amend laws all based upon a fundamental error, without discovering this error; and therefore was his life, although a life of incessant well-intended industry, occupied in showing and attempting to remedy the evils of individual laws, but never attempting to dive to the foundation of all laws, and thus ascertaining the cause of the errors and evils of them.”—Autobiography, vol. i. p. 96.

No one whose regular education had not terminated when he was seven years old could have thought of writing in this *ex cathedra* strain.

pidation, met me, and taking my hand, whilst his whole frame was agitated with the excitement, he hastily said, 'Well, well, it is all over; we are introduced;' and when I was fairly in and he had requested me to be seated, he appeared to be relieved from an arduous and formidable undertaking. He had one share, and his friends have stated that it was the only successful enterprise in which he ever engaged."*

Sir Samuel Romilly advised Bentham to have nothing to do with Owen, "who," he said, "although very well intentioned, was really a little mad;" and Bentham himself describes Owen in anything but a flattering manner.

John Walker, of Arno's Grove, appears to have been the man most after Owen's own heart in the new company. He everywhere speaks of him with affection, and he seems to have combined the tenets of a Quaker with the education and manners of a gentleman. William Allen, of Plough Court, was also one of the Society of Friends, and he it was who ultimately caused the retirement of Owen from New Lanark.

Whilst all this was being accomplished in London, the Campbells in Glasgow—good, easy men!—imagined that Owen was dreaming away his time in Utopian schemes. We have no space to describe the manner in which their counsels were overthrown; suffice it that New Lanark was ultimately sold to Owen and his friends for 114,100*l.* Again were his hopes crowned with success. When he returned, the people took the horses from his carriage, and drew him to New Lanark in triumph. That night the village was illuminated, and was a scene of heartfelt rejoicing. He had returned to his people and his home, and was what he had, through evil and through good report, nobly desired to be, the head of a great manufacturing establishment, conducted for the benefit of the working classes.

When Owen found himself in uncontrolled management of New Lanark, he established the Institution for the Formation of Character. The population now amounted to about two thousand persons, all of whom were employed in the mills. There were more than a hundred children under the age of two years, and three hundred between two and ten. As soon as the children could walk, they were admitted into infant schools, where, by means of pictures, models, and familiar conversation, they were furnished with a few ideas. The object contemplated in their early training was to interest and amuse them, and the only principles which appear to have been enforced upon them were those of mutual kindness and charity. A deputation from Leeds sent by the Poor Law Commissioners of that town, in 1819, reports:

"In the education of the children, the thing which is most remarkable is the general spirit of kindness and affection which is shown

* Autobiography, vol. i. p. 96.

towards them, and the entire absence of anything that is likely to give them bad habits, with the presence of whatever is calculated to inspire them with good ones; the consequence is, that they appear like one well regulated family, united together by the ties of the closest affection. We heard no quarrels from the youngest to the eldest, and so strongly impressed are they with the conviction that their interest and duty are the same, and that to be happy themselves it is necessary to make those happy by whom they are surrounded, that they had no strife, but in offices of kindness.”*

When they arrived at the age of ten the children were employed in the mills, and in the evening their education was continued until they reached seventeen years.† The kilt was universally adopted by the youthful population, singing and dancing were taught to them as soon as they could use their voices and their logs, and they were regularly drilled and instructed in the simpler military exercises.

“In another large room,” says Mr. Sargent, quoting from an account of Dr. M’Nab, Physician to the late Duke of Kent, “six boys entered in Highland costume, playing a quick march on the fife, with all the boys and all the girls following in order, the rear being closed with other six boy-fifers. The whole body, on entering, formed a square; then, after practising *right face* and *left face*, they marched round the room in slow and in quick time. At the word of command fifty boys and girls, by means of a sort of dancing run, met in two lines in the centre of the square, and sang, with the accompaniment of a clarionet, *When first this humble roof I saw, The Birks of Aberfeldy, Ye Banks and Braes of Bonny Doon, and Auld Lang Syne*. The square having been reformed at the word of command, other children came to the centre, and went through several dances in an elegant style. In England there would be great awkwardness in such a case, from the clumsy or ragged shoes, but these youngsters went barefoot.”‡

On all sides we find praises of New Lanark, and he must be very sceptical who doubts the testimonies which are given of Owen’s success there. There seems, indeed, little reason to suppose that his own description of the results of his system was in the least exaggerated. In his second essay he says of the people whom he ruled, and whose condition was so bad when he under-

* Autobiography, vol. i. p. 255.

† In Owen’s “Report to the County of New Lanark,” in which he advocated his quadrangular villages, he says:—“The male children of the new villagers should be clothed in a dress somewhat resembling the Roman and Highland garb, in order that the limbs may be free from ligatures, and the air circulate over every part of the body, and that they may be trained to become strong, active, well-limbed, and healthy.” (p. 38.) He surely could not have advocated the *toga*. But Owen knew about as much of the Roman dress as he did of Hebrew.

‡ Robert Owen and his Philosophy, p. 204.

took their management: "Drunkenness is not seen in their streets, and the children are taught and trained in the institution for forming their character, without any punishment. The community exhibits the general appearance of industry, temperance, comfort, health, and happiness."* All this was done without one appeal to a judicial tribunal, and the people receiving very small wages.†

Owen's publications, and his management at New Lanark, had made him well known throughout Europe. He had had interviews with Lord Liverpool, then Prime Minister, and with Lord Sidmouth, then Home Secretary; through the former, he had circulated two hundred of his essays interleaved with blank sheets for observations, among the Governments of Europe and America and the most celebrated universities, and through the latter he had sent a copy to each of the English bishops. The Prussian and Austrian ambassadors and the late Emperor of Russia visited him at New Lanark. The Dukes of York and Sussex had several interviews with him; the Duke of Kent, until his death, was his intimate friend, and when Lords Lansdowne and Brougham established their infant school in Westminster, they copied Owen's institution for the formation of character, and engaged a schoolmaster whom he had trained.

The world being thus prepared, Owen made his first public appearance in London in 1816. The war was concluded, peace was restored, but not prosperity. The barns of the farmers were overflowing, the warehouses of the manufacturers were filled, but prices had fallen much below the prime cost of production. The former discharged their labourers, the latter worked short time, or closed their mills and dismissed their hands. Employer and employed were equally distressed, and destitution prevailed both in the country and in the towns.

A great meeting was called at the City of London Tavern, the Duke of York presiding. Many of the bishops were there, and at the solicitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Owen stated his opinion upon the causes of the national distress. At the unanimous request of the committee, then appointed by the meeting, he drew up a plan for its cure. In this report, as it may be termed, he attacked the late war, the political economists, stated his views upon the formation of character, gave a description of New Lanark, and advocated the division of the country into quadrangular villages. This committee did not feel inclined

Autobiography, vol. i. p. 285.

† Youths and young women, until they were eighteen years old, received by the week 4s. 3d. or 3s. 5d.; by the piece, 5s. 4d. or 4s. 7d. Men and women over that age received by the week, 9s. 11d. or 6s.; or by the piece, 14s. 10d. or 8s. This is very little for skilled labour.

to take into consideration a report so "extensive in its recommendations, so new in principle and practice, and involving great national changes," and which, moreover, seems to have offered no suggestion for the remedy of the then present want, or for allaying the popular discontent. Indeed, the knowledge of the simplest principles of political economy would have prevented him from producing so absurd a paper. A Committee of the House of Commons was at this time sitting upon the Poor-laws.* Owen was determined not to lose his report, and therefore gave notice to the committee, through Mr. (now Lord) Brougham, that he was willing to be examined. They refused to examine him, and he revenged himself by publishing a fictitious examination in the daily papers, such as he imagined would have taken place had he been admitted, and concluded by saying, that were the debate upon his exclusion published, "it would be a valuable document to prove a conspiracy of the upper against the natural and legal rights of the lower classes."

Owen now attempted a general improvement of the condition of the persons employed in the factories. In 1815 he had called a meeting in Glasgow, with the view of adopting a petition for the repeal of the duty on cotton, and to declare the necessity for some measures being taken for the protection of the people engaged in textile manufactures. The first resolution was passed unanimously, but for the second he could find no supporter. In his usual fashion, he published the address he had read upon that occasion, and distributed it among men of influence. When he was in London, he communicated upon both questions with the Government. The then Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Vansittart) promised that the duty on cotton should be reduced to one quarter of its former amount, and said that the Ministry would favourably entertain any Bill introduced into Parliament for the relief of the workpeople, though they themselves could not take charge of such a measure. Owen induced the first Sir Robert Peel to introduce the desired Bill into the House of Commons, and it was referred to a committee. Two sessions were consumed in inquiries upon the subject. Many and unanswerable arguments were brought against this Factory Act, apparently unjustified as it was upon any grounds of principle or expediency, and the only arguments which could be adduced in its favour were founded upon the successful management of New Lanark. Instead of resting their opposition to the measure, however, upon the firm bases of economical science, the cotton-spinners were intent upon destroying Owen's authority in such matters. Two

Known as Sturges Bourne's Committee.

delegates were sent to New Lanark to collect all the tales of scandal which they could discover. Happily for them, there were there several old women and one clergyman. They brought this reverend defamer in triumph to London, and they arranged an interview between him and Lord Sidmouth. He accused Owen of having propagated infidel and revolutionary opinions at a public meeting, of encouraging dissenting ministers, and of declaring himself an enemy of Church and State. He had not heard these sentiments expressed himself, but his wife had, and he had every reason to depend upon the accuracy of her memory, since she was in the habit of repeating his sermons to him with great exactness. Lord Sidmouth dismissed these statements and the deputation which made them, with the contempt which they deserved.

During the two sessions through which the Commons Committee sat, Owen attended every one of their meetings. He was subjected to much severe examination by the manufacturing members, one of whom (Sir George Phillips), with unparalleled impudence, questioned him so discursively upon subjects having no reference to the matter in hand, including his religious opinions, that, upon the motion of Mr. Brougham, the examination was expunged from the minutes. In 1819, the Factory Act received the Royal assent, a measure the policy of which is at least questionable, and for the origin of which we are inclined to give Owen little credit.

There is an old proverb which says, "Set a beggar on horseback, and he'll ride to the devil;" and this proverb Owen was now fated to illustrate. An ex-linendraper, who had suddenly become an important person, who was admitted to the friendship of royal dukes and the confidence of Ministers, was certain, whatever his talents may have been, unless he possessed great moderation and prudence, to make himself ridiculous in the end. Moderation and prudence were not among Owen's many virtues. He was now no longer contented with doing good among his two thousand labourers in New Lanark—a manufacturing village was too narrow a field for the exercise of his talents; he determined to ameliorate the condition of all men; the sphere of his labours should be bounded only by the confines of civilization. The attention of the great had turned his head, and he imagined he was the prophet of philanthropy, the forerunner of a millennium. On the 30th of July, 1817, Owen announced his intention of calling a meeting, and subsequently he appointed the 12th of August and the City of London Tavern the time and place of its holding. He published a considerable document to prepare the public mind for what was to be done at this meeting. He entitled it: "A Sketch of some of the Errors and Evils arising from the Past and

Present State of Society, with an Explanation of some of the peculiar Advantages to be derived from the Arrangement of the Unemployed Working Classes into Agricultural and Manufacturing Villages of Unity and Mutual Co-operation, limited to a Population of from 500 to 1500 Persons." The meeting came off, and was adjourned to the 21st of the same month. Owen read an address, and being determined not to "hide his light under a bushel," he spent a large sum in purchasing the assistance of the newspapers. He sent no less than thirty thousand of these, containing an account of his proceedings, to various parts of the country. The letter-bags were so loaded with this unusual burden, that the mails were delayed twenty minutes in starting. Forty thousand small pamphlets were distributed gratis, and Owen informs us that the Government became alarmed at his indefatigable activity.

"On being informed of this alarm of the Government, which was heightened by all the London and many of the provincial newspapers being loud in praising my measures, and giving great aid to the circulation of them among all classes, making me decidedly the most popular man of the day, I asked Lord Liverpool for an interview two days before the second meeting, which had been adjourned to the 21st of August, to give all parties sufficient time to take their measures in opposition to it. The interview was immediately appointed for twelve o'clock the next day at his Lordship's private house. The door was opened before I had time to ring the bell, and I was shown at once into the apartment of the private secretary, who was then Mr. Peel, afterwards the talented and celebrated prime minister—the second Sir Robert Peel—who, on my entering, arose and said, with great deference in his manner, 'My Lord Liverpool will see you immediately,' and then remained standing, while I was seated, for two or three minutes, when Lord Liverpool came hastily from his private room adjoining, to request me to walk in. I mention these particulars here to show the effect which my extraordinary popularity produced upon the Government; and it was equally paramount with the population of all classes."*

In the interview which Owen had with Lord Liverpool, he seems to have informed him that he did not intend to overthrow the constitution, and having given him this comforting assurance,

* Autobiography, vol. i. p. 149. This description reminds us of Mr. Thackeray's "Yellow Plush Papers" more than anything else. Owen never loses an opportunity of parading the attention which he received from people with titles.

"Even Irish names, could he but tag 'em
With lord or duke, were sweet to call;
And at a pinch, Lord Ballyraggum
Were better than no lord at all."

Poetical Works of Thomas Moore, p. 411.

he asked him to allow him to propose his name and the names of some of his colleagues as members of a committee of investigation, which, at the next of his meetings, he intended to nominate. To this Lord Liverpool assented, and Owen says that he subsequently learned that he and other members of his cabinet were converts to the new views of society.

Between the two meetings, Owen was challenged to make a declaration of his faith. Under like circumstances the ancestor of a present pious peer said that his religion was the religion of all rational men, and upon still further inquiry as to what that might be, he replied that which no rational man ever mentions. But this was not the opinion of Owen. Friend of the bishops as he was, he was determined to show that he was no friend to their creed. Therefore, after detailing his plan for the formation of quadrangular villages (New Lanark was not quadrangular), he thus announced his views:—

“Why should so many countless millions of our fellow-creatures, through each successive generation, have been the victims of ignorance, of superstition, of mental degradation, and of wretchedness? My friends, a more important question has never yet been put to the sons of men. Who can answer it, who dare answer it, but with his life in his hand? a ready and willing victim to truth and to the emancipation of the world from its long bondage of disunion, error, crime, and misery. Behold that victim! On this day—in this hour—even now—shall those bonds be burst asunder, never more to reunite while the world shall last. What the consequences of this daring deed shall be to myself, I am as indifferent about as whether it shall rain or be fair to-morrow. Whatever may be the consequences, I will perform my duty to you and to the world, and should it be the last act of my life, I shall be well content, and know that I have lived for an important purpose. Then, my friends, I tell you that hitherto you have been prevented from ever knowing what happiness really is, solely in consequence of the errors—gross errors—that have been combined with the fundamental notions of every religion that has hitherto been taught to men.”*

Owen was not torn in pieces: the days of physical vengeance for heterodoxy had passed by; but no man, even now, can insult the cherished prejudices of the world with impunity. A few clergymen at the meeting made a faint attempt to hiss, but the announcement was received with deafening applause. He turned round to his friends on the platform, and said: “The victory is gained. Truth openly stated is omnipotent.” But he was mistaken. Lord Brougham, whom he met next day, judged far more correctly when he told him that if one of the Opposition had made such a statement in Parliament as he had done, he would have

* Autobiography, vol. i. A. p. 115.

been burnt alive. Taking this as a metaphor, it was true as regards Owen. He had incurred the sublime hatred of ecclesiastical rancour, and from this meeting dates the long list of failures which made his life ridiculous for forty years. The Ministry, if they ever had anything to fear from his popularity, had now no further cause for alarm. It had sprung up like the prophet's gourd, and it withered quite as fast. He was not a martyr, but he was an outlaw. England was no longer the scene for his triumphs. "A people destitute of faith, but terrified at scepticism, who believe in their religion, because if they did not do so they would know not what to believe in"—as has been aptly said—was no place for an infidel reformer. To the Continent, therefore, he went, and thence to Ireland. Abroad, Professor Pictet, La Place, and Cuvier, were among his friends. They were not frightened at his irreligion. He met with Pestalozzi and the Duc d'Orleans in France, and in Ireland the Catholic bishops seem to have treated him well, for an atheist is more acceptable with them than a Protestant.

On his return to New Lanark he was received very differently. Up to the period of the unfortunate meeting, he had observed towards the subject of religion a prudent reticence. Three of the partners in the New Lanark Company were, be it remembered, Quakers, and philanthropy would have been no excuse in their eyes for impiety. Until now, they had not dreamed that his opinions were so decidedly opposed to all that they considered most necessary for man's welfare here and hereafter. For some time, however, they had looked with suspicion upon the singing, dancing, and drilling, in which the children in the institution for the formation of character were encouraged. They had contemplated their instruction in these worldly and soul-destroying exercises with much the same feelings as a hen may be supposed to experience, which having hatched ducklings, watches her supposititious brood entering the water; but as the Bible was read, as psalms and prayers were permitted, they had refrained from interference. When, however, Owen declared his real convictions, they were seized, after the manner of their sect, with "fearful quakings" for the souls of their adopted children. The profanity at which they had formerly winked, they were now determined to eradicate with the strong hand of authority. Singing, dancing, and drilling were no longer accidental parts of the system for the formation of character; they were the practical results of the accursed infidelity which, in their manager, they had such good reason to deplore. William Allen headed the Quakers who went down to New Lanark to effect a change. In 1824 an agreement was signed, by which no singing but psalmody, no dancing, and no drilling were to be permitted; "and," say they in this precious docu-

ment, "having considered the dress of the children, we are of opinion that decency requires that all males, as they arrive at the age of six years, should wear trousers or drawers, and we agree that they shall be required to be so clothed." Owen refused longer to remain in the New Lanark Twist Company, and would only retain its management until another could be found competent to undertake it. He had long contemplated the formation of a community at Orbiston, in Lanarkshire, and he now went to the United States with the idea of founding one there. In 1829 he finally retired from New Lanark, and the first thing which was done there, when it had fallen into Christian hands, was an increase of the hours of labour and a decrease of the labourers' wages.

We have felt that New Lanark was the really important point in Owen's history, and have therefore dwelt much longer upon his connexion with it than its chronological extent would have warranted. We shall have to hurry over the remainder of his life with such haste as will preclude the possibility of our doing minute justice to all its details. Those of our readers who may be sufficiently interested in the subject to desire to pursue it further, we must refer to the works from which we have extracted our information.

The community at Orbiston, though commenced under Owen's auspices, was carried out under those of Abraham Combe, brother to the phrenologists. It lasted but a few years, and not a trace of the village now remains. Owen's own project was New Harmony, in the United States. He bought thirty thousand acres of land from a body of about seven hundred German enthusiasts in Indiana and Illinois. These people had emigrated under the guidance of a pastor or prophet named Rapp, and were now leaving the home of their adoption, not because of want of success there, but because the profane world was pressing upon their sacred precincts. The soil was fertile, the scenery was fine, water power was abundant, and nature seems to have fitted it in every way as the trial place for an experiment like that of Owen. In the Congress Hall, at Washington, he declared his schemes to the Americans, and here he commenced to develop them. The object of his new community was to ensure happiness to all its members, and the means by which this end was to be accomplished were, in his own words: "The adoption of a system of union and co-operation, founded in a spirit of universal charity derived from a correct knowledge of the constitution of human nature." Into the society two classes of persons were to be admitted, those who had capital, and those who could only bring labour. Capitalists who were indisposed to work were to receive their maintenance upon the payment of an annuity to the public exchequer; and labourers employed in various trades, or in the education of youth, were to receive a like reward for their services. If overtaken "by

age or sickness, they were to be supported out of the common fund. As the profits of the establishment were expected by Owen to be far greater than the outlay, an account was to be taken at the end of every year of the work done by each family, and the surplus money was to be divided among all in proportion to the value of this. Any person who desired to retire, or who was expelled, was to take with him the amount allotted to him at the last account day. The affairs of the community were to be regulated by a committee of all persons who had reached a certain age; and in accordance with thirty-nine articles which Owen framed, the minutest incidents of private life were to be determined by this public authority. Under this arrangement the New Harmonians were to continue until they had reached a condition of education and advancement sufficient to warrant Owen in withdrawing from their government. Their arrival at this desirable state was to be shown by their paying back to him the purchase-money of the territory. But he was so delighted with their progress that he did not wait for this practical proof of their improvement, and in 1826 a convention was held for the purpose of framing a constitution. The constitution was framed, and it declares that happiness being the object in view, the principles upon which the members of the New Harmony community of co-operation and union will be required to act in attaining to it, are equality of rights between adult men and women, co-operative union in business and in amusement, kindness and courtesy in action, and community of property, which it is said is adopted to prevent "competition and opposition, jealousy and dissension, extravagance and poverty, tyranny and slavery." A number of laws were made, all of which, destitute of sanction, without even the good marks and fines of New Lanark, were to be spontaneously obeyed in the happy village. Ten communities of similar description sprang up round New Harmony, but although the institutions had been constructed upon Owen's principles, the men who were to live under them had not so been made. Itinerant preachers sowed the seeds of religious creeds among Owen's people, and these soon grew up into a fine crop of discord. One by one the principles of communism were disregarded, until at the end of a few short years Owen himself acknowledged that New Harmony had failed. Thirty years have now elapsed since the society finally broke up, the land is still in the possession of the family of its founder, but it is not the seat of a community of co-operation and union.

In 1828 he went on a journey to Mexico for the purpose of founding another society. Nothing came of this enterprise; but Owen spent a few days among the West Indian islands, and was delighted with the condition of the slaves in Jamaica.

"Wherever I go," he says, "I find philanthropy and religion mere names to confound the understanding and deceive the very best-intentioned individuals. If Thomas Clarkson, Mr. Wilberforce, William Allen, Fowell Buxton, and other British philanthropists, made an unprejudiced comparison between the present state of the manufacturing and other labouring classes in the islands of Great Britain and Ireland, and the slave population of the West India colonies, they would discover that they had a task equal to all their united powers of body, mind, and means, to advance the former to the same enjoyments that are now in the actual possession of the latter."*

The Jamaica slaves are, he goes on to say, "better dressed, more independent in look, person, and manners, and greatly more free from corroding care and anxiety, than a large portion of the working classes of England, Scotland, and Ireland;" and therefore he earnestly wished that no one would interfere with their enviable condition—a condition, be it observed, which nearly approached his *ideal* of the existence of humanity, as it *practically* does that of the more valuable brutes trained for the use of man.

Owen had now lived for nearly threescore years. His mind was active as ever, and his time was at his own command. His management at New Lanark had terminated, Orbiston had disappeared from the face of the earth, New Harmony had failed, and the Mexican project had proved abortive. His policy, but not his principles, had undergone some modification. Events compelled him to confess that socialistic communities, though founded upon the surest principles, were difficult to construct, so as to prevent the occurrence of fatal dissensions. He therefore dedicated himself to the task of instructing the working classes of his native land, for the purpose of preparing them for the mighty changes which he still vainly hoped to effect. He determined to institute among the people co-operative societies, in which they could purchase the necessities of life, and undertake their just division among themselves. He delivered Sunday lectures in the Mechanics' Institute in Southampton-buildings, and he established the Equitable Labour Exchange in Gray's Inn-road. This was the first of those institutions of which the Rochdale Pioneer Society is the most flourishing type. The Christian Socialists† (an abnormal growth of these latter days) were surprised to discover more than twenty of them scattered throughout the kingdom. He, as usual, grandiloquently

* British Colonial Operator, 93.

† The Christian Socialists are otherwise termed Muscular Christians. The Professor of History at Cambridge and Mr. Hughes are the chief prophets of the sect. Their *ideal* is the pious and strong. One who praises God and can walk a thousand miles in a thousand hours.

announced the object which the Equitable Labour Exchange was intended to secure. It was "to employ beneficially, and educate usefully, all who are unemployed and uneducated in Great Britain;" and of the measures which were adopted for this purpose, the most important was the sixth. It was "To receive provisions, clothing, and other property, and services of every description, to be exchanged on the equitable principle of *labour for equal value of labour*, through the medium of labour notes." A person who had done so much work received a piece of paper on which was estimated its value, and in exchange for this he could obtain an equivalent quantity of any commodities he might desire. Gold and silver were to be abolished, and in a short time the labour notes were at a discount. It was found in a little while that this institution could not succeed; it was therefore abandoned, and Owen lost several thousand pounds in the enterprise. After this he espoused the cause of the Dorchester labourers, and of trades' unions all over the country. He saw Lord Melbourne upon the subject, but the days of his power were over. Once he had a name to conjure with, but now it had lost its virtue.

For more than twenty years after this his life has little interest for the public. Few people even knew that he was still alive—

"Ein unnütz Leben ist ein früher Tod,"

He called public meetings, but hardly any one attended them, he reiterated his old principles, which every one had forgotten, and became, in truth, a complete social Joseph Ady. Those who applied to him were to hear of something to their advantage, and he generally told them that the whole fabric of society was founded upon a gross error, or that the prosperity of the world depended upon the cultivation of the soil with the spade instead of the plough.

He offered himself as a candidate for Parliament, first for Oldham, and then for any constituency who would pay all his election expenses. Not one could be found inclined to do this, so he consoled himself by presenting endless petitions to the Houses of Lords and Commons, and addresses to the sovereigns of Europe. Uninstructed by experience, he founded another community, called Harmony Hall, in Hampshire. Here his success was no better than it had been in Indiana. The members quarrelled with each other, and would not do their appointed labours. Spade husbandry did not yield the return that was expected; the ploughmen insisted upon teaching the children, and the teachers insisted upon ploughing. People would *not* dance and sing, or *would* dance and sing at unseasonable hours, and then, to crown all, they deposed Owen from the management. At last, in his

dotage, he became converted to spirit-rapping. He denied the miracles of Christ, but put implicit faith in those of Mrs. Hayden. He had interviews with several of the Hebrew prophets, whose Divine mission he still doubted, and with Byron, Shelley, and Dr. Chalmers. He praises the ghost of the Duke of Kent for its punctuality in keeping appointments, and asserted that he was certain spiritual aid would contribute to the final acceptance of his system. It is not, however, our province to detail these painful manifestations of mental disease; we must leave this part of Owen's life to some journal of psychological medicine, for spiritualism (as its believers call it) is simply a form of epidemic malady analogous to revivalism. Whilst the former attacks nervous infidels, the latter attacks hysterical Christians.

In November, 1858, he returned to his native town. "I will lay my bones," he said, "where I derived them"; and at Newtown he sank under the weight of eighty-seven years. Four old men with tottering steps bore him to his grave; they had once been his schoolfellows. He was buried near to his parents, among the ruins of an ancient Saxon church, and there, amidst the memorials of an orthodox past, sleeps the prophet of future innovation. On his plain tombstone his schemes and principles are not recorded, and no lying epitaph exaggerates his virtues. His time of birth and death alone are there, as those of Robert Owen of New Lanark.

In spite of his mistakes, his vanity, and his failures—the two former being the most obvious causes of the last—Robert Owen deserves well at our hands. Unmixed praise or blame is rarely merited by any one, and it certainly is not by him. If he propounded no great truths, he combated great errors. If he did not induce many to change their opinions, he at least gave all an opportunity of strengthening their present ones by comparing them with his. He provoked that which is always of advantage—a great deal of free discussion. But few of his doctrines are entirely false, and none of them are wholly true. It often happens that established notions and dissenting ones, though neither of them are quite correct, yet contain the truth between them, and form as it were the requisite complements to each other. This is illustrated in both of Owen's most important theories—that upon the formation of character, and that upon the establishment of socialistic communities. Each is made up of a thread of truth and a web of error. The first, taken as he states it, and accompanied by the conclusion which he deduced from it—man's character is formed *for* him and not *by* him, and he therefore is not responsible for its results—contradicts the universal experience of mankind, and stifles our noblest aspira-

tions for moral improvement; but if modified by accepted doctrines, it may be incorporated as a part of the great theory of philosophical necessity in human affairs, that our thoughts, volitions, and actions are the consequences of antecedents. The second, whilst merely adopted by private industrial societies—the condition of absolute community of property being eliminated—might prove beneficial, as the institution at Rochdale, founded upon a similar basis, has proved; but were it acted upon by a nation and enforced by a Government, the consequences would be the utter destruction of individuality, the reduction of all intelligence to the same dead conventional level; the extinction of all personal liberty, and the production of a stagnant or retrograde civilization, such as exists in China, and is threatened in France. These are the two chief doctrines with which the name of Robert Owen is identified; spade husbandry and spiritualism may be looked upon as merely accidental accretions, but these two he set forth in his earlier writings, and perseveringly repeated in his later ones. Upon them he founded his system for revolutionizing society, and long after they had been proved to be erroneous, he continued to believe in them himself, and untiringly to declare their truth to a wisely incredulous world. His works are mere reiterations of them, and in the chaos of undigested thought and defective argument which he gave to the world in and between the four essays on the “New Views of Society” and the seven books of “The New Moral World,” they are everywhere visible. His mind had never undergone any regular training, his understanding had been subjected to no discipline, his thoughts appear to succeed each other without any particular order or design, and although his premises are for the most part always the same, it is not easy to trace any connexion between them and his multitudinous conclusions. His ignorance of what others had done led him, in common with most self-educated men, to believe that each fresh acquisition to his knowledge was a new and original discovery. This contributed to produce in him the overweening vanity which he exhibits upon every page of his autobiography. He compares some sermons which he composed when he was between seven and eight years old, to the masterpieces of Sterne; and says that he found the turn of thought and idea so similar in the two cases, that he destroyed his productions for fear he should be charged with plagiarism. He constantly asserts himself to be the being whose lot it was to regenerate society, he firmly believed that he had discovered the *panacea* for all human ills, the *virgin earth* of social science, and that all the governments of Europe were upon the point of mapping out their respective dominions into quadrangular villages, and of substituting for

their present creeds and institutions an organized system of Owenism.

From his success at New Lanark, he thought that the excellence of his plan had been proved by an *experimentum crucis*, forgetting that there it had only been partially tried; he tried it to the full in England and in America, and it failed. He imagined that he had dealt a deathblow to all the religions of mankind, and that he had inaugurated a new system of political philosophy—that he had freed the human mind for ever from the influence of superstition, and had secured for all people another golden age of virtue and of plenty; but he had only destroyed his own reputation and proved himself ignorant of the first elements of social science. By the sacrifice of the whole of their personal independence, the dwellers in his model villages were to get enough to eat and drink and clothe themselves, and their children were to be taught singing, dancing, drilling, and reading, writing, and arithmetic. It entered not into his mind that these things are not quite sufficient to make a nation prosperous, great, and happy. It did not occur to him that “men live not by bread alone,” that mere physical welfare is not all that is required by human beings. He busied himself about many things, but the one thing needful he forgot, Liberty—the only true basis for felicity and improvement, which he ignored when he pronounced his eulogy upon the slaves of Jamaica, and which he would have abolished to raise the condition of our labouring men. It did not appear to him that education consisted in aught else than a few lessons of philanthropy, in singing, dancing, drilling, in reading, writing, and arithmetic. The rich and increasing harvests of modern science and philosophy were not known to him—he saw not that

“ — through the ages one increasing purpose runs,
And the thoughts of men are widened with the circling of the suns; ”

but he imagined that human happiness would be complete when all men were fat and enslaved, and that human knowledge would ripen and extend when all men had received the same miserable elements of a parish education. And even if that education had realized the ideal of Comte, he did not see that progress would stop in a people where each was turned out from an institution for the formation of character, as like each other as the blocks of concrete with which they are building Dover Pier. The advance of man in all that makes humanity admirable depends upon diversity of mind and opinion; were all alike, that advance would cease, and a retrograde movement set in. Allegiance to the sovereignty of the individual is the loyalty which each man now owes to all.

There is no danger that the theories of Owen will be adopted

in practice. They are such flimsy chains that they can never bind a nation. Long before his death they were demolished and forgotten, but he still believed himself to be the destined benefactor of humanity—a kind of atheistic Messiah. After his conversion to spirit-rapping, he seems gravely to have applied to himself the following description given by some spirits at New York, who probably had left their bodies in Bedlam.

“That which the world now most needs, and there is little hope of its redemption till that can be done, is to generate, as it were, a new world’s Redeemer—one who elementarily shall be able to combine the love of a Jesus, the boldness of a Paul, the fidelity of a Daniel, learning of an Aristotle, morals of a Socrates, education of a Plato, intellect of a Webster, eloquence of a Brougham, and the religion of a Madame Guyon.”

“Humano capiti cervicem pictor equinam
Jungere si velit, et varias inducere plumas,
Undique collatis membris, ut turpiter atrum
Desinat in piscem mulier formosa superne;
Spectatum admissi risum teneatis amici.”*

His conversion to spirit-rapping was not in the least surprising. Uneducated men are constantly leaping with awkward gait from the heights of scepticism to the heights of credulity. They attempt to determine every question by the light of nature. Study, reflection, and caution in forming judgments, are unknown to them.

In the foregoing pages we have dwelt more upon the incidents of Robert Owen’s life than upon the peculiarities of his theories, because we desired to express our sympathy with the practical good which he did, but to declare our complete dissent from the results of his speculations. His biography is more interesting than his works; whilst the former is calculated to instruct and amuse, the latter are only fitted to mislead and to tire the reader. But even here we feel that he lived too long: too long for himself, too long for his friends, and far too long for his biographer.

* Horace, De Arte Poet., 1-5.

ART. IV.—THE ORGANIZATION OF ITALY.

Italy in Transition. By WILLIAM ARTHUR, A.M. London : 1860.

IT is now nearly two years since Italy began to draw to herself the almost exclusive attention of that highly educated portion of the European public whose minds, unshackled by local interests or the prejudices of country, enable them to take an unbiassed cosmopolitan view of that great struggle for civil and religious liberty, which, although the theatre of the combat has often changed, has never entirely ceased to agitate the breast of man, for whenever the fire has been trampled out in one spot, some brave spirits have ever been found ready to kindle it in another. Germany, at the period of the Reformation, England during her great Civil War, represented the cause of freedom, and both succeeded in beating off the assailants, though with different degrees of completeness, and thus caused the Teutonic race to be considered as the true representative and guardian of liberty of thought; while the apathy with which Spain and Italy beheld the struggles of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and the rapidity with which the entire ascendancy of political and religious despotism in France followed the defeat of the Huguenots in the field, notwithstanding the strong hold their doctrines seemed once to have obtained, induced thinking men to set it down almost as an axiom, that the Latin nations, having failed to embrace Protestantism, were utterly unfit for the task of governing themselves. Only a few years ago, the state of Italy seemed an exemplification of this theory. We beheld a country of heavenly beauty and rare fertility, which had once given birth to the material conquerors of the world, and then to those princes of the ideal realms of art and poetry whose sway is even yet undisputed, and to those merchant nobles who rivalled in luxury, while they far surpassed in refinement, the monarchs of other lands, reduced to a mere geographical expression, her ports deserted, her cities crumbling into decay, and the very thoughts of her inhabitants crushed under the extreme of foreign and domestic tyranny. From the Alps to the Grecian Sea, not a spot that freedom could call her own; the heavens seemed united as bronze, until, at the foot of the mountains, in a province so despised as hardly to be considered Italian, there sprung up a constitution, even as a cloud no bigger than a man's hand, the growth and spread of which over the peninsula bid fair to reverse the judgment pronounced in the case of at least one nation derived from the Latin stock. The little constitutional State which two years since did not count five millions

of inhabitants, already possesses nearly twelve; while we write, the question whether the ten millions dwelling in the Two Sicilies shall be united to the northern kingdom, is being practically agitated, and if the decision be in the affirmative, the loss of all temporal power by the Pope, and the final expulsion of the Austrians from Italy, can politically be only questions of time. But even if we suppose the whole peninsula united under the sceptre of Victor Emmanuel, the Italian question will only have passed through its first phase, and in this article we propose to examine what probability there is of the Italians forming themselves into a consolidated State.

Of all the problems of political science, none perhaps is so difficult of solution as that of assimilating two provinces or races, united under the same government. Within our own islands, after seven centuries of rule, the Irish are still a distinct people, and in the recesses of the Welsh mountains may still be heard occasional echoes of the hatred borne to the Saxon by the ancient Celts. Austria has totally failed to absorb the nationalities gathered under her sway; and probably the best instances that can be given of the successful incorporation of one State with another, are that of Lorraine with France, and of Posen with Prussia. In Italy the difficulties to be encountered are not those of race or religion, nor is the union of the provinces a compulsory marriage, as has too often been the case, when, to terminate a war, so many hundred thousand persons and their dwelling-places have been allotted by treaty to one sovereign or another, from motives of geographical convenience, without the slightest regard to their moral affinities; but still, the position of the new State is anomalous and complicated enough. It is symbolical of the whole situation that within the new frontiers we find a State without a name, a king without a title. Now that the annexed provinces exceed in size, population, and wealth those to which they have united themselves, it seems absurd to talk of the king and kingdom of *Sardinia*, titles which would, beside, convey an idea foreign to the majority of those whose votes have created the new State, viz., that they intended to merge their own individuality in that of Piedmont. On the other hand, notwithstanding the counsel of the Emperor Napoleon, who, after the convention of Villafranca, is said to have advised the immediate assumption of the title of "King of Italy," and to have replied to the objection, that Lombardy alone did not constitute Italy, that if the name were taken the State would follow, Victor Emmanuel and his ministers have not deemed it fitting to assume this name while in possession of scarcely half the peninsula. Thus, the official paper is termed the "Gazette of the Kingdom," in formal documents the "State" is mentioned without its being named, and decrees are headed

"Victor Emmanuel, &c. &c.," reminding one of the proud old French motto,

"Roi ne puis,
Prince ne daigne,
Rohan je suis."

These small circumstances would be childish, were they not emblematical, but like straws, they may serve to show which way the wind blows. They indicate that the present State is an incomplete body, and that although the action of the Government may be restrained by prudence and the pressure of external circumstances, it still sympathizes with the popular aspiration which raises the shout of "Viva il Re d'Italia," whenever the sovereign appears in public; and chiefly perhaps they testify that Count Cavour and his colleagues do not desire to swathe the large limbs of freed Italy in the swaddling-clothes which shielded the infant liberties of small Piedmont. This liberality, which meets at once the instinct of the many, and the matured thought of the few competent to judge so complicated a problem as the organization of a State, is popularly recognised in the laudatory name of "l'Italianissimo" (the most Italian), applied to Count Cavour, in contradistinction to the "Piedmontese," often used to stigmatize the narrower views of his parliamentary rival, Signor Rattazzi.

That the tendency of Italy towards political unity is of extraordinary strength but few will deny. It has been manifested in a thousand ways, and with a patient perseverance which is perhaps the most difficult effort for an excitable southern people. The votes in favour of union with Piedmont in 1848, recorded in Lombardy, Venetia, Parma, and Modena; the flying to arms in 1859; the swelling tide of emigration which has flowed steadily from Venetia and Umbria for a year past; the resistance of Central Italy to all the cajoleries of diplomacy; the universal suffrage which proved that in Tuscany but one man in twenty-five, in the Emilia but three in seventy-three, could be found to vote for a separate State; the thundering acclamations which greeted Victor Emmanuel at his entrance into Florence and Bologna; the addresses of the Sicilian municipalities; the coldness with which Naples received the boon of a constitution really liberal in itself, and the sudden illumination of the city to honour the birthday of Garibaldi;* the wonderful and romantic progress of that chief through Calabria, from the first landing below Reggio to its consummation at the entrance into the capital, amid the shouts of the Lazzaroni, and the salutes of the soldiers, still nominally in the service of Francis II.—all testify to the conviction of the Italian people, that

* On several occasions a vain endeavour was made to induce the Neapolitans to illuminate in honour of the constitution. At length, one evening every window was suddenly observed to be blazing with lights, and in great hopes of a popular revulsion in their favour, the ministers, and even the Papal nuncio,

one in country and in language, they must have one ruler and form one State, if they would secure the liberties of their fair land, and place it beyond all risk of the renewal of foreign oppression. Nor need we wonder at the instinct which has induced the Italians to rally round Victor Emmanuel, however essentially different his character from what has usually been deemed the ideal of an Italian. The king, human from his very imperfections, is thereby rendered all the more loveable, and his truly national aspirations and soldierly qualities, individualize, not what the Italians have been or even are, but what they yearn to become. Little doubt can, we think, be entertained that the remaining provinces, when polled, will elect him to be their sovereign with the unanimity that characterized the votes of Central Italy. As regards Sicily, the King of Naples himself gave up the game by proposing to recognise the decision of universal suffrage, in the vain hope of preserving his continental provinces by this concession, and everything that has occurred since Garibaldi set foot in Calabria shows the annexionist party to be rapidly gaining ground in Naples itself, hitherto considered the most separatist of Italian cities.

But all this tendency to fly together, which may be illustrated by the Arabian tale of the Mountain of Magnet, which drew to itself all the iron nails and bolts of the ships that passed within the circle of its fatal attraction, is by no means synonymous with the desire or even the capacity to form a strictly centralized empire, like that of France. Hardly less strong and of far more ancient origin than the tendency to political union, is that towards municipal and administrative independence, and this instinct, which, wisely directed and skilfully taken advantage of, may, we believe, prove of the greatest advantage to the State, may, also, if unwarily thwarted and obstructed, become a rock among the breakers on which the vessel of the new kingdom might go to pieces, the young liberties of Italy being wrecked when apparently so near the harbour.

This tendency to municipal or administrative independence, already strong, and which will receive an additional impulse from any future annexation, and must therefore be all the more considered in any scheme for the organization of the actual State, may, in our opinion, be attributed to three principal causes, of which the first may be most aptly termed the diversity of tenure. Just as a proprietor in England may and does constantly possess freehold, leasehold, and copyhold lands, with each of which he is obliged to deal in a different manner, King

hastened to follow the general example. The shouts of the populace soon informed them that the demonstration was intended for Garibaldi, but too late, for they did not dare to extinguish the lamps already burning in their windows.

Victor Emmanuel holds sway over his provinces by the several rights of inheritance, treaty, and popular election. Those held under the first tenure, like freehold lands, are his absolutely, and any franchises they possess are theirs by his gift; for the second, he has incurred European obligations, expressed or implied by the treaties which constitute his title to them; while, as regards the third, he was elected for a purpose, which his acceptance of the trust binds him to carry out. It would, perhaps, be impossible to find a State inhabited by a single race, and yet made up of more composite elements. Nearly eight centuries have elapsed since Oddone, fourth Count of Savoy, first set foot in Italy by his marriage with the wealthy heiress of Susa. Subsequent alliances extended the borders of the little territory he bequeathed to his descendants; but all these acquisitions taken together scarcely constituted what would now be termed the principality of Piedmont, and their importance was not sufficient to place the Counts of Savoy among Italian potentates. Still the geographical position of the tiny State, and the restless, energetic disposition of most of the princes of this house, who skilfully profited by their situation as guardians of the Alps, gave them an incommensurate importance, and thus lead us to the second phase of their aggrandizement. Louis XIV. of France set so high a value on the alliance of the Duke Victor-Amadeus, that he endeavoured to secure it by the marriage of his two elder grandsons, the Dukes of Burgundy and Anjou (Philip V. of Spain) with two daughters of that Prince, while Austria, with the same object, ceded to him a large slice of the Duchy of Milan, including the important provinces of Alessandria and Valenza. At the general pacification of Utrecht (1713) the Duke of Savoy acquired the regal title and the island of Sicily, exchanged five years later for that of Sardinia; and the subsequent treaties of Luxembourg (1736) and of Aix-la-Chapelle (1748) made the Ticino the frontier between the new kingdom and the Austrian possessions in Italy. This portion of the present dominions, united more than a hundred years since, by a transfer of certain districts, without extinguishing any other Italian State, and since then peaceably handed down from one sovereign to another, may fairly be regarded as that inherited.

Very different in their effects on the balance of power in Italy are the acquisitions made in the present century, and especially within the last eighteen months. A hundred years ago, two great Republics, the last relics of the innumerable free cities of the Middle Ages, sat enthroned on the Mediterranean and Adriatic shores. Both were swept away by the mighty hand of Napoleon, and the Congress of Vienna had no taste for restoring republican governments, however patrician in form. Genoa and Venice were,

therefore, respectively assigned to Sardinia and Austria, in addition to the territories they possessed previous to the revolutionary wars. A great and important alteration was thus effected. The Italian Powers from nine* were reduced in number to seven; but even this cannot be compared to the change made during the last and present years, which has reduced them to four. The conquest of Lombardy, and its cession by treaty, are events too recent and familiar for us to particularize them, as are also the votations of Tuscany and Emilia, which, while they add a population of four additional millions to a State which the Treaty of Zurich had declared to consist of eight, had the further effect of wholly extinguishing three (Tuscany, Parma, Modena), of dismembering a fourth (that of the Pope), and of forming the third tenure of which we first made mention, namely, that of popular election.

This great diversity of tenure would perhaps alone suffice to make a large measure of municipal liberty indispensable, but it is far from being the only motive urging such a course; for, as is natural, there exists an equal difference between the laws of the component portions of the State, and consequently between the manners and customs of the inhabitants, and these divergencies, in our opinion, constitute the second and third causes of that tendency to administrative independence, which we are endeavouring to explain. In the earliest times the Roman historians depict Italy as divided into a multitude of infinitesimal States. Each large city lived a life of its own, was independent of its neighbours, and possessed of sovereign rights within its adjacent territory, and when the supremacy of Rome was established, the Roman practice of sending out colonies, and allowing them to regulate their own affairs, seems rather to have intensified than checked the vitality of the provincial cities. The promptitude with which any Italian town acts alone on emergency, and the ease with which the municipality adapts itself to the most difficult circumstances, assuming the government and providing for all the requirements of order and the public service,† afford singular testimony

* It may be useful to note how Italy was divided up to 1796. The King of Naples possessed the whole territory lately reigned over by his great grandson, while the Pope held the whole duchy of Ferrara and Romagna, in addition to his actual dominions. The three duchies of Tuscany, Modena, and Parma were almost what we lately saw them; Venice ruled Venetia, and more than half of what is now termed Lombardy; Genoa swayed the Ligurian coast, while the King of Sardinia and Austria were respectively confined, the former to his island and Piedmont, the latter to the duchies of Milan and Mantua, both old imperial fiefs, and confirmed to her by the treaty of Utrecht, the first as a heritage of the Hapsburg family, the latter as being vacant by the demise, without direct heirs, of the last Duke of the house of Gonzaga, in 1708.

† Bologna affords a remarkable instance of this. On the 12th June, 1859, the Austrians silently quitted the town before dawn, and the legate followed

to the wise policy of Rome, and to the stability of the institutions she founded ; yet we can scarcely refuse to recognise the unconscious working of the old spirit, when we reflect that the sites of the ancient colonies are generally identical with those of the modern towns, and that throughout the Middle Ages, which form the intervening link of time between the fall of the Roman Empire and our own days, municipal life in Italy was in a state rather of morbid activity than of decay. Then, indeed, every village was disposed, first to found its own sovereignty, next to oppress its neighbour. The general course of the tide of events as we look down the stream of time, has been towards consolidation ; yet, in every treaty between a suzerain and a vassal powerful enough to make stipulations in his own favour, we find it agreed that the laws and customs of the incorporated city should be respected, as for instance, in the convention by which Bologna acknowledged the sovereignty of Pope Nicholas V. (1447), while enforcing the adoption of his own laws, seems to have been the heaviest blow a victor could inflict on his vanquished foe.

It cannot be doubted that the number of States into which Italy was formerly divided rendered her an easy prey to her foreign foes, and it is perhaps fortunate that few, if any, of these treaties were long respected. The successive waves of French, German, and Spanish dominion, swept over the length and breadth of the land, effacing many minor differences, yet others still survived, and were capable of being evoked, even after the sway of the Code Napoleon had familiarized its subjects with the principles of modern legislation, and they are sufficient in number and importance to render a general organization of the highest difficulty. If the laws of Piedmont were generally in advance of those of the other provinces, it would perhaps be possible to introduce them everywhere, but this is far from being the case. We must remember that fifteen years ago there was not a State in Europe more priest-ridden, or governed by laws more despotic and medieval in character than the kingdom of Sardinia ; and though vast improvements have been gradually introduced by the enactments of Parliament during the last twelve years, no wholesale abrogation of the old laws has been attempted, and there are as yet many that cannot bear a comparison with those of Tuscany for instance, or even with the Austrian code still prevailing in Lombardy.

The Dictators of Tuscany and the Emilia last year proclaimed the *statuto* (constitution) of Sardinia in their respective Govern-

in the early morning, as soon as he learnt the departure of his allies. Before night a committee of government was at work, an *improvisé* national guard was on duty at the gates and the public buildings, delegates had started for Turin, and all this without the slightest disorder.

ments, and placed them under the Sardinian law, a decree of great political utility, but productive of great confusion in private affairs, even in the Emilia, where the law of force had prevailed for so many years, and which in Tuscany had to be modified by the important proviso, "in so far as it does not contradict the actually existent laws." This distinction is an important one, for though the constitution, which is rather a declaration of principles than a statute, and leaves the widest possible scope for parliamentary legislation, is applicable to every province, and some enactments, like the Siccardi law, subjecting priests to the civil tribunals, and that on the suppression of convents, and the disposal of Church property, may even be regarded as peculiarly requisite in Romagna, where one-third of the lands is in mortmain; there are others which could not be applied without causing great and unjust hardship to individuals. For instance, the law of succession and inheritance is different in each of the provinces. In some the eldest son enjoys greater advantages than in others; in Lombardy, especially, the legal dower of daughters is proportionably larger than in Piedmont, and all marriage-contracts having been drawn up on this basis, great inconvenience would result from the sudden introduction of the Sardinian law. Many other similar cases could be given, but perhaps this instance of the law of succession, and the diversity of the systems under which the taxes are raised in the different parts of the monarchy, are the strongest examples we can cite, for, as Byron jocosely, but profoundly says,—

"Kill a man's family, and he may brook it,
But keep your hand out of his breeches pocket ;"

and nothing is more likely to excite general and reasonable discontent—a danger to be especially avoided by a new Government—than a legislative attempt to interfere with the principles upon which any social system may have grown up.

This question would be sufficiently complicated if the whole difficulty lay in the difference between Sardinian and Lombard laws, or between the customs of Piedmont and Tuscany, but this is far from being the case. Further enlargement of the State being a point essential to its very existence, as the present defenceless frontiers exact armaments utterly incommensurate with its financial resources, so long as the Austrians hold Venetia as a vast entrenched camp, and a Papal army hovers on the southern frontier, we must also take into account the idiosyncrasies of Naples and Sicily, in possession of excellent laws, and attached to their peculiar customs with a tenacity which has hitherto, in a great measure at least, counterbalanced the hatred felt for the Bourbon dynasty. We do not so particularly mention

Umbria, as, throughout the Papal States,* the confusion and delay in the administration of the existing laws, and the corruption of the tribunals, have long led to so absolute a negation of justice, that the advantages attending the introduction of any fixed system, would probably far outweigh the inconvenience of a change even in fundamental laws.

The Italian ministers, therefore, in any project they may draw up, and the legislature in discussing the organization of the new State, must bear in mind, not only the differences between the actual provinces, but also between all these and others that further political change may bring into communion with them, not forgetting that as too frequent shocks are fatal to the constitutions both of individuals and States, one principal object of their labours must be to discover some means by which future annexations may be effected without unhinging the connexion between the older provinces, and entailing a change in their organization. The drawing up of a comprehensive scheme for the organization of Italy will task to the utmost the intelligence of the statesmen to whom her destinies are confided, and of course it is not for us even to attempt to indicate beforehand the shape its details are likely to assume; but while this subject is occupying the minds of those thoughtful Italians who know that their country would not yet be constituted even though the whole peninsula were united under a single sceptre, it may interest our readers to learn what are the principles on which the majority of them would readily agree to base their political edifice.

What Italians aspire to, is the enjoyment not only of nationality but of liberty; few therefore would desire to establish a system of centralization similar to that prevailing in France. So many cities of ancient, historic, and artistic fame, which but yesterday renounced their metropolitan rank, could ill brook to see Turin invested with the supremacy which Paris holds over Rouen or Grenoble. Were all orders for their administration to emanate from the old capital of Piedmont, the States of Central Italy might well urge that they sacrificed their autonomy in order to create Italy, not to become provinces of a State less Italian than themselves. A farther inconvenience of centralization would be, that any fresh annexation to the kingdom would unhinge the whole system, and require it to be balanced and poised anew; a shock which had better be avoided if any scheme can be devised capable of accomplishing this end.

From these considerations it is thought that the scheme most likely to cause general and permanent satisfaction, would be one

* The government of the Papal States was so lately described in a recent number of this *Review* (July, 1859), in an article on M. E. About's admirable "Question Romaine," that it seems needless again to describe that which we trust is so soon destined to pass away.

based on the formation of large provinces, the geographical delineation of which would be decided by both nature and history, each governed by a separate and independent administration. The natural conformation of Italy, a long and narrow peninsula unequally divided by a central chain of mountains, seems to render the strict subjection of the provinces to a capital from which some of them must necessarily be remote, almost impossible, while even a cursory examination of the map and of history indicates the administrative districts into which not only the actual kingdom, but the whole country, might readily be divided. Sardinia, isolated by the sea; Liguria (comprising the whole of the ancient republic of Genoa), and Tuscany cut off by the Apennines from Piedmont and the Emilia, which in their turn are divided from Lombardy by the Lago Maggiore, the Ticino, and the Po, would each form provinces inhabited on an average by two millions of persons, while, singularly enough, Venetia, Umbria, and Sicily, if hereafter annexed, would each form provinces nearly equal in size, and in number of inhabitants, to those above named. The kingdom of Naples might perhaps have to be divided into three or even four provinces, for which reminiscences of the Roman dominion might suggest both boundaries and names, as they have already done for the Emilia and for Umbria, a name long obsolete, and revived by modern Italians to designate collectively the Marches, and the southern slopes of the Apennines under Papal rule, as it did in ancient days.

If the principle that Italy is better adapted for a municipal than for a centralized system of government be conceded, the actual position of Tuscany becomes at once a guide as to what might be, and an important indication of Count Cavour's policy on this subject. During the interval between the conclusion of the armistice at Villafranca, and of the peace at Zurich, Signor Rattazzi, then Minister of the Interior, and the soul of the La Marmora cabinet, making what the constitutional lawyers of the country deem an abusive use of the full powers conferred on the King by Parliament solely for the prosecution of the war, endeavoured by a series of decrees to assimilate the administrations of the hereditary provinces and of Lombardy. Had he confined himself to introducing the Statuto, and such laws as had received the sanction of the Parliament since 1848, the evil perhaps would not have been great, but more than this, he arbitrarily reimposed for another year the Austrian taxes with all their injustice, and published enactments invented by himself, new to Piedmont as well as to Lombardy, on municipal elections, and many other subjects supposed in free countries to be beyond the sphere of any executive. Even more than the matter of these laws, the manner in which they were promulgated was highly displeasing to the Lombards, who justly considered that since they had become free, and a constituent

part of the State, their representatives ought to be heard in Parliament on subjects of vital importance to their welfare.

When it was seen that even after the peace of Zurich the torrent of decrees continued unabated, care only being taken to affix a date anterior to the twenty-second of November, the discontent rose and swelled, and it might in time have been fraught with danger to the State, had not the King, guided by the singular and almost magnetic instinct which seems to apprise him of the very pulsations of his people's hearts, induced Signor Rattazzi to resign, and again summoned Count Cavour to his councils. The conduct of this statesman presents a striking contrast to that of his ministerial predecessor. The decrees already issued with respect to Lombardy could not be arbitrarily cancelled without a fresh and still more flagrant abuse of power, but the source from which they poured was suddenly dried up, the summoning of the Chambers put an end to an exceptional position, and it was promised that the Rattazzi laws should be subjected to a rigid revisal in any scheme proposed to the Parliament for the organization of the State.

With regard to Central Italy, Count Cavour was not burdened by the weight of previous mistakes, and we shall see how he dealt with the Emilia and Tuscany. The dedications of both were laid at the foot of the throne by their respective Dictators, and accepted by the King; but the moment they came within the sphere of action of the executive, they were somewhat differently dealt with. The Emilia having already introduced the Sardinian code there could be no scruple in continuing it, but the Rattazzi decrees were not extended to this province, the rule of the Intendants, created by Farini, in imitation of constitutional Piedmont, being everywhere continued, instead of "Governors of Provinces" being appointed over them, as Rattazzi had done in Piedmont and Lombardy, a measure of very doubtful policy, as it reminded the people of the system pursued before 1848. With regard to Tuscany, the liberality of Count Cavour went a step farther. Conformity of institutions not having yet been introduced, he refrained from doing so, and though the Tuscan ministers necessarily lost that name, they continued their functions, as far as regarded the internal administration of the country, under the subordinate title of directors of sections, while Baron Ricasoli was appointed Governor-General to preside over the whole government of the province, and the Prince of Carignan was sent to Florence as *locum tenens* for the King.

This position of Tuscany would become both anomalous and unjust, were it to be long retained by her alone. If Italy is to be, Tuscany must either submit to the same system as her sister provinces, or privileges now peculiar to her must be extended to

them. We incline to think the adoption of the latter alternative both more probable and more just, and we will therefore endeavour to show in what the actual administrative autonomy of Tuscany consists. At its head stands the Governor-General, in direct correspondence with the ministers at Turin, to whom he refers all projects, the application of which would affect, not Tuscany alone, but other parts of the State, or which from their nature are beyond the competence of any local authority, while the orders returned are addressed to him alone, either to be countersigned by him for publication, or transmitted to the directors of sections, who form as it were a provincial ministry, and respectively preside over the departments of the interior, justice, ecclesiastical affairs, public instruction, and finance. In this manner, Tuscany, which, if all her affairs were transacted at Turin, would only be entitled to the sixth part of the attention of each minister, profits exclusively by the industry of five chiefs of departments, while in the cases reserved for superior adjudication, the ministers receive projects already elaborated and prepared for their decision, instead of having to work out the points of importance from amidst a mass of details.

Owing to the adoption of this scheme, Tuscany has not suffered from the confusion usually inherent to political changes. The old laws having been systematically maintained (such alterations as were absolutely requisite to facilitate the working of free institutions were made by Baron Ricasoli during his dictatorship), and even the Italian currency introduced with cautious slowness, private interests have in no case been affected, nor has that of the public been exposed to risk by any delay or confusion in the despatch of business, while, on the other hand, ample guarantees have fenced in the principle of the unity of the State. The directors of sections, and the Governor-General himself—all appointed by the Crown under ministerial responsibility, and liable to dismissal—are, however important their functions, still sufficiently under the control of the central government, while the representatives of Tuscany, elected by the same laws as those of every other part of the monarchy, attend their parliamentary duties in the capital, and, by taking part in the debates on all subjects concerning the whole State, the decision upon which may at times be in their hands, although they must defer to the opinion of the majority in matters relating to their native province, aid in consolidating the legislative unity of the State.

Not the national representation only, but the customs are also one, since the abolition of the customs' barriers between Tuscany and the adjacent province, and the adoption of the Sardinian tariff for all imports and exports. It is merely a question of convenience whether the duties collected at Leghorn should be paid into the pro-

vincial treasury, or directly into that of the State, the essential point is that they should be the same at Leghorn, Genoa, and Ravenna, and that having once paid at its landing, merchandize should be sent to any other part of the kingdom free of duty; and this is indisputably the case. The army, too, is one. It is entirely under the command of the Minister of War, the uniform and banner are those of the State, the numbers of the divisions and the regiments regularly follow each other, and the circumscriptions of the five military districts (four great commands, and a reserve concentrated at Turin) by no means correspond with those of the provinces. As yet, perhaps, the principle of unification has hardly been pushed far enough in the army, for while the contingents of Lombardy and the hereditary provinces are mingled in the same regiments, the Emilians and Tuscans still form separate corps, but as all officers are appointed without regard to the place of their birth, we may safely conclude that the recruits furnished by future conscriptions will be distributed among all the regiments as they may be needed.

Experience will probably suggest many modifications in the working of this scheme of administrative autonomy, but we cannot but hope that its principle may be found applicable to every portion of the State, as it appears to us to combine the requisites really necessary for stability. It would allow the gradual introduction of improvements without the risk of legislative confusion from the clashing of old and new laws, or obliging one province to wait upon the requirements of another, while unity of action would be sufficiently ensured by the legislature, the ministry (to whose hands the foreign relations of the State would exclusively be confided), the army, and the tariff being one. It may farther be deemed an advantage that a number of offices of the highest dignity and importance would thus be in the gift of the Crown, wherewith to reward the exertions of those by whom the kingdom has been created, and though the successful working of the scheme would necessarily depend in great measure on the personal qualities of the men first appointed to carry it into execution, we cannot believe that fit persons would be wanting, if we may judge by the example of Baron Ricasoli, who, after displaying an aptitude for the highest place with singular success, is now, as Governor-General of Tuscany, setting an example of patriotism by showing (to use his own words on accepting the office) that he knows as well how to obey as to command.

The very geographical conformation of Italy seems to point to some scheme of this nature, and if, as seems probable, the annexation of Sicily and Naples be speedily effected, we believe its adoption will be found inevitable. The great modern discoveries of steam and electricity have undoubtedly diminished the obstacles

to a single government; but if they were formerly such as to induce the Romans to consider the peninsula as divided into three parts—Cisalpine Gaul, stretching from the Alps to the Magra on the west coast, and to the Rubicon (now again risen to geographical importance as the frontier between the free kingdom and the States of the Church) on the east, which they treated as a foreign province; Italy proper, comprising Tuscany, the present Papal dominions, and the northern provinces of Naples, and finally Magna Grecia, they are still impediments to a strict system of centralization. The lapse of centuries, and community of suffering, have fused the descendants of the Gauls, of the Etrurian tribes, and of the Dorian colonists into one race, whatever may have been their origins, now lost in the night of ages, and in spite of small differences of customs and dialect, the political circumstances of the time are drawing them on to form a single State, but cannot at once efface the different laws and habits which have been growing up for hundreds of years.

One of the chief of these obstacles to centralization, after that of the division of Italy by the Apennine chain into two great parts differing in the essential particulars of climate, soil, and natural productions, is the difficulty of selecting a capital. A system of centralization implies that there should be in a country one great city, as incontestably superior as Paris to all the other towns of France, concentrating at once the aristocracy, the administration, the business, and the wealth of the nation, and thence drawing to itself and absorbing all the independent talent that may spring up in the whole country, leaving the provinces to be inhabited by those only who, owing to inferior abilities or want of means, have been defeated in the race for distinction in the capital, or prevented from even attempting the prize. We will not here pursue the inquiry whether inordinate activity in the head, compensated by comparative atrophy in the members, be an advantage to the whole body politic, though we think the instability of institutions in France might suggest the answer, for such a state of things is simply impossible in Italy. A metropolis of course there must be, in the sense that one city should be selected for the residence of the court, the ministry, the representatives of foreign Powers, and for the assembly of the legislature, although even this is difficult, and as an Italian capital cannot be chosen on the principle which it is said induced Philip II. to fix on Madrid—viz., its nearly equal distance from each coast of Spain, other considerations drawn from strategy and history must be brought into play. The difficulty arises from contending claims, but we believe it may be safely said that Turin, at least, possesses none of the qualifications necessary for a metropolis, which should be central, sufficiently removed from the frontier to obviate danger of

its falling into the hands of an enemy in the case of foreign invasion, celebrated enough to render jealousy on the part of other cities unreasonable, and, if possible, magnificent, and adorned by public buildings in which to carry on the business of the State. This is no description of Turin, and we suspect that the readiness with which Florence and Bologna sent their deputies thither in the present spring, may partly, if not wholly, be attributed to the conviction, that a change must speedily be made, and a future Parliament, perhaps, summoned to meet in a different place. This change would, we believe, be inevitable in time, even were no farther alteration to take place in the political distribution of Italy, but if Naples and Sicily be annexed, it will become imperious, for how could Naples and Palermo permanently submit to be governed by orders emanating from a distant northern town, secondary in every conceivable point of view, except perhaps, the constitutional stability of temper of its inhabitants? It may be remembered with profit, that Machiavelli, the master of political science, has inculcated a maxim utterly opposed to such an attempt, namely, that one means of securing and attaching to himself a new possession, is for a prince to fix his seat of government within its borders.

But if not Turin, then what city? Antiquity, and the example of the Italian kingdom of Napoleon, would point to Milan, founded by the Gauls of Autun 600 years before our era; size and classic association to Naples, the Greek Parthenope; the patriotic spirit of the inhabitants to Bologna; artistic charm and geographical position to Florence; while we have heard Piacenza advocated from a military point of view, though we doubt whether any statesman would consent to risk the civil government in a fortress which might some day become the chief object of a hostile attack. Its vicinity to the frontier would probably be as conclusive against Milan as against Turin, and the same remark applies to every city north of the Apennines in a less degree, perhaps, to those south of the Po (especially if we suppose Venice free), yet sufficiently to eliminate them from the list. If the kingdom were destined long to retain its present frontiers, Florence must, we conceive, in time unite every suffrage, but even the fair queen of Arno could scarcely claim the homage of Naples, while that city, in turn, appears too far to the south, and too open to the sea, for the capital of Italy.

There is indeed but one city to whom all those of the peninsula would be proud to yield their claims to the first place, whose liberty seemed but a few months ago a distant dream, painful from the apparent impossibility of even hoping its realization, but which we trust may be soon looked for as the natural and almost inevitable corollary to the deliverance of Naples—Rome, the

widowed empress of cities, the bereaved mother of nations, now bowed to the earth, and mourning on her seven hills, under the double weight of priestly rule and foreign occupation, yet whose possession by the Italians would be the complement and keystone of the temple of their national liberty, without which, all that has been already gained seems hollow and unstable as a palace pictured by the Fata Morgana. Though shorn of her glory, Rome still unites all that is needed for the capital of Italy—strategic position south of the Apennines, historic fame to command the willing obeisance of all her sister and daughter cities, easy access to the sea, already secured on the one hand by the railway to Civita Vecchia, and which might be completed by the construction of another line to Ancona, palaces wherein sumptuously to lodge the Government and the representatives of the nation, unrivalled monuments of history and art—and the day that Victor Emmanuel shall ride up to the Campidoglio, and tread with armed heel through the halls of the Vatican, will see the end of the Italian question, about which Europe need no farther concern herself: while until this ultimate aim of the ambition of all true Italians be attained, Italy must still continue a cause of general anxiety and distrust.

But are we not painting an ideal picture; is not the liberation of Rome a distant and vain dream? Scarcely so, if we reflect upon what may be termed the expansive tendency of the new Italian kingdom. Its growth has hitherto been so rapid, that if not checked by some unexpected catastrophe, its spread over the peninsula may confidently be foretold. On the 2nd of April in the present year, Turin presented a curious spectacle. On that day Victor Emmanuel was to open the first Italian Parliament, in which sat the noblest sons of every part of Italy as representatives of the six free provinces, and a deep thrill ran through the assembly, and the spectators, as the names of the new senators and deputies were called over; Riario Sforza, descended from one of the noblest houses of Rome, sat among the Tuscan deputies: Giustiniani, heir to a ducal family of Venice, Poerio, the lately escaped victim of Bourbon tyranny, respectively representing small towns of Lombardy and Piedmont, stood up in turn to take the oath of allegiance, the simple words of which, on their lips, stirred the hearts of the auditors as though uttered by each on behalf of his native province; and deeper yet was the sensation, when the sovereign, with faltering tones, announced to the Chambers that he had irrevocably bound up his fate with that of Italy by severing the bond with his transalpine states of Savoy and Nice, and then regaining the firmness of his manly character, proclaimed his resolution to stand between his people and the storm of Papal wrath, menacing the just consummated union of Tuscany and Emilia, then but a fortnight old. Scalding tears burst from

the eyes of brave men, Venetians and Sicilians, at the thought that while this glorious scene was enacting, their native provinces were groaning in chains, and that a long time might elapse before they could be struck off, or they have other representatives amid the pomp of the day than the tricolour banners, veiled with crape, at the passage of which through the streets every brow was uncovered with more heartfelt respect than formerly at the presence of the host. They little thought that at that moment the flame of insurrection was kindling in Sicily, and that two months would suffice for the deliverance of Palermo, four for the entrance of Garibaldi into Messina. After the wondrous liberation of Sicily, and the sudden collapse of Bourbon tyranny at Naples, who shall say that Rome and Venice may not dare to hope?

Nor need we wonder that the first thought of each freed province should be to fly towards union with those already liberated, nor that the inhabitants of such as are still captive should hold up their hands as in prayer to the three men who stand out in bold relief from the mass of their countrymen and direct the destinies of Italy—Garibaldi her sword, Cavour her shield, Victor Emmanuel her banner of order and right. Is it strange that a prisoner, pent in a close dungeon, should pine for air; that a flower in a half-dark room should grow towards the light; that a bird escaped from a cage should carol in its joy at restored liberty? It is perhaps hard for an Englishman, accustomed from his childhood to the enjoyment of freedom, to appreciate the small things the total of which constitutes the happiness of freed Italians. He may laugh at the simple and almost childlike enthusiasm with which they greet the discovery that there are no forbidden newspapers, that they dare give utterance to their thoughts without pausing to consider whether they can be overheard, and that the troops passing by are Italians born like themselves, their own flesh and blood, whom they may applaud in the streets to their heart's content without exciting anything but a smile of sympathy on the part of their rulers, pleased to see them happy. All these things may be small in themselves, but they bear witness to others of far deeper significance. They testify that the rulers rely on the affection of their subjects, and are anxious to see them qualified to bear a part in the government of the State; that the police exists for the social protection of quiet citizens, not to play the part of eavesdropper to private conversations; that the army is raised for defence against foreign foes, while internal peace is entrusted to the national guard; that the rule of foreigners and priests has passed away, and that the former will no longer be seen but as guests, while the latter must themselves submit to the law, instead of dragging men to prison and condemning them to long and cruel punishment for no greater crime than an unwary oath, the eating of meat on a fast day, unwillingness to go to

confession, or the audacity of thinking independently on matters of faith; that taxes will no longer be imposed without the consent of the deputies freely elected by a constituency consisting of nearly the whole male population of the kingdom; that every man accused may rely upon a prompt and public trial. How should not all these things, of which the others are but the symbols, go far to constitute the happiness of a people? A stroll through the streets of Milan, or Bologna, would perhaps be the best manner in which any sceptic could dissipate his doubts of the fact.

The Sardinian Government has often been accused of culpable propagandism, and of sapping the foundations of neighbouring thrones by exciting intrigues and conspiracies, for the sake of future aggrandizement. This is but the excuse of a bad conscience. There is no need of a secret propaganda, the institutions reared and fostered in Piedmont suffice, and with a knowledge of their existence arises a desire to share in the benefits they confer. How should men deprived of every civic right—*forbidden to write or to speak or almost to stop in the streets to salute a friend, liable to be torn from their homes at dead of night for some thoughtless word of liberalism (reported by a servant in the secret pay of the police, or, worse still, whispered by a superstitious wife in the ear of her confessor) and carried off to prison, there to lie for months and years, untried, and unarraigned, or tortured, perhaps even to death, to wring from them avowals of crime never committed,* while murderers and thieves are turned loose upon society to make room in the dungeons for the political prisoners, whose secret thoughts are periodically scrutinized as a measure of public safety, while agriculture is impeded, commerce fettered, and even railways frowned upon as the possible precursors of freedom of thought—not long to be free? When it is whispered to these oppressed men that within the limits of their own country there exist institutions under which their brethren by race and language enjoy all that is denied to them, how is it possible that they should not aspire to partake the blessing? When they reflect that within the memory of most of them, the same liberty was indeed theirs for a short space, bestowed by their sovereigns in an hour of terror and weakness, to be torn away with massacre and violence at the first opportunity, and then learn that if the institutions of the northern kingdom have fared better, it is because they were sheltered in days of sorrow and dismay by the royal warrior, who after assuming his crown on the disastrous field of Novara, has*

* The documents published by order of Signor Farini, while Dictator of the Emilia, and some of which are reproduced in the work at the head of this article, sets this fact beyond doubt, as they include official orders for the employment of torture, and reports of the execution of the same, and their testimony is confirmed anew by the discoveries made in the dungeons of Palermo and Naples.

known no ambition but the weal of Italy, ever keeping before him the memory of his fated father, who, dying in exile of a broken heart, mourned and would not be consoled, as running over his past life in his mind, his agony drew from him the exclamation, "God did not find me worthy even to die for Italy," until they grew to their present proportions, how should the hearts of these men not burn with a holy enthusiasm, and yearn to be followers and subjects of Victor Emmanuel, the king of unbroken faith?

But the end is not yet attained. The land is in sight, but the ship is struggling through the waves, and may still be obliged to ride out many a storm ere she reach the port. Venice and Rome, for the possession of which the Italian people will have to contend in the first case with the material might of Austria, in the second with all the bigotry of the whole Catholic world, are yet to be won, and until they are so, the Italian question cannot be set at rest, nor Italy be free, as Napoleon III. declared she should be, from the Alps to the Adriatic. We trust the struggle may be postponed yet awhile, until Italy be in a more forward state of preparation; for enthusiasm, however great, though it may sometimes avail to overthrow regularly trained armies in the field, as we have lately seen in Sicily, cannot suffice for the reduction of stone fortresses, which are not impressed by the moral superiority of volunteers over mercenaries. At the present moment all hopes for the future must rest upon the consolidation of the free provinces. In military enterprises, a base of operations is indispensable, and in this light we may regard the Italian kingdom. The more provinces are included in the free State, the broader will be the basis; but, also, the greater will be the necessity and the difficulty of consolidation. From the old fable of the faggot of sticks, we learn that union is strength, and, at the present, Italy may be compared to a loosely bound faggot. Each stick separately is weak; the whole bundle would be strong, but the effort of the rulers henceforth must be so to tighten the bonds, that together they may form one solid and indivisible mass. Every link of union must be strengthened and drawn together; every just cause of jealousy or distrust must be removed; no favour must be shown to one province rather than another, or the labour of years may be overthrown in an hour.

Ten years, from Novara to the declaration of war in 1859, were expended in preparing Piedmont for the struggle, and laying the foundations for the liberty of Italy, without ever losing sight of the size the edifice was designed ultimately to attain; and so solid was the basis thus slowly erected, that one year more sufficed to raise the building to its present fair proportions. In some respects, perhaps, it would have been preferable had the revolutions of southern Italy been longer delayed, but statesmen must adapt and

utilize events which it is beyond their power to obviate, and we trust there will be no hesitation in accepting the annexations of Naples and Sicily, if they are offered in a legal and constitutional manner. But at that point we hope there may be a pause, to gather strength before a fresh effort be undertaken, for it would be folly not to perceive that premature action might imperil all the progress that has been already made. Considering the great excitement now prevailing throughout the Peninsula, it would be vain to expect the Italians to stop short: but progress towards the ultimate end may be of many kinds; time spent in organization cannot be considered as lost, and while we must thoroughly approve the policy of Count Cavour's cabinet, in endeavouring to direct and moderate the current of opinion, we cannot but feel deep anxiety as we watch the progress of Garibaldi and his fiery volunteers. But we trust that even he, however great the temptation to let himself be carried away by the impetuosity of genius, will see that Italy is not yet in a position to cope singlehanded with the disciplined forces of Austria, and that it could never be wise for her to incur a collision with France, by risking an attack upon Rome, so long as a French garrison shall be entrusted with its defence.

The struggle with Austria may be delayed, but sooner or later it must be undertaken. Therefore it is that so heavy a responsibility rests upon Count Cavour and his colleagues, for it is their task to arm and prepare Italy for the future fight. Every step they have taken since their accession to power has obviously been directed to this end, and it is fortunate that they have been strengthened and supported by the confidence both of the sovereign and of the National Parliament. It must be their object to develop the military resources of the country, while they strain every nerve to content the populations of the different provinces, and fuse them into one people. One of the chief means to this end must be to relieve them as soon as possible from all uncertainty as to their future government, and to reassure them against all jealousy of ministerial encroachments, by hastening to prepare the project for the administrative organization of the kingdom, to be laid before the Parliament at the beginning of its next session. Not only should it be sought to satisfy the people with their administration, however, but at the same time to give them opportunity for fusing, and no means perhaps can be found more effective than the construction of railroads to connect the different towns, and to facilitate the passage of the Apennines; and if Count Cavour had not already given sufficient proof of his appreciation of the use of these iron bands, by the singularly skilful manner in which he has caused the lines in Piedmont to be designed, an additional testimony might be found in the

approval he has hastened to give to the scheme for constructing a railway from Leghorn to the Roman frontier, and the rapid urging on of the works destined to connect Florence and Bologna.

But however pressing these civil cares, there are others of still more vital importance. Our readers will not fail to perceive that we allude to the army, and to the providing of means for its maintenance; and as regards both these particulars, there exists abundant evidence to show, that the ministry considers the very safety of the State to depend upon the promptitude with which it may be placed in a position to resist a hostile attack, and that the Parliament fully appreciates the gravity of the crisis, which may be determined at any moment; perhaps, in consequence of the very successes of Garibaldi in the south. The large majority that voted the late loan, and the cheers that greeted the declaration of Count Cavour, that great sacrifices would probably be requisite, sufficiently testify to the latter point; while as regards the first, we see the immense orders given by the Government for the preparation of warlike stores, and the circular of Farini, Minister of the Interior, recommending and authorizing the formation of volunteer corps on the model of those in England, a measure of deep policy, worthy of the statesman from whom it emanates; for while it provides for the defence of the country in case the whole active army be required for service in the field, its moral effect must be good both at home and abroad, as proving to the people the confidence of their rulers, and to foreign powers that the sovereign is able to rely as fully on the citizens of his dominions as on the regular soldiery.

Meanwhile we know that the generals of the Italian army are straining every nerve to bring the troops under their command into the highest possible state of efficiency. That Italians can fight, has been sufficiently proved at Varese and Palestro, still more recently at Calatafimi and Melazzo, but hardihood in battle is not the only, nor perhaps even the chief quality required in a professional soldier. The experience of the Crimea showed the patient endurance and soldierlike qualities of the old Piedmontese troops. But the Italian army is composed of many elements: Lombard conscripts, sent back by Austria, and already brutalized by the discipline of the lash; old and new Tuscan battalions, accustomed to consider enrolment in the army as a pretext for wearing a gaudy uniform and leading an idle life; hot-blooded volunteers from the Emilia, ready to face any enemy in the field, but grievously impatient of the restraint and wearisome sameness of garrison duty in a provincial town. Some time must elapse before the excellent leaven of the old troops can penetrate and assimilate this mass; and while this operation is going on, the loss of the steady battalions of Savoy will be severely felt; but if

only some interval be allowed, we doubt not that it will be found capable of any effort that can reasonably be demanded of an equal number of men. Some writers, mostly civilians, are apt to blame General Fanti for not seeking to increase the numerical strength of the army more rapidly; but in our opinion, independently of the charge that would be entailed on the treasury by large levies of recruits, a burden which should not be laid on without urgent necessity in the present state of the finances, there may be many reasons for preferring a smaller and more highly disciplined force, to one more imposing on paper but less to be relied on by its commanders. Nevertheless, the Italian army is not to be despised, seeing that it has been possible to throw fifty thousand men into Umbria and the Marches, while the exposed frontiers of Romagna and Lombardy are defended by a first line of nearly eighty thousand men. These numbers cannot, however, be deemed excessive, while the Austrians garrison Venetia with upwards of one hundred thousand men, supported by the formidable fortresses of Verona and Mantua, with the power of pouring in any number of reinforcements from the Tyrol, especially if we remember how naturally defenceless is the frontier, consisting near Modena of an almost imperceptible ditch in the fields, and that in the very part most favourable for an attack, so that cold steel would have to supply the place of artificial breastworks. Under these circumstances, it must have required no small amount of moral courage in the Government to detach so large a force against the Papal army; but it was impossible for the Italian King to leave the people of Umbria exposed to the tender mercies of Lamoricière; and while we rejoice that the decision to pass the Rubicon, both literally and figuratively, has been carried out with so much energy, we do not fear but Marmora will be able to show a bold front upon the Mincio, while Cialdini and Fanti pursue the career of victory so well begun at Pesaro, Perugia, and Castelfidardo. This campaign against the Papal mercenaries may prove of essential use in perfecting the organization of the troops; and commanded by such men as the three generals above named, we trust that the Italian forces will at no distant period be fit to cope with the Austrian army.

Were the minister on whom rests the great responsibility of the fate of Italy less skilful or of less approved ability than Count Cavour, we should look upon the future with deep anxiety; but if past success, won by unceasing industry, and the exercise of an almost unerring judgment, be an earnest for the future, we believe that the destinies of Italy may inspire far more of hope than of fear. At all events, they cannot be in better hands. The man who has known how to extinguish the traditionary hatred which so long divided the Venetian from the Florentine, the

Genoese from the Pisan, by the common love of Italy, and to throw down provincial barriers until the hearts of the people beat in unison from the summit of the Alps to the extreme point of Sicily, will surely be able to devise some scheme of internal organization which may form the complement and keystone of his labours; while, at the same time, the statesman who with eagle-glance discerned all the advantage to be derived from taking a share in the Crimean campaign, and from the moment he took his place at the council-board at Paris, made Italy a subject of European interest, with an ability, the recollection of which still induces Austria obstinately to decline any conference to which Sardinian representatives could claim admittance, is the very person best qualified to guide his country through the nets diplomacy may spread in the path of her wondrous regeneration, the course of which cannot be run without causing deep displeasure and dread to the numerous defenders of time-honoured abuses throughout the world. The wide views of Count Cavour and the liberal policy he has followed with undeviating consistency throughout his ministerial career, and the sincerity of which is attested by his written advocacy of the same cause before his accession to power, afford the best guarantees for his taking up the great question of the internal organization of the kingdom in a wise and liberal spirit, while in his colleagues, and the many distinguished and talented men who sit on the benches of the Parliament which must finally decide upon each point of the scheme, he will find coadjutors both able and willing to assist in perfecting his plans, as well as in carrying them into execution when once adopted.

We have hitherto refrained from even touching upon the religious side of the Italian question, but we cannot conclude without a few words upon this head; for one peculiar feature of the struggle in which the Italians are engaged, consists in its double nature of an insurrection against spiritual as well as temporal despotism. The Pope himself has chosen to make it so, by throwing the weight of his authority as head of the Church into the scale against the nationality of Italy, and launching the thunders of excommunication against all those who assisted in, or merely connived at, the formation of the Italian kingdom. Prelates and priests, but too ready to do their utmost in furtherance of this decree, were not found wanting—they alarmed their penitents by threats of punishment in another world, deserted the Cathedrals of Pisa and Sienna at the approach of Victor Emmanuel, and refused to pray for the welfare of the State at the festival of the Constitution. Among the lower clergy, however, there are many good priests who sympathize with the people, and encourage their national tendencies; but they do so at the risk of ecclesiastical censure; for

the Vatican and the majority of the hierarchy have decidedly set their faces against the liberal movement.

Four centuries ago such a course might perhaps have been fatal to the national party. Now that twelve millions of Italians have practically proved that the time for excommunications has gone by, it only renders their programme more complete and intelligible, for it proves to demonstration that the liberty of Italy is incompatible with the retention of any temporal authority by the Pope; and the Italians are, therefore, resolute that that authority shall cease. Some of our readers may, perhaps, see in this an indication that Italy is likely to become Protestant; but this is far from being the case. One most curious feature is, that for a long while she has not been as religious or as Catholic as at the present moment. The churches were never better attended than since the excommunication; the leaders scrupulously respect religion both in word and deed; those well acquainted with Italy are struck by the improved moral tone of the people, and the heightened esteem in which truth and honour are held; but in opposition to the bigots of the Catholic world, who are enrolling themselves under the Papal banner to force two millions of unwilling Italians to endure the honour of being temporal subjects of Pius IX., both leaders and people are determined to use their best endeavours to separate the spiritual and temporal powers; and while rendering all honour to the ministers of religion as such, to deprive the Pope of every acre of Italian soil, and to reduce his myrmidons to their legitimate position as citizens of the State in which they were born.

It is a most pleasing circumstance to see the interest taken by England in the struggles of Italy against temporal and spiritual oppression, testified to by the assistance in money sent to Garibaldi, by the graceful sympathy of our countrywomen for his wounded soldiers, and by the taking of service under his banner by English officers; for, in our opinion, this struggle is not only one of the most interesting of modern times, but also one of the most important as regards the civilization and progress of the world. It is the war of the future against the past. Italy fights for existence, for liberty, for the right of speech and action. She promulgates no wild theories, her constitutional banner is held aloft by a chivalrous monarch, heir to the oldest reigning house in Europe, surrounded by counsellors belonging to the highest aristocracy, whose private wealth and station warrant them against all suspicion of entertaining ultra-democratic opinions; and while the armies are composed of men born to ease, who exchange all the comforts of home for the hardships of a camp, that each may boast he has had a share in securing the triumph of the Italian idea, her people suddenly freed from the trammels of des-

potism, have set a rare example of self-control and of moderation even towards the instruments of the tyranny they abhorred, with but one exception, which, standing alone as it does, rather serves to enhance the merit of the Italians by proving the violence of the passions they had to resist than to tarnish their cause, and thus give the best guarantees for their capacity to govern themselves under the far less difficult circumstances of a regularly organized State. Against Italy we see arrayed the powers of the mediæval world—a Pope and his cardinals, armed with threats of excommunication in this world, and eternal death in the next, backed by hireling troops gathered from every part of Europe by promises of large bounty on earth and paradise hereafter, and a foreign sovereign with mercenary armies, representing the might of brute force, all contending for “the right divine to govern wrong.”

If Italy succeed in her aspirations, we shall see a nation of twenty-six millions of most intelligent men regenerated by the baptism of fire, in possession of a most fertile country, with near 3000 miles of seaboard,* and with ports in which the navies of the world might ride in safety, and, above all, governed by constitutional maxims, added to the roll of European States. Can it be doubted that such a kingdom, on the borders of the Mediterranean, would be a most valuable ally for England? Common principles of liberty would place Italy on our side in European complications; her fleets might be of the utmost assistance in war, while her commerce would no less add to our prosperity in peace. If, on the other hand, Italy be worsted in the struggle, things cannot return even to the point at which they stood two years ago. As M. Grandguillot truly said in the *Constitutionnel* a short time since, Italy must be entirely free, or Austria rule from Turin to Messina, and, we may add, with Austria the Pope. Whether it could be desirable for any free and Protestant State to see despotism reign unchecked in the south of Europe, and Papal sway resume its mediæval ascendancy over the Catholic powers, we consider a point that needs no demonstration, and one which we may confidently leave to the unassisted judgment of our readers.

* To prove the maritime capacity of Italy, we may note that her coasts are in length double those of France, and exceed those of Spain by one-third, and these powers have respectively 1500 and 2000 miles of seaboard. A comparison of the number of ports is equally in favour of Italy, while her peculiar shape places all her inhabitants within easy reach of the sea for commercial purposes.

ART. V.—THE ANTIQUITY OF THE HUMAN RACE.

1. *Der Mensch im Raume und in der Zeit (Physisch, Sprachlich, Geschichtlich), eine Ethnologische Skizze.* Von Dr. F. Pruner-Bey. München. 1858.
2. *Om Virkningerne paa de aandelige og legemlige Evner af Menneskernes Forplantning inden en mere indskrænket Kreds af Individier. Foredrag i Videnskabernes Selskabs Møde i Kristiania den 3 Maj, 1858.* Af Ludvig Kr Daa.

BETWEEN the years 1830 and 1846 few fossil remains were of greater interest than a single rib which, in the days of its flesh, belonged to an Irish elk, whose posthumous importance, like that of a veteran with a pre-eminently honourable wound, or a hospital patient with an interesting, though mortal, disease, arose out of an untoward accident that befel him during his lifetime. The rib in question had an oval opening near its lower edge, with the margin depressed on the outer, and raised on the inner surface; round which there was an irregular effusion of callus, the product of inflammation, the product of a wound by a sharp-pointed instrument; which, though it failed to go far enough to kill the stag, went far enough to set up a morbid process—the first of its sort, with a few doubtful exceptions, of which a sample has come down to us. That the wound produced the callus is clear; but what produced the wound? Dr. Hart, from whose description the notice was first taken, committed himself to the opinion that an arrow had hit the animal and had remained in the wound after the shaft was broken off. That Dr. Hart's argument failed to satisfy Professor Owen (who considered that the animal has been wounded by one of its own species in a *prælium Veneris*), may be stated by the way; the morbid anatomy of the extinct animals, though it has supplied an illustration, and serves to introduce the subject, being no essential part of the present inquiry. Who made the arrow? Who shot it? Who fabricated the bow to which it belonged? A human being, perhaps; a human being with the eye of an archer and the appetite and aptitudes of a hunter; a human being who lived at the same time, and in the same locality, with the so-called Irish elk, the *Cervus Megaceros* of Dr. Hart; the *Megaceros Hibernicus* of Professor Owen.

In the way of date, the interpretation is of course double. The extinct *cervus* may have been as late as the existing man;

or the existing man may have been as early as the extinct *cervus*. In either case, however, a current statement of most of the writers on geology is traversed—the statement that the origin of man (palæontologically speaking) is so recent, that human remains and the remains of extinct animals have either not been found together, or (if found) not found *in situ*.

Then came the relics from the Delta of the Mississippi, and then a piece of crockery from the Nile, upon the deposits of which venerable river a series of borings were made in 1857; in due course they found their way to the Royal Society.

“In the lowest part of the sediment at the colossal statue of Memphis, at the depth of thirty-nine feet from the surface of the ground, consisting of true Nilotic sediment, the instrument brought up a fragment of pottery. Having been found at a depth of thirty-nine feet, it would seem to be a true record of the existence of man 13,371 years before A.D. 1854, reckoning by the before-mentioned rate of increase, 73½ inches in a century.”—(“An Account of some recent Researches near Cairo, undertaken with the view of throwing Light upon the Geological History of the Alluvial Land of Egypt.” Communication of February 11th, 1858. By L. Horner, Esq., V.P.R.S.)

This same piece of Nilotic earthenware is among the first of the data which were utilized for the purposes of discussion as soon as they were discovered. As a general rule, there was an impulse (we might almost say an inclination) to underrate the examination of such new facts as traversed old doctrines. This we infer from a comparison between the dates of the first announcements of the several series of facts connected with the question and those of the special researches which have given rise to those notable modifications of the older views which are now setting in with a run. In 1849, M. Boucher de Perthes, of Abbeville, in his “*Antiquités Celtiques et Antediluviennes*,” notified the occurrence of rude works of art in conjunction with the bones of extinct mammalia, and in matrices over which a great depth of subsequent deposit had accumulated. In 1855, Dr. Rigollet endorsed his opinions as to their antiquity. The following extract, from Mt. Prestwich, is little more than a year old:—

“The author purposely abstains for the present from all theoretical considerations, confining himself to the corroboration of the facts:—

- “1. That the flint-implements are the work of man.
- “2. That they were found in undisturbed ground.
- “3. That they are associated with the remains of extinct mammalia.
- “4. That the period was a late geological one, and anterior to the surface assuming its present outline, so far as some of its main features are concerned.

“He does not, however, consider that the facts as they at present

stand of necessity carry back man in past time more than they bring forward the great extinct mammals towards our own time, the evidence having reference only to relative, and not to absolute time; and he is of opinion that many of the later geological changes may have been sudden, or of shorter duration than generally considered. In fact, from the evidence here exhibited, and from all that he knows regarding drift phenomena generally, the author sees no reason against the conclusion that this period of man and the extinct mammals—supposing their contemporaneity to be proved—was brought to a sudden end by a temporary inundation of the land; on the contrary, he sees much to support such a view on purely geological considerations.”—(“Proceedings of the Royal Society,” May 26th, 1859.)

Pari passu with the attention thus recently, and thus effectively, given to the stratified deposits of the Valley of the Somme, went the investigations of the ossiferous caves, especially of those of Sicily and our own island. In 1829, lamp-black was growing dear, and the sugar-refiners had to look in new quarters for their supply of bones. One of the districts that thus commanded notice was the northern coast of Sicily, especially the parts between Termini and Trapani. Here it was that they found caves in the rocks, and bones in the caves. They were in different conditions; some cemented into a hard rock, so as to form a true osseous breccia; others in the condition of Yorick's skull, an ordinary churchyard bone. Of those that were exported, the far greater part belonging to animals no longer to be found in Sicily; and of these, the genus *Hippopotamus* was, beyond all comparison, the most conspicuous. It gave two species, and any per-centage of bones.

In one heap out of several shiploads sent to Marseilles, De Christol, an able palæontologist, had found that in a weight of 30 quintals all the bones belonged to *Hippopotamus*, with the exception of six derived from *Bos* and *Cervus*. . . . *Hippopotamus* bones preponderated in a similar proportion. De Christol had counted about 300 astragali alone of this genus; and Abbé Seinà had collected, for the Museum of Palermo, 76 astragali of *Hippopotamus*, 40 of which belonged to the right side, and 36 to the left. The bone-breccia is chiefly composed of bones of *Hippopotamus*, and extends on either side outside the cave to a length of about 85 yards. Assuming the above ratio of astragali to the other bones, as a standard of an approximative estimate of the number of the skeletons inside and outside the cavern, the author showed what a vast number of individuals it implied. He considered that they were accumulations of a long series of generations. A lively discussion having arisen in Sicily as to the origin of these bones, in which Ferrara maintained the opinion that they consisted of the skeletons of elephants captured by Metellus from Hasdrubal, 504 years before the Christian era; and of hippopotami imported by the Saracen rulers of Sicily during the Middle Ages, the Government undertook an exploration of the cavern.”

It is needless to say that this is not exactly the way in which the accumulation is accounted for by the *savans* of the latitude of Greenwich, in whose speculations Metellus and the Saracens have been the most infinitesimal of elements. On the contrary, the hippopotami themselves have formed the very smallest part of their discussions. The true point of interest was the extent to which human remains were associated either with them or their congeners; and it was not long before the phenomena of the Valley of the Somme and the Sicilian caves were found to repeat themselves in Devonshire, in Belgium, and in France. As the accurate knowledge of the Pleiocene formations of Mr. Prestwich was more especially tested in the stratified deposits of Picardy, the anatomical acumen of Dr. Falconer was applied to the osseous breccia of the caves; the exploration of that of Brixham having been partially subsidized by means of the Government grant to the Royal Society. Dr. Falconer's investigations have run definitely and decidedly in the same direction with Mr. Prestwich's, so that, from more quarters than one, and at the same time, the doctrine as to the non-occurrence of human remains with those of extinct animals has been shaken.

Nor is this all. The question as to the original unity or non-unity of mankind (in other words, as to number of species of the genus *Homo*) is not as it was. Not only have old criteria become distrusted, but strong opinions as to the great extent to which a variety may simulate a species, have been hazarded and adopted.

More than this. A variety may not only simulate a species, but it may *become* one. At the June meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, holden at Oxford, whilst controversy, hot and heady, concerning the antiquity of the human species was going on before one assembly, an intellectual digladiation as to whether there were such a thing as species at all, was either alarming or edifying another: for the doctrine that each species, instead of being independently created, had descended, like a variety, from some other, propounded long ago, but revived anew and fortified with cogent arguments, was now ceasing to be esoteric, and was being defended and opposed with equal zeal, if not with equal discretion, *coram populo*—able zoologists and candid palæontologists being not ashamed to own that their views upon the matter had undergone a material change. The history of this is another matter. All that concerns the inquiry as to the antiquity of man is the extent to which the two questions act and react upon one another. If the unity of the human race be our postulate, we require a long time for the operation of even the most powerful causes to bring about the amount of difference which is known to exist; whereas if we suppose the extreme forms to have had a separate origin, we may

find that organic contrasts, both strong and numerous, are compatible with either small changes or short dates—compatible with either or with both.

Upon the ordinary doctrine of species more will be said in the sequel. At present, it is the *rate of change* that lies before us.

Be the change great or small, the time required for it is subject to two kinds of calculation: our evidence being either documentary or developmental. It is documentary when we find a record, and it is developmental when we get a stage of growth. A man may be known to be in his eighteenth year by a reference to the parish register; but he may also be known to be somewhere about that age by his having grown a beard, or thought of taking a wife. As a general rule, inferences from development are only approximations to the real date; but in most cases, this, if not all we wish for, is all we have any chance of getting. Perhaps it is, as much as we care to have; for the pursuit of truth has a stimulus which is wanting to the possession of it, and the chase is worth more than the quarry. Meanwhile, the rules that apply to an individual apply to his generations; so that the criteria which give us the age of a man, help with the annals of mankind.

Now, it is by no means difficult to see that these two kinds of evidence are differently distributed. Some part goes to the geologist, some to the archæologist and the ethnologist. Whether certain so-called works of human art are really what they seem is archæological; though the mineralogist, skilful in saying what may be due to natural lines of cleavage, may have something to say to it. Upon the whole, however, it is archæological. Some of the specimens in question are, undoubtedly, artificial. *Pace γεωλογων dixērimums*, some (those *not found in situ*, but purchased by visitors) may be not only *made*, but made for the market and on the occasion. Some, on the other hand, are so rude as to be very like natural flints with a strange, unnatural shape. Others, however, have both been found *in situ*, and look artificial enough for anything. Still they, each and all, are objects upon which the archæologist, *ex professo*, should have his say. Then comes the ethnologist; especially in his character as the investigator of what may be called the Natural History of Civilization (*Culturgeschichte*, or *Kultur-historie*). Practically speaking, he takes nine-tenths of the evidence from development. The present state of things may require 3000 years to develop it, or it may want 3,000,000. This is the point upon which he is, or ought to be, able to speak. He leaves, however, the documentary part to the geologists. If they give him too little, he waits for further discoveries: if they give him too much, he must suppose that his average rate of development is too high; in other words, that things have moved more slowly than he fancied; or, what is much

the same, that long (perhaps indefinite) periods of stationary stereotype have interrupted his uniformities.

It does not, however, follow that, because the question of stratum and matrix be one that can safely be left to the geologist, that of species can be made over unconditionally to the zoologist or the botanist. It is decidedly an ethnological one; in some respects it is pre-eminently so. By whatever name we designate them, the numerous divisions and subdivisions of mankind supply more data for that part of natural history which deals with the question of species and variety than can be found in any other group of equal classificational value. Not even the natural history of the domesticated animals can compete, in variety of detail, with that of the domesticator. It is neither so comprehensive nor so complicated. It would scarcely be so if the horse or ox were actually as ubiquitous as man; and ere long they may be so. It would scarcely be so; because it will always want civilization as an influence, and language as a character.

We may make what we like of mankind as a class, translating the word *kind* into the language of zoology by either *genus* or *species* at our pleasure. We must, however, make it into a class of some sort; but this, whether wide or narrow, has a distribution in space of its own. Whether *homo* be the name of a species, a genus, or an order, the individuals to which it applies are ubiquitous. The Tropics are not too hot, the Polar Circle too cold, for them. Walcheren is not too low, nor Tibet too high; Lapland is light, and Arabia dark, enough for them. The Flora of Boothia suffices for their vegetable, the fauna of Easter Island for their animal aliment; the flesh of the reindeer, with a *minimum* of farinacea, feeds them; so do rice and arums, with an equal *minimum* of albuminous matters. No known species has varieties, no known genus has species, no known order has genera, of this kind; no known variety has any such ubiquitous individuals. Hence the imperfection of all comparisons between man in respect to his departure from a certain type and the lower animals. That *some* change or other is effected by the physical conditions of soil and climate, no one denies; though many make it both trifling in amount and slow in rate. Let only its existence, however, be admitted, and it is clear that, of all the organisms of the world, the human body is the most exposed to its causes; and this being the case, it is mere oscitancy to measure the variation of a real or supposed species of the genus *homo* by the varieties of any other species. It is mere idleness to do so, though it is often—too often—done. The logician, too, has something to say to this same question of species, and that both in his character as an ordinary investigator of the conditions of accurate reasoning, wherein he is more especially logical, and as an outlying speculator in

ontology, where he walks amid the dim and labyrinthine mazes and hazes of metaphysics. Even these, however, teach him something: they teach him that a natural effect from a supernatural cause is, for the purposes of science, no effect at all. A cause ending or an effect beginning with itself is *nil*. It is an end where there ought to be a continuance, a beginning where we require an antecedent. For science, the terms are correlative and the series is infinite; and when this is not the case, there is a contradiction in terms—in other words, there is no science at all. That such arrests of effect and beginnings of cause may exist has not been proved to be impossible. A million creations of something out of nothing are as possible as one: a million somethings ending in nothing are equally so. *Rerum Natura* may perhaps supply them. It is only certain that such a *Rerum Natura* belongs to history and rests upon evidence; rather than to science, which rests upon inference. Nothing can make it scientific. It need not be unscientific. It need not be opposed to science, for it may be super-scientific or transcendental. It *must*, however, be non-scientific—perhaps better than science, as (if it exist) it probably is. The protoplast, according to the ordinary sense of the word, is the beginning of a species, and the beginning of a species is, *pro tanto*, a creation. A protoplast is a miracle, and is no more than any other miracle to be either assumed *à priori*, or to be arrived at by inference. Like any other miracle, it must rest upon testimony; the testimony being open to its proper amount of criticism. It may satisfy the first witness, but it must be so strong as to be satisfactory at second-hand.

Nor is such evidence (provided that the fact be real) impossible. If the course of nature be uniform, and if causes are to produce effects to the end of time, the introduction of a new species is as much of a possibility as free-trade in France or constitutional government in Naples. Our ancestors may have seen (without noticing) it. We ourselves, on the look-out, have not beheld it. But our descendants may. If the doctrine that maintains it be right, many of the present naturalists are like Moses on Mount Pisgah—the Promised Land is before them, and their sons may see in detail what is withheld from the fathers. If the world is to last only half as long as it has lasted, and if the number of species is to be only half what it has been, we may, with the present appliances of science, with the present excitement of attention, and with our previous records of what we have known and what we may expect, actually observe the introduction of a new protoplast. Its centre of creation may be the latitude of Greenwich, of Berlin, or of Paris. The exact locality is, of course, scarcely within the range of a guess. The *Elephas venturus*, or the *Hippopotamus expectatus*, will probably

appear in some sequestered locality, but the *Pediculus theologicus*, or the *Morphio orthodoxus*, may take their introduction in the society of their earlier congeners on the very body of a *savant*—possibly on that of a dean or bishop, whose great work on the permanence of organic forms has, perchance, led him to neglect himself. On the spot where this occurs there will be a miracle—to the first observer a revelation.

To say that science has nothing to do with the beginning of things is merely a help towards the promulgation of a sound and admitted doctrine. Yet speculation presses towards it. One beginning, however, we admit by the very avoidance of it. We must assume, or rather we must put up with, it once—but once only. We must assume, or put up with, as the beginning of *all* things; not because it is scientific, but because our faculties cannot take its opposite in its fulness. We must do this; because the alternative is eternity, and that makes us mad to think about. It is certainly a serious alternative, and one to which we must give in. But it is not to be repeated, still less repeated *ad libitum*. The Father of Eternity may step in once, but it must be once for all.

“Nec Deus intersit nisi dignus vindice nodus
Incident.”

For one single instance he is called for. There is the *dignus nodus*. To invoke him on every occasion is to imitate the waggoner who sat by the quagmire, and instead of putting his shoulder to the wheel, called on Hercules. Whatever we may say of The Beginning, as either right as a matter of fact or necessary as a condition of thought, it is, nevertheless, inconceivable; whilst, whatever we may urge against the mutability of specific characters, or (to put the case still more strongly) against the transformation of species, and however much we may prove it wrong as a piece of history or superfluous as an hypothesis, it is still conceivable. The beginning of all things is beyond and anterior all possible testimony. The beginning of any species subsequent to the date of the present article, is well within the range of a good look-out. Testimony and inference is all we have to go on. For the beginning of a specific creation, subsequent to the primeval beginning, though inference is out of the question, testimony is possible. For the beginning of *all* things *both* are inconceivable; and the notion that, because we *must* assume a beginning in one case, we *may* do so in any, is set aside by incommensability of the respective conditions. The doctrine of the creation of species is simply the beginning of (certain) things assumed *ad libitum*. Testimony *may* prove it, science cannot; it ought not even to divine it. A protoplast à

priori is in the same category with an *à priori* miracle. Both may be; but the proof lies with the affirmer.

Meanwhile, it is time to continue our notice upon the distribution of the different elements of the question. The documentary part goes to geology, the developmental to ethnology. Just in proportion as these two sciences are in a healthy state, will the answers that they give be satisfactory. A great deal will be taken on trust. But what if the condition of one of the two sciences involved be untrustworthy? Few form independent opinions; the special investigators lead, the rest follow. Be the science what it may, the great question for the million is the condition of the study of the subject. Where it is advanced, there either are, or have been, numerous illustrators of it, there is a certain number of recognised facts, there is a recognised method or logic, and there is an approximation more or less close to something like a public opinion. There is a cultivated common sense. It may be that it is very special and very limited, nevertheless it precludes certain forms of nonsense. When mathematics had reached a certain point, it made the quadrature of the circle an absurdity; when physics had passed a certain line, no man could call the perpetual motion a respectable paradox. Fifty years ago, geology had a great many open questions, upon which amateurs might hold what they chose with impunity. Indeed, all sciences have their stage wherein trash is allowable; in which the body of admitted facts and necessary trains of reasonings is insufficient to preclude oscillation and retrogression. In this stage every man is allowed an opinion, and one man's is as good as another's, and it is never too late to make a great discovery. A little later, all such discoveries are mares'-nests; but during the stage in question they are on a level of some respectability. The sooner such a stage goes by the better; attempts to recal it are vain. The paradox about the moon's orbit, which some months ago found a place in the daily papers, was an anachronism; but it was an unachronism only because astronomy was the science to which it appertained. At the time when astronomy was emerging out of astrology, it was a respectable opinion. Its parallel in accuracy would, just now, in ethnology, be respectable. Indeed, it is of such respectabilities that the higher ethnology—*i.e.*, the ethnology of the over-hasty generalizers—is made. But what is ethnology? The answer to this, so far as it bears on the present question, has been given. It is the science which, *inter alia*, deals with the developmental evidence. But who are the ethnologists? The Mrs. Harrises of science. What Louis XIV. said of the State—*l'Etat, c'est moi*—Dr. Prichard might have said of his science, if it were not that he was too modest a man to do so. He was just as truly the worst as he was the best of his

kind. He was the only one. The future historian of the inductive sciences may describe ethnology as being, A.D. 1860, in the condition of English geology, when it was divided between William Smith, the scriptural geologists, and the amateurs. The ethnologist cultivates a science in its infancy. What is his audience? Who are his fellow-labourers? Who keeps him right? If his knowledge be but little, and his inductive habits less, who corrects him? If his inductive powers be decent, and his knowledge sufficient, who backs him? Let his ambition be that of the demagogue, and he is fooled to the top of his bent? Let his feelings be exclusive and aristocratic, and he is like Philip's son. He would fain run a race, but he wants a king for a competitor. There is a certain amount of sciolism, but no school.

A man who is either an ethnologist or nothing, is, in all probability, nothing. A man who is something with ethnology super-added, is, in all probability, an ethnological amateur, hasty, undisciplined, irresponsible, speaking with much authority that he claims for himself, but with little that is allowed him by others. He is probably lecturient—*i.e.*, deep in the knowledge of men like himself; widely cognizant of the newest applications of the fewest *data*; and, above all things, so far-seeing as to see nothing definitely. Of men who could speak with authority either as civil historians or as biologists, with a single notable exception, no one has gone out of his way to get into the fold of ethnology—*No one has gone out of his way*. It is necessary to put the statement in this form, because *obiter dicta* on the part of both naturalists and historians are common. Men who write about the quadrumana must needs on occasions give a few words to the bimana. Their general practice, however, has been to say as little about them as they can. In like manner, writers about France or Russia, as empires, must recognise such races as the Kelt or Slave. But Polyhistor goes no further than his documents take him; and, so doing, limits himself to his character as a historian; whilst Cluvenus, who could write with equal ease about a chimpanzee or a nautilus, restricts himself to the anthropoeid apes, or to the purely anatomical characters of the members of the class above them. Each shows his sense. Margites, however, writes haphazard, and, having thought closely upon nothing, can dogmatize at random upon anything. When science is in this state, it has always a certain number of paralogisms which are more prominent than their fellows. Such, amongst others, in ethnology, are the following:—

1. *The confusion between time as a force and time as a condition.*—The ibis of the time of the Pharaohs is the ibis of the present time: and its being so is a proof of the permanence of specific characters. If rags were cheap, and there were no excise-

duty upon foolscap, and if time, instead of being a condition under which force may exert itself, were an actual force, such an argument as this, briefly expressed, might possibly be worth the paper it is written on. As it is, it is a measure of the laxity of certain biological trains of reasoning. And it is an inexcusable one; because it originated with the naturalists, who are supposed to know (which the simple ethnologists are not) what is meant by induction. It goes back to the time of Cuvier; or, at any rate, it has been endorsed by so great a name. The ibis, as it exhibited itself to the scientific eyes of the French *savans* of the Egyptian expedition, was the same, to a muscle and a feather, as the ibis mummies of the pyramids. Admire, then, the permanence of forms under the pressure of some three millenniums, and deduce the theory of the immutability of specific characters accordingly. But what are three millenniums as a force? three millenniums taken by themselves, as so much *time*? As a force, nothing; though, as a period within which forces may act, much. But these forces are *nil*. The Valley of the Nile of Mehemet Ali is the Valley of the Nile of the Pharaohs; its telluric conditions being unaltered. So much heat and moisture then; so much heat and moisture now. Days of the same length, and suns of the same intensity then; suns of the same intensity, and days of the same length now. The same food, the same opportunities for building nests, the same periodicity of changes. What was there to alter anything, and why should anything, whether ibis or ibis-worshipper, be altered? No cause, no effect—nothing to wonder at in the real or hypothetical instances of immutability. One of the Pharaohs has the credit of having circumnavigated Africa. Had he done it with four ships, of which three had been driven out of their course, one reaching Teneriffe, one Tasmania, and one Ireland, and had the descendants of the wanderers remained, up to the present time, Ægyptian in all things except their latitudes and longitudes, resistant to the physical influences of the island on which they had been driven, with all their African characteristics as good as new, something (nay, much) might have been said about them. With the facts, however, as they stand, and with nothing in the way of influence, except the *apparent* one of time, the only thing they illustrate is the extent to which learned men may write laxly. But enough of this, which is neither more nor less than an episode in the history of opinion—opinion as opposed to fact, and assertion as contrasted with induction. It is no more wonderful that a series of generations of ibides in the Valley of the Nile should resist the unassisted influence of three thousand years, than the cast of a trilobite in a Silurian matrix, should endure the lapse of three, or three hundred, million. The environment on both sides is the

same throughout. From the first to last, there has been nothing more than the opportunities for influences to act on them. But these opportunities ended in nothing. Expose the matrix of the trilobite, or convert the bed of the Nile into a saddle-back ridge, and you shall see what you shall see—possibly all the permanence of specific characters you talk about—possibly that obstinate adherence to an original type upon which you love to dilate—possibly all this and more; but, possibly, something very different. Until, however, such a chance of making an observation is given us, it is the best to suspend our judgment.

2. *The confusion between language in general and languages.*—The following passage from a work of the only naturalist who has hazarded his reputation by advancing opinions on ethnology is a sample of this.

“There is another point to which I would simply allude. Much importance is attached to the affinity of languages, by those who insist upon the primitive unity of man, as exhibiting, in their opinion, the necessity of a direct affiliation between all men. But the very same thing might be shown of any natural family of animals, even of such families as contain a large number of distinct genera and species. Let any one follow upon a map exhibiting the geographical distribution of the bears, the cats, the hollow-horned ruminants, the gallinaceous birds, the ducks, or of any other families, and he may trace, as satisfactorily as any philological evidence can prove it for the human language, and upon a much larger scale, that the brumming of the bears of Kamtschatka is akin to that of the bears of Thibet, of the East Indies, of the Sunda Islands, of Nepal, of Syria, of Europe, of Siberia, of the United States, of the Rocky Mountains, and of the Andes; though all these bears are considered as distinct species, who have not any more inherited their voice one from the other, than the different races of men. The same may be said of the roaring and miawing of the cats of Europe, Asia, Africa, and America; or of the lowing of the bulls, the species of which are so widely distributed, nearly over the whole globe. The same is true of the gackling of the gallinaceous birds, and of the quacking of the ducks, as well as of the song of the thrushes,—all of which pour forth their gay and harmonious notes in a distinct and independent dialect, neither derived nor inherited one from the other, even though all sing thrushish. *Let any philologist study these facts and learn, at the same time, how independent the animals are, one from the other, which utter such closely-allied systems of intonations; and if he be not altogether blind to the significance of analogies in nature, he must begin himself to question the reliability of philological evidence as proving genetic derivation.”—Prefatory Remarks, by Agassiz, to “The Indigenous Races of the Earth,” by Nott and Gliddon.

Valgat quantum. Against such philologues as argue that the simple fact of all men being in possession of an articulate lan-

guage is a proof of a common origin, this very crude remark may hold good; for it may be said that just as snakes hiss, and *gallinaceæ* (as Agassiz, writing in American, rather than in his own language, calls it) *gackel*, and bears *brum*, and other animals perform some other action with a barbarous onomatopœa for a name, so do human beings *speak*, *i.e.*, use a language consisting of certain sounds, which grammarians call *articulate*. But who so argues? No one. The most rampant verbalist in Germany has never committed himself to such a doctrine; and the current practice of investigators is against it. If it were not so, the whole tenor of their talk would run differently, and the field of their inquiry would be of the narrowest. Having, with no great difficulty, arrived at the fact that all the men and women of the world *spoke*, they would (provided that they thought as Agassiz makes them) rest on their oars after a short and pleasant voyage, and a very superficial survey: the very general fact of the universality of such a characteristic as language being a bond between the Australian and the European having satisfied them. But it is well known that this is not the case. It is well known that, upon the simple fact of any two divisions of mankind *speaking*, no relationship has ever been based; the philologues, in this respect being, in their zoology, quite as careful as the ornithologists or erpetologists in theirs. They may or may not have known that in different parts of the world, bears *brum* (so to say) on their own bottoms; *proprio motu*, and without either mutual imitation or community of descent. They may or may not have known that thrushes sing with a certain amount of *thrushish* (*Ἀγασσιζιστὶ λάλευμες*) similarity, on the same principle; though in certain cases, with singing-birds, imitation may have something to do with the concord. They may or may not have known all this. Knowing, however, or ignorant, they have always gone beyond the mere generalities of the question; not only asking whether all men had language, but how far particular languages differed or agreed in their details.

3. *Classification by definition instead of type.*—This either gives undue prominence to extreme forms, or else ignores notable points of likeness. In either case there is error. There is error if we contrast the Laplander or the Eskimo with the Guinea Negro without taking cognizance of the numerous varieties that lie between them, and there is error if we separate the most Asiatic of the Africans from the most African of the Asiatics, simply because their affinities, after running for a certain time in different directions, end in being (apparently) no affinities at all. It is carelessness and ignorance as to the details connected with this train of reasoning that more than anything else makes ethnology distrust zoology. The details on both sides are so numerous and

so important, that, up to the present time, every authority upon one subject has been but an amateur in the other. It is not that the varieties themselves are wholly unknown; there are naturalists who are honourably distinguished by a wide and minute knowledge on these points. It is the details of their several characteristics in their full integrity that are so often overlooked, and it is the belief that, when the skulls or skins differ, other things differ also, which is so often taken upon trust. More than this—when the oversight is pointed out, the characteristic which has been neglected has a fair chance of being depreciated. That professed philologues have overvalued language as a test of consanguinity is as true as that naturalists have underrated it; and it is equally true, that with the exception of men of very candid minds, the reason is to be found in their inability to work the problems connected with its opposite. If the *tertium quid* is unduly ignored in our classification, it is too often forgotten in our dynamics. The influences, whether of climate or nutrition, that are required to convert a North American Indian into a Hottentot, or *vice versa*, are undoubtedly great—perhaps improbably, perhaps impossibly so; but they are also superfluously great. All that is wanted is a change from some intermediate form to one or more extremes. Whether white men can ever become black, or black men white, is one thing—whether brown men may not become either or both, is another.

4. *Toleration of difference of climate.*—Another subject upon which much has been written is the extent to which the *indigen* of one part of the world can be acclimatized in another; and here, as elsewhere, the accuracy or inaccuracy of the current statements is of little importance. What does it matter what they are, so long as, whether good or bad, patent or obscure, they are irrelevant? At the present moment English children thrive badly in India, in Jamaica, in Demerara, to say nothing about the adult Anglo-Saxons of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. Frenchmen in like manner fall-off in Senegambia, whilst no one does well in Sierra Leone, or along the Gold Coast. The Portuguese may fare a little better in Angola and Inhambane, and the Spaniards indifferently well in the Philippines or in South America. Similar instances can be adduced; and in a question of colonization as it exists in the nineteenth century, they would be applicable. They would warn us against bringing extremes together, against sudden exposures on the part of the northern nations to the heat, the moisture, and the malaria of the tropics, against out-door labour in enervating climates, and the like. But how would they apply to the question as to the original peopling of the world? Unless we suppose that the

first pair of human beings were born with a compass in their pockets, and a dockyard within a walk, not a whit. These it is which determine the character of the migrations that go on before our eyes; and these it is which by transporting an Englishman to India, or a Negro to Scotland, expose him to the influences of a new and unfamiliar climate, strongly and fatally contrasted with that of his native land. But these sudden changes and these dreaded contrasts had no place in the primary diffusion of mankind—on the contrary, the transitions were one and all gradual; such a fact as a family from the latitude of Liverpool settling upon a spot in the latitude of Whidah or Calcutta being impossible. The real movement was from (say) Barbary to the extra-tropical Sahara, from the extra-tropical Sahara to the inter-tropical, thence to northern, thence to middle, thence to southern Negroland, thence to the parts beyond the Equator, to the southern limits of the tropic of Capricorn, to the climates of Southern Africa, to Caffraria, and the Cape. In all these cases, each area was peopled from the one in immediate contact with it; which was similarly peopled from the one nearest it: the climates being in many cases all but identical, and none very strongly contrasted—all, too, being climates under which a generation or two (at the very least) gave themselves time to become naturalized.

The area is continuous, and it must be believed that the stream of population by which its several parts were successively appropriated by human beings, was continuous also. Like a gradually widening circle on a still piece of water, the human movement spread itself in all directions—not necessarily at the same rate, not yet with a necessarily regular outline, but, on the contrary, with no notable irregularities in either. Regular, however, or irregular, the movement is one of continuity. If so; in *most cases*, the change of conditions must have been gradual, and along with the change of conditions, the effects resulting from them. If so; most extreme forms must have graduated into each other. Of these gradations, some may be regular, some abrupt, according to the equability or inequability of the conditions which determine them. After parallels and parallels of monotonous desert, where the only difference between one spot and another may have been a slightly greater nearness to the equator, a jungle may present itself, succeeded by a mountain range, a table-land, an ocean with a group of islands, half volcanic, half coralline. When this is the case, we expect abruptness; not, however, because it is the rule according to which organisms change, but because special influences have not only existed but been known to have done so.

5. *Historical period—its margin.*—It is only in the eyes of the civil historians themselves that the differences of opinion

as to date of the origin of the true historical period are important; at any rate, they are of no great importance in the present inquiries. This is because the most extreme discrepancies give the comparatively short period of somewhere about 1500 years. On certain grounds (whether safe or unsafe is immaterial) certain investigators believe that there is nothing much older than the Homeric poems, and these come down to the ninth century B.C. If so, there is no document 3000 years old. Those, however, who think thus are in the minority. Whether they are in the wrong is another question.

On certain grounds, on the other hand (whether safe or unsafe is no matter), there are numerous competent authorities who give to certain countries an antiquity which either approaches or transcends the second millennium B.C. Those who dilate upon the Indian Vedas, those who go into the dynasties of Manetho, those who endorse the extreme results of Babylonian investigation, and those who think that China has been as she is, (in a permanent state of immovable stereotype) for an indefinite period, do this; and except that each backs his own favourite country, they mutually support each other. As a class, they are not very nice about evidence, and as to antiquity, they think it quite as legitimate to presume as to prove it. Still, 1500 or 2000 years gives the *maximum* amount of difference between their dates and those of their opponents. But this is a small sum. It is small, of course, in the eyes of a geologist, to whom, of all men, time is no object. But is not very great in even those of the natural historian of civilization.

Look at its history palæontologically — *i.e.*, from fore to aft, or from effects to causes; the result will be that it is nothing for which our present *data* require any inordinate length of time. In doing this, however, we must be careful against what the Greeks call *ἀλαζονεία*. We must guard against overvaluing it. If there is much which implies the wisdom of a long life; there is also much which reminds us painfully of an infantile condition. In our present state, however, there is nothing that requires a geological period. Language is the growth for which the most time is required; but 10,000 years are a good deal in the lifetime of even such a language as Homer's: no matter how small it was on its birthday.

All this, however, is subject to geological criticism. If this say, "we must have years by the million," all that the ethnologist can say is that he is "slow to think so, though he is open to evidence." But he may add that from *his* point of view, one of two things is necessary — either the rate of development is slower than *his* facts make it, or (what is much the same) there must have been periods of arrest of indefinite length. If the two in-

quirers have confidence in each other, they will each reconsider their opinions. This is what it should be now.

The most tangible element in the natural history of civilization is experience. *Race*, whatever it may mean, is hypothetical. Unless it mean a difference of species, it gives us only a *breed*, and a breed is a result—no cause, but an effect. Experience, however, is a force; but in order to gain experience, we must have a change of conditions; and in order for experience to act and react, we must have intercommunication. This implies two things (1) Contact with certain latitudes and longitudes, soils and climates, aliments and housings, clothings and locomotive *apparatuses*, &c. To know a boat, you must have water, otherwise you are like a shipwreck on the coast of Bohemia. To realize fire you must have a cold spring or a cool summer. But all this, to which more may be added, gives us only the experiences of a certain area. For action and reaction you must have (2) The contact of men and women with unlike wants and different *stimuli*; you must have the teachings and learnings of commercial and social intercourse. All this implies two movements—one centrifugal and one centripetal. The first sends out a group of families from (say) the Euphrates, the Mediterranean, the Nile, the Danube, or the Don; the second brings them back, some in boats, some on camels, some on horses, to (say) the Levant; where experience, the offspring of want and intercourse, first accumulates, and then diffuses itself anew. The rate at which this works is a mystery, though not an unapproachable one. We may get at it by a legitimate induction. Argue backwards, analyse the elements of the highest existing civilization, eliminate in order, such forces and elements as history tells us are recent—the electric telegraph, the steam-engine, the printing-press, the mariner's compass, gunpowder, and the like. Then eliminate such useful arts as certain physical conditions render impossible; such as silk in the Arctic Circle, and shoe-leather in Easter Island. Then reconstruct, and ask what countries give us the same, and what intercourse diffuses them. We can see our way to much in this way. A few elements, however, still stand over. The origin of the boat lies beyond our induction. So does that of the use of fire. Language lies further back still. But language is just the point concerning which any hypothesis as to the rate at which it develops itself, or the condition in which it first originated, is pre-eminently premature. The little that is known concerning it is based upon a few out of the thousand-and-one known dialects of the earth's surface; for it is clear that, for any question of *rate*, it is only those forms of speech of which we have specimens that range over several centuries that are available. Such are those of Greece, Rome, Palestine, and India; and, to

some extent, those of Slavonia and Germany: languages which may be studied in more stages than one; and which, because they can be so studied, are the primary elements in our inductions. The very facts, however, that make them available, the fact of their having been spoken by the more advanced populations of the world, and the circumstance of their having been reduced to writing at an early period, subtract from their value as measures of the rate at which languages in general grow. They exhibit the phenomena of the maturity rather than the infancy of speech. They tell us, no doubt, that a space of some 2500 years amply accounts for such differences as exist between the Greek of the Homeric heroes, and the Greek of the modern Klephths; but they tell us nothing as to time required for the difference between the language of the Iliad and the language of first speakers of speech. For getting at this we must have recourse to the rudest contemporary languages of Africa, America, and Polynesia. But of these the known history is counted by decenniums, whilst the decenniums may be counted on our fingers. Our knowledge of language in its infancy is, at the present time, what our knowledge of the foetal life was in the days when embryology was not. It rests on few facts, and on a very indifferent logic.

Nor is this all. Even if we had more data for the phenomena of rate than we have, a multiplicity of complications and objections would still stand over to embarrass us. What did language begin with? Between the doctrine that brings in the well-worn simile of Pallas, and supposes that, even as that goddess came into the world out of the head of Jove, with her teeth cut and her ideas formed—a full-grown virgin and deity—so did Language appear with a well-stored vocabulary, a clear system of articulations and a mass of moods and tenses, which only called for the grammarian who should arrange them *secundum artem*—between, we say, this extreme view on the one side, and, on the other, the hypothesis that protoplasts of our kind were, until they had worked out the rudiments of language, actually destitute of articulate speech, there is every variety of intermediate opinion—hypotheses, alternatives, guesses of all shapes and sizes. So numerous, indeed, are they, that it is scarcely possible to go into the questions upon which they bear without either arguing in a circle or taking up an undue assumption. Upon the whole, however, the phenomena of language, as generally received, may fairly be said to require a geological rather than historical period for their development. That certain hypotheses will shorten this period is certain; just as others will prolong it. Upon the whole, however, it is a long one. Nevertheless, whether long or short, our views as to its duration depend upon our views as to the unity or multiplicity of the

species of the genus homo. With a single species as a starting-point, with an approximation to a definite rate of change, and with the amount of difference as it exists at the present moment, we have, as our problem, the time required for bringing those differences about. But what if, with certain original differences of species, these differences in language be original also? In such a case, instead of a semi-geological period, an historical one will suffice—nor need that be a very long one.

Mutatis mutandis, the calculation of the time required for the evolution of a certain amount of anatomical differences between the several divisions and subdivisions of mankind, proceeds on the principle under notice: our factors being the present amount of contrast, the rate at which the forces which effect it work, and the original amount of difference or likeness. The greater the original likeness, the longer the time needed. The greater the original difference, the shorter. The difference between the negro and the European, supposing the one to have been black and barbarous, the other fair and flaxen-headed, *ab initio*, is effected in no time; whereas the same difference, if attributed to the force of circumstances acting in time, may require a long succession of millenniums. Yet the actual rate at which the change of the physical environment effects a change in the physical conformation of the individuals affected by it, is as uncertain as it is important. It is uncertain, because the facts themselves are as hard to obtain as the inferences from them. There is a feeling of partisanship and advocacy afloat which impedes both their collection and their application. Know a man's opinion, and you may anticipate his statements. If he favour the doctrine of unity, a very little evidence will be enough for him. He will easily believe that Jews grow black in India and fair in Northern Asia; and he may possibly believe that negroes in America have a slow tendency towards blanching. In questions of a more refined character, he will be satisfied with indirect evidence; and finding that between two populations speaking the same language, one occupant of a level flat and the other of a high mountain range, there is a notable difference of size or colour, he will without much difficulty refer the points whereon they agree to a community of origin, and explain away the differences through the difference of air, soil, or altitude. The evidence in short which satisfied Dr. Prichard, and which is largely adduced by him, satisfies inquirers of this kind, *i.e.* inquirers who are half-satisfied beforehand. But change the temper of the investigator, and let his presumptions be in favour of the multiplicity of species, and then see how such phenomena are treated. The whole mass of indirect evidence is set aside as a loose analogy, and the double-coloured Israelites ignored. The purity of their blood is denied, and the men of the dark skins

are said to have inherited their darkness (as the fair ones their comparative whiteness) from the aborigines of their adopted land. If this mixture can be proved, well and good. If not, the opposing critic has to prove the contrary; and, as that is a negative, the matter comes to a dead-lock. It may be laid down as a rule that, for the practice of controversial ethnology, ubiquitous populations like the Jews, Parsees, and Gipsies, (in cases where they depart from the ordinary type of their stock, and approach that of the climates under which they live,) are of pure or mixed blood according to the convenience of the controversialists; and the old story of the showman repeats itself—"Which is Bonaparte?" and "which the Duke of Wellington?" "Whichever you please."

Yet the question with which it is connected is important. Few speculators deny that change of condition has *some* influence. Whether little or much, it has *some*. The differences between habitual warmth and habitual chills, between habitual starvation and habitual satiety, can hardly be ignored as forces, even by those who most strongly uphold the permanence of specific characters. That the big races will keep big on nothing-a-day to live upon, and the small ones propagate their smallness under a system of comfortable lodgings and long rations, can be only believed under the pressure of a vast weight of prejudice or preconception. The amount of this preconception as a force which determines learned men to admit any amount of causes but no effects, though not very difficult to investigate, is irrelevant. It is only necessary to see how it bears on the question of date; and, as slow changes imply long periods, it is clear that it bears upon it very palpably. But what if this change have a limit? What if naturalists can say to such influences as climate and aliment, "Thus far shall you go and no further. You shall convert a Mongolian into a Chinese, but a Malay into a Papuan or an Australian you shall not convert; nor yet an Asiatic of Siberia into an American of Canada." This is what in practice they *do* say; whether with a due warranty is another matter. Let those who affirm, prove; and it is clear, that, with the inquirer who sets up his limit, the *onus probandi* as to the line which it is to follow, should lie. In the present state of our knowledge, few assumptions are more gratuitous than this one of a limit. Change of cause implies change of effect, and that *ad infinitum*. Meanwhile, it is much more certain that the time in which such causes can act is of any required duration, than that forms remain permanent under conditions which have a tendency to change them; being pliable up to a point, and, that point being passed, obstinately and specifically resistant.

It is this which brings us to the notice of the current doctrine of species, *i.e.*, the doctrine that each originates out of its own

proper protoplasts. The Law of Parsimony, in ordinary cases, reduces these to a single pair. With social animals, however, this condition is not only not imperative, but is, to some extent, contra-indicated—so that, to some extent, societies come into the world ready-made. Whoever holds this view in respect to mankind requires but a short time for the development of existing phenomena. It is not, however, a very common one. Still less has it been developed with any skill or success. Its chief condition is that the protoplast of the same society belong to the same species and the same locality.

The doctrine of the multiplicity of protoplasts with a unity of species, is a modification of this. The species is one, but the primordial individuals who constitute it are placed in different portions of the earth's surface. Their descendants differ in so far as they come of different ancestors; but they agree in having their physical characters alike. Whether the facts, real or fictitious, involved in any definition which could be given of this hypothesis would satisfy every definer of the term *species*, is doubtful. It is only certain that numerous speculators hold it—generally without knowing what they do. Those who talk about *race*, if pressed by a Socratic dialectician as to the meaning of the term, for the most part retire upon something of the kind. As an hypothesis, it allows of the *maximum* of development in the *minimum* of time.

Another hypothesis akin to this, which would give considerable results within a short period, is founded upon a sort of analogy upon a sort of doctrine connected with a debatable question concerning the origin of our domesticated animals. It is to the effect that pure species are, at present, *nil*; that all is hybridism; that out of the intermixture of allied species, capable of mutual intermixture, a *tertium quid* has been developed—the pure stock being extinct. This view reconciles the uniformity of language (which it, either rightly or wrongly, considers itself forced to admit) with the differences of physical conformation, by believing that certain species, with little or no language, were capable either of learning it from others, or of intermixing with them. The remedy here is better or worse than the disease, just in proportion as we lay great or little stress on physical differences. Upon physical differences, however, great stress is laid. It is upon the high valuation of these that the amateur naturalist holds forth with unction to the amateur ethnologist—who, if his ethnology be of the German fashion, little more than an exaggerated philology, takes his doctrine upon trust. Men of this kind are supposed to see far. Whether they see the present tendencies of Natural History Proper is doubtful. It is clear that they come out the strongest, and profess the most advanced opinions, just at the time when pure naturalist opinions as to species are setting in for a modification.

The views alluded to at the beginning of our notice, differ from all the forms of the proper species doctrine in this—they never begin with a protoplast at all. They never say when the man in *posse* ceases to be something other than man; or when the entity which is to come out man, ceases to be the entity out of which it, in its turn, was developed. It gives no definite origin of man as man. For when does he begin? Does the erect posture make him? Does language? Do the powers of abstraction and generalization? We put these questions in a spirit of honest criticism. The distinguished author of the last form which the doctrine has taken, has, perhaps, heard them put differently.

That all these views complicate the question of date is clear. They must excuse us if we indicate but negative results.

There are certain areas where the evidence is in favour of a certain amount of difference having been developed rather than created *ab initio*—this development of difference requiring time.

There are several vast regions which the purely zoological view, so far at least as it points to the spots where the nearest approaches to humanity have their home as the likeliest centres for species of the genus homo to have originated, excludes. It excludes Polynesia, excludes Australia and Tasmania; it scarcely favours New Guinea, and the Kelanonesian range between it and New Caledonia. Even the smaller and more distant islands of the Indian Archipelago are not very decidedly indicated; neither are Madagascar and North and South America. In each and all of these areas, the presumption that arises out of the general phenomena connected with zoological geography, is in favour of immigration rather than aboriginality. Of course, an amount of difference must be taken as we find it; and if nothing less than a decidedly new species will explain it, general presumptions must be set aside. If an aboriginal tiger had been found in Norfolk Island, we must have recognised it. At the same time, the chances against its so being found should have told their tale, and made us either criticise the evidence or acknowledge its exceptional character of the fact. Carrying this view still further, and dealing only with the existing species, the two localities which are likeliest to have been the cradle of mankind, are the countries of the chimpanzee and the orang-outan. The more we recede from them—i.e., the more the birthplace of any lower animal has our nearest congeners unlike ourselves, the more unlikely it is to have given us a progenitor. Whether we are like the higher apes is another question. It is another question, too, to value the difference. It is only certain that, whether great or small, our nearest congeners are the simiadae just named. They may possibly be unpleasantly near; but they may also be near us, in the way that the second horse, in a race where all were dis-

tanced, was nearest to Eclipse. Eclipse was first and the rest nowhere.

The districts just enumerated not only exclude the protoplasts of the genus homo, supposing that genus to have contained a single species only, but they exclude (though somewhat less decidedly) the protoplasts of *any* species, or any number of species; assuming the genus to have contained *more* than one. Yet at present they are inhabited; and they are islands.

We need not believe in an historical Atlantic, in order to appreciate the importance of islands as opposed to continents, in questions connected with the palæontology of both our floras and our faunas. That more spots than one, now surrounded by the ocean, were once portions of a continent, and that they are only islands because the connecting tracts of the interjacent land have been submerged, is recognised by all those zoologists and botanists whose studies carry them upwards in the stream of time, and (so doing) bring them within the domain of the geologist. And here they find an instrument of criticism in the character of the insular organisms. Sometimes they are little more than those of the nearest continent; this being the case when the island is small and the continent near. When the island, however, is large, and the connexion with the continent either distant or indirect, the result is a contrast; and a peculiar vegetation, with a peculiar set of animals to match, like those of Australia or New Zealand, presents itself. In the former of these cases there has been simple diffusion; in the latter (according to the current phraseology), a specific centre of creation. The third class of facts for our present researches is more important still. Let a certain area, at a certain period, be part of a continent; let it contain certain species of plants or animals; let these extend to a certain distance round a certain centre, and no farther; let the peripheral parts of this area (it need not by any means be a true circle) be submerged, so that the remainder be left in the shape of an island. The result, in respect to the organisms thus left occupant of this island, will be isolation—*isolation* truly synonymous with *insulation*—*isolation* which often carries along with it a clear and abrupt line of demarcation; *isolation* which, from the obliteration of the intermediate forms destroyed by the submergence, may make, according to circumstances, either a variety simulate a species, or a species a genus. No one has written with greater clearness or cogency on this point than Mr. Wollaston.

“The Canaries are the head-quarters of the genus *Hegeter*; Teneriffe may, indeed, be called the land of *Hegeters*. No less than thirteen or fourteen species have been recorded as indigenous to those islands; and there can be no reasonable doubt whatsoever that that

ancient region (when continuous and entire) was the primæval centre or range of that heteromorous group. The Hegeters are an apterous race, and of a sedentary temperament; hence, when the area (whether by general or partial subsidence it signifies not) was broken up, it is not surprising that those local fragments of it should have become the nucleus of reception, as it were, for the members of the genus. Nevertheless, a few of these many representatives (of more discursive capabilities, perhaps, than the rest) had found their way, before the period of dissolution, to a considerable distance from their original haunts. Thus, one of them (the *H. Calebricola*, Woll.) had arrived at what now constitutes the rocks of the Salvage; another (the *H. elongatus*, Oliv.), at least, if not two, had colonized the Madeiras, and is said (though I believe incorrectly) to have even reached the present coast of Portugal; the latter species is clearly of a more adaptive nature than its allies, inasmuch as it has also naturalized itself on the opposite shores of Africa. One thing, however, is at any rate manifest, that the Hegeters attain their *maximum* in the Canaries, and that a few members only have been sent off in a northerly or north-easterly direction from thence."

Mutatis mutandis, what applies to the Hegeters and the Canaries, applies to the Tarphii and to Madeira; the genus *Tarphius* being congregated about that island, just as the genus *Hegeter* was congregated about Tenerife.

"Many kindred species may, of course, have been lost during those gigantic subsidences which caused the Madeiras to be shaped out, and to tell their tale above the waves as ruins of an ancient land; yet our existing cluster of forms could not have wandered far, at that early period, from the serras and ridges of their birth; perhaps not so far indeed (considering the limited bounds within which they are now confined, and that time should in reality have increased their range rather than diminished it), as they have succeeded in doing at the present day. Hence we may reasonably conclude, that Madeira proper is an example of what we have alluded to in a preceding page—namely, of the accidental retention during a vast downward movement, of a nucleus of small specific areas of colonization, the colonizers of which had not extended elsewhere."

And so on with certain terrestrial mollusca. After enumerating some of the present denizens of the same island, the author continues:

"That these actual species (saved alive from their fellows, after the wholesale destructions in this Atlantic province had been completed), are no results of insular development, is demonstrated by the fact that two of them (for the third has apparently become extinct) have not altered one iota since the fossil period, which, in the opinion of Sir Charles Lyell, is anterior to the dissolution of the intermediate land; whereas, had they been mere modifications of each other, induced by the local conditions and influences to which they have

been through a long series of ages severally exposed, the difference between their recent contour and that of their fossil homologues would have been doubtless at once conspicuous. I gather, therefore, that like the *Turphii*, to which we have lately drawn attention, they are veritable surviving members of an esoteric assemblage which found its birthplace on the post-miocene (?) tract."

The note of interrogation, after the word *post-miocene*, is the author's; in other words, it belongs to the original text.

"Although there are many causes through which species may become annihilated, yet, since the subsidence of a tract into the sea involves the maximum of loss which a space of that magnitude can sustain, the above conclusion gives rise to a corollary, *that it is in islands that we should mainly look for genera which are to be rigidly pronounced.* The question therefore naturally suggests itself—Is this in harmony with what we see? or, in other words, Is it consistent with experience or not? I believe that it is; for I think it will be found on inquiry, *that the greater proportion of those groups which are more especially isolated in their character* (I do not say necessarily the more anomalous, though this in some measure follows from the fact of their detachment) *are peculiar to countries which are insular.*"

Now, it is certain that, whatever else mankind, as a species, genus, or ordo, may supply in the way of zoological palæontology, it supplies no analogues to the *Hegeteres* and *Turphii*—nothing which tells us that, when the sea came in between, those fringes of the older continents which afterwards became islands were the occupancy of man. Indeed, the extent to which the earth's surface is, at the present time, occupied by any tribes whatever, and explored by the more civilized, is an element in our calculations. Though it is too much to say that any of the continental areas are uninhabited, it is certain that in three great districts we have *terra incognita*—in Central Africa, in Central South America, and in Central New Guinea. That these should be unknown to Englishmen and Germans is natural enough: That, considering the rudeness of the populations of the parts around them, they should be thinly peopled, is also natural. The thinness of their population, however, along with the isolation of their occupants, is decided evidence to the imperfect mastery of the Man of those parts over the Nature of them; and, when we lay out of our account the results of the higher and more recent civilization that has developed itself within the historical period, it is just this mastery of man over the physical conditions of the area in which he is placed, that is the best measure of his civilization—a civilization which is limited to the useful (we might almost say the necessary) arts, and attaches itself to them but imperfectly. But this culture, the result of knowledge, is the result of experience—the daughter of Time. Assuredly, the lower forms of civiliza-

tion, in the eyes of those who admit progress of any kind, indicate anything but a high antiquity.

The fact of some large islands being, like Iceland, uninhabited until the historical period, and of others, like Madagascar, being uninhabited till a little before, leads us towards the same conclusion.

What our own civilization—the civilization of the *litterati* and *savans* of Western Europe—indicates, is a point which can only be determined after some slight sacrifices in the way of self-love. We have a natural tendency to overvalue it. Intellectual men overrate their own; and modest men give the mass of their fellow-creatures the credit for being there or thereabouts—on a *par* with them. Yet nothing is more transparently clear than that the points wherein the philosophers differ from the vulgar are points of which the history is not only, to great extent, known in detail, but is also known to be, comparatively, recent. The average of our civilization is more plain than complimentary. It is a satisfactory result if a few thousand years have effected it; for *thousands* write *millions*, and it is an unpleasant one.

Repeating what has already been stated that, the documentary evidence being given over to the archæologist and the geologist, we have limited our remarks to that which depends on development only. Recognising, in the peculiarities of the island Faunas, an approximate *terminus* on the side of antiquity, and suspending judgment upon the question of protoplasts until such time as either some unborn progenitor of a new series of descendants, now in the womb of time, shall have presented itself to our ken, or, on the other hand, until the period within which it may reasonably be expected shall have elapsed, we find that ethnology tolerates, rather than demands, a geological epoch for the antiquity of the human kind. If, however, the documentary evidence insist upon one, we must choose between an infinitesimally small amount of human culture to begin with, and a rate of change slower than our present inductions suggest; or (what is nearly the same thing) long intercalations of arrested progress. When we argue backwards, from the present to the past, from effect to cause, the links of our chain are clear and palpable as long as we count by centuries. When we get towards five figures they become dim and disconnected. The men of seven figures are the geologists. With them the millionaire question began, and with them, in the present state of our knowledge, we may leave it.

ART. VI.—RUSSIA—PRESENT AND FUTURE.

1. *La Vérité sur la Russie.* Par LE PRINCE PIERRE DOLGOROUKOW. 8vo. Paris. 1860.
2. *Etudes sur l'avenir de la Russie.* Par SCHÉDO-FERROTI. 5 parties. 8vo. Berlin. 1860.
3. *Reflexions prealables sur les bases proposées au mode d'Emancipation des Serfs en Russie. Lettre à Monsieur Rostovtsoff, par un Député de Comité.* Paris. 1859.
4. *Kolokol—The Bell.* London. 1860.
5. *Pod Soodt.* London. 1860.
6. *L'Economiste Belge—Lettres de M. Molinari.* 1860.

THE revolution preparing in Russia, and which the events of every day seem to be hurrying to a catastrophe, has attracted as yet but little attention in this country. The reason of this is, partly that the Russian government loves to invest its simplest measures with a mysterious secrecy, and partly that an acquaintance with the language and literature of Russia is an accomplishment rare in England. That literature, since the accession of Alexander II., has exhibited a force and fertility hardly to be expected in a country where the harshest form of censorship had been so long in vigour, and has proved itself worthy of the most favoured countries of Europe. The occasion which has called this literary power into being is indeed one of vital interest to the Russian nation, and had held silent possession of the most thoughtful minds of the country during the whole of the long and oppressive reign of the Emperor Nicholas. That dreaded sovereign on his deathbed recommended to his son and successor the adoption of a line of policy that should bring peace and internal improvement to his unwieldy empire. The task was a difficult one; but the new Czar openly avowed his intention of inaugurating a new era. Peace was made with Turkey and the Western Powers, the army was reduced to a peace establishment, public feeling was propitiated by the removal of restrictions on travelling and restrictions on the press, and the way was prepared for the grand measure of the reign, the greatest measure of the century—the emancipation of the serfs.

The importance of this central question became more and more evident in proportion as other questions of innovation and reform grouped themselves around it; we purpose therefore to lay before our readers some considerations on the present

aspect and possible future condition of Russia as affected by the spirit of change which is active within her borders.

To aid us in this review, we have a crowd of books, pamphlets, and journals, in Russian, French, and German, from which we select, as sufficient illustrations of our subject, the works named at the head of this article, each one offering, as it does, a view differing from the other of the question before us.

Prince Dolgoroukow makes an impetuous assault on all the existing institutions of his country, in which he finds every vice consistent with corruption and decay. None but a Russian, he says, is able to write truly about Russia, and no Russian but himself, and one or two others, has been found willing to perform this dangerous national service. Self-exiled, these chosen few have consecrated their lives to the duty of tearing off the mask which the Russian government has worn ever since it has shared in the politics of Europe. The face is a European face; but the heart is a heart of Asia. To expose this deception, and to shame the rulers of his country into becoming really European, Prince Dolgoroukow drags the offenders against justice and good government into the light they most hate—the light of European publicity. Hitherto it has been made a point of honour among Russian writers to cover the sore places in their body politic, and to attack chivalrously foreign authors like Custine, who audaciously betray the secrets of the empire. "Away with such squeamishness," says Prince Dolgoroukow, "I have come abroad for the express purpose of publishing all I know about the evil ways of the public functionaries of my country, and I have taken care to place myself and my papers in a place of safety in order to do so with impunity." We have nothing to say against this determination, and believe it to be the only way open to a conscientious writer for the expression of opinions which necessarily condemn those who have authority over him. Yet we think his strictures would have come with greater weight, and carried more complete conviction to the minds of his hearers, had they been delivered in more temperate language, and without the offensive personalities which are found in almost every page of the book. "Fools and knaves" are epithets he freely applies to functionaries whom every reader at all familiar with the dignitaries of the Russian court can have no difficulty in identifying. One minister seems to be the especial object of the writer's aversion; a conversation in his drawing-room is repeated to his disadvantage, the grievances of the clerks in his office are solemnly set forth, and three or four times it is asserted that he has had attacks of insanity. However well merited vituperation may be, a writer's indulgence in the use of it will always diminish confidence in his judgment, and impartiality.

Apart from this defect in temper, more suited to the ebullitions of a pamphleteer than the reflections of an historian, the merits of Prince Dolgoroukow's book are great. The style is clear and vivacious; the arrangement masterly. The illustrative anecdotes are told with touches of real humour, and the portraits of persons, ages, official and otherwise, are drawn with a talent truly dramatic. In the main, we doubt not the charges of maladministration which form the principal topic of the volume are true, and the suggestions of improvements are well worthy the consideration of those engaged in the momentous measures of Russian reform. At page 17, we read that one suggestion of the writer's, made through the Grand Duke Constantine, to the effect that public business should be transacted at a weekly general meeting of the ministers under the presidency of the Emperor, instead of at private conferences of his majesty with each minister separately, was in part adopted. Prince Dolgoroukow can expect little more such condescension from his sovereign after unkind allusions like the following:—

“Let us cure us of our sores; let the administration be transformed. There is yet time, but make haste; time goes fast everywhere; in Russia it is galloping. The Emperor Alexander, animated with excellent intentions, wishes for reforms; you (the bureaucracy) put every imaginable obstacle in his way—take care! Remember that the defenders of old abuses in France, for having hampered and paralysed, in 1789, the good intentions of the loyal Louis XVI., that true father of his people, brought on a fearful anarchy, of which they were the first victims. * * * At this hour Russia is at the point where France was in 1785; she is marching to her 1789, a date that would have been so happy and so brilliant for France, but for the obstinacy of short-sighted men! In God's name save us, save us from 1793!”

The calm and sage reflections of the writer who has adopted the pseudonym of Schédo-Ferroti (a gentleman of Livonia, we believe) serve as an excellent corrective to “*La vérité sur la Russie.*” The author, like Prince Dolgoroukow, is a constitutionalist, but with a leaning to the monarchical element as strong as the bias of the latter towards the popular element in the Constitution. His five separate “studies” have appeared at considerable intervals one from the other, and treat severally of—

- 1st. The liberation of the peasants.
- 2nd. The principles of government and their consequences.
- 3rd. Malversations and remedies.
- 4th. The noblesse.
- 5th. The military.

Each subject is treated with a patient attention to detail and matters of fact worthy of all praise. To any one desirous of obtaining a dispassionate conception of the condition of the Russian administration, we strongly recommend the perusal of these

five pamphlets. We shall have occasion to refer to them again in the course of this article.

The concluding words of his fourth "Etude" exhibit the colour and tendency of his opinions:—

"No great State (is possible) without a monarchical government, no monarchy without a nobility, and no nobility without landed possessions, and that *esprit de corps* which is based, not on community of pretension and privilege, but on the community of noble and generous aspirations, and of duties to be fulfilled—a spirit which proudly unfurls the banner of nationality, and inscribes thereon the motto, 'Honour is a worship of which the gentleman is the priest.'"

The third author on our list is, we believe, a gentleman of great landed possessions and family connexions, a circumstance to be borne in mind when reading his able pamphlets. He complains bitterly of what he considers the excessively democratic tendency of the Czar and his supporters in the schemes put forth for emancipating the serfs, in which he sees little else than a plan for aggrandizing the bureaucracy, whose power is already so mischievously great. In writing thus he, too, has braved the wrath of the powers that be, but without incurring the necessity of self-exile. M. Lavergne, the author of a well-known book on the rural economy of England, has supported the views of this writer in *La Revue des Deux Mondes*.

The *Kolokol*, a Russian journal published fortnightly in London, presents us with the democratic socialistic opinions of a writer of great ability and literary power. M. Herzen had gained, under the pseudonym of Iscander, a high reputation as a writer of romance and of works bearing upon the social history of Russia and of Europe, before he came to England and set up the Russian printing-press, whence has proceeded in unflinching succession a series of *prohibited* Russian writings which cannot but exercise a powerful influence on the general Russian mind. M. Ogareff, who is associated with M. Herzen in the management of the *Kolokol*, has contributed to that journal several most able papers on the question of emancipating the serfs. The malversations and other administrative iniquities of the Russian functionaries denounced in the *Kolokol*, were thus often brought for the first time to the knowledge of the Emperor, who is said to be a "constant reader" of the audacious publication. By way of extending the operation of this valuable judicial function of their paper the editors resolved, a few months ago, to publish a supplement specially devoted to the exposure of acts of injustice committed by the authorities in Russia, who were thus brought by the press at London to the bar of public opinion, whence the name of the publication, *Pod Soodt*, or "under judgment."

The letters of M. Molinari in *L'Economiste Belge*, give an in-

teresting account of that gentleman's experience during a politico-economical tour recently made by him in Russia, where he has been delivering lectures at various great towns on free trade, free labour, and other economical subjects of the very first importance to Russia in the present crisis of her fate. That he should have been received generally by large and enthusiastic audiences is a small but not insignificant fact.

This cursory notice of our authorities presents, we believe, a fair sample of the spirit and temper of the literary combatants in the great struggle now agitating Russia. On the main point, as we have said, there is no longer any controversy, and never was there an instance of more rapid change in public opinion—all are agreed as to the justice, wisdom, and necessity of granting liberty to the serfs. Differences occur as to the measure of this liberty and the mode of conferring it. The Committee Deputy is for granting absolute personal freedom and nothing more, leaving all real property in the hands of the present holders, and obliging them only to pay the hire due for the labour they require. As the peasant must then pay rent for his cottage, his garden, and such land as he can till, this change would manifestly give considerable advantage to the proprietor over the peasant, and the condition of the latter would hardly be an improvement on his present state of serfdom.

In so far as this plan tends to the formation of a class of Russian country gentlemen, Schédo-Ferroti and Prince Dolgoroukow appear to agree with the Committee Deputy; but they both are for endowing every peasant with his cottage, garden, and a small portion of land, to pay the value of which he shall be allowed a certain number of years, during which no ejectments will be permitted. The wishes of the Emperor, and the plan shadowed forth by the Government for the guidance of the Central Committee, are conformable to these views, but they countenance the mischievous notion that payment for the cottage, &c., may be made by compulsory labour, a notion which our experience of the apprenticeship system introduced into the West Indies, is sufficient to discredit.

The Socialist party naturally entertain very strong opinions on the mode of redistributing personal and proprietary rights, now that the time has come for emancipating the serfs. As a natural consequence of emancipation, they look for the overthrow of the noblesse and the revival of the communal system in all its force. The socialistic working of the communes in Russia is still very remarkable in every department of labour, and instead of condemning communistic ideas as relics of an infant and barbarous state of society, the writers we allude to see, in the prevalence of those ideas in Russia—the beginning of a new and better life for

the masses, not only of Russia, but of all Europe. The important differences involved in the several opinions of the writers on Emancipation are reflected with greater or less accuracy in the various sections of the great body politic of the Russian Empire.

We therefore purpose presenting to our readers a sketch of the component parts of Russian society, every member of which will be affected by the coming change, and so facilitate the conception of the future condition of Russia when the serfs shall have been emancipated, and the consequent inevitable reforms in the administration shall have taken place.

Taken roughly, the following division of the inhabitants of Russia will indicate with tolerable correctness the groups interested in a really national question, and influencing with more or less weight the decision of such a question.

1. The peasantry.
2. The clergy.
3. The bureaucracy.
4. The nobility.
5. The army.
6. The Emperor and his ministers.

All the writers we have enumerated speak well of the unadulterated Russian peasant, the raw material of the nation, and by right the basis of its social and political institutions.

"Of all the writers," says Schédo-Ferroti, "who have written upon Russia, even those evidently animated by a hostile spirit, I know not one who has not spoken well of the Russian people, thereby doing justice to the national genius of the country; for in them is still found Russian nationality in all its primitive greatness, with its noble and generous instincts, its patriarchal institutions, its innate respect for authority, its faith, so sincere, *naïve*, and tolerant."

From some personal experience among the natives of Eastern and Central Russia, we venture to corroborate these flattering testimonies with certain qualifications. Naturally agile and strong, the Russian is unconquerably lazy; good-natured, hospitable, and courteous, he is crafty and uncandid: once started in the pursuit of gain, he is shrewd and persevering in the attainment of his object, but he is overreaching and unscrupulous; he is moreover deficient in that quality most precious to a young nation, the accumulative faculty, being naturally spendthrift, and a lover of the pleasures of the moment. It must be admitted that these are the vices which accompany a state of slavery, and it is to be hoped that in a life of freedom the Russian people will rapidly outgrow them. The charge of cruelty so often brought against the Russian soldiery cannot fairly be laid against the people in their normal condition. Like all unsophisticated people, their nature being much nearer to primitive human nature than ours, they are sub-

ject to transports of rage and fury, just as they are capable of intense pleasure in simple natural joys, to a degree we cannot conceive of.* They have an extraordinary aptitude for all kinds of handicraft—a talent for trade that would shame a Scotch pedlar or a Manchester bagman, and a general *savoir faire* in the exigencies of life that would do honour to a French Zouave.

And these are natural gifts, not arts acquired in thickly populated cities, where the friction of life sharpens the wits of the greatest dullards. The vast majority of the Russian population of seventy millions is rural, there being 92 per cent. compared with 8 per cent. of the urban population. The great and natural occupation of the people is agriculture, which has hitherto been followed carelessly and inadequately for the advantage of absentee masters—gamblers at Baden-Baden, and spendthrifts at Paris—but to which the new era dawning upon Russia will give the living and vigorous impulse springing from the interests of the labourers themselves.

The feelings of family affection are strong in Russian peasant households, the authority of the parent, and, at his decease, of the eldest in the family, being generally acknowledged and maintained. The weakening of home influence is found to be injurious. The favourable aspect of the peasant's character diminishes in proportion to the distance and the length of time which separates him from the domestic hearth. The soldier, recruited for twenty-five years, is lost to his family, and irrevocably separated from the beneficial influences of his native place. He becomes a well-drilled item in that terrible machine—a regiment, but is no longer a citizen in any sense—almost ceases to be a man. The peasantry justly regard the recruitment as one of the severest afflictions that can befall them. Again, removal in another way from the primitive condition of his life, has hitherto been fatal to the type of true Russian nationality. The servants of the Russian gentry are less national than the peasant—

“Mimicking the manners of their masters,” says Schédo-Ferotti, “they gladly doff the national costume to don the German (that is, European) coat, and are already infected with the mania for ranks and titles, that curse of the upper classes in Russia. Pluming themselves on their titles of *laquais*, *kammerdiener*, *koukhnmeister*, or

* We feel pleasure in recording the sense of perfect security with which a solitary stranger, if he know but a little of the language of the people, may travel at all hours of the day and night through the loneliest parts of Russia, confiding in the guidance of rough-bearded peasants, who convey him over the wide tracts that separate one village from another with their own horses and in their own carts, at a very trifling cost.

† In Russia the epithet *Niemets* signifies German and foreigner, being used as the term Frank is used in Turkey.

schweizar, borrowed from the German vocabulary, they are proud of being no longer *moujiks* (peasants), little dreaming how much they have lost by the change."

It is from the peasant class that the native merchants and burgesses spring, and the proportion of towns in the empire is too small, being on an average one town in 130½ square miles, to admit of the townspeople being regarded as forming by themselves an influential class of the population. In the commercial class, however, such as it is, the national type is partly preserved, and the national costume worn; but no sooner does the bearded, kaftan-robed dealer grow rich, than he endows his son with the European swallow-tailed coat, or procures him some subordinate government place, where the youth may shine in the metal buttons of a uniform, and attain after years of service to a *tchin*, or rank in one of the fourteen classes of nobility. The wealthy merchants also depart from their true vocation by seeking, at a great sacrifice, for such decorations and titles as will give them the rights of nobility. The cross of St. Vladimir does this; and certain other privileges were granted by the late Emperor Nicholas with a view to afford to the merchants the honours of hereditary nobility. A native Russian mercantile firm, of three or four generations standing, is said to be unknown.

The people of Russia, when weeded of the lacqueys of all descriptions—menial* and commercial—remain a solid mass of some sixty millions, devoted mainly to the tillage of the soil, and to the pasturage of cattle in a region which for the most part is well prepared by nature for the agricultural and pastoral life. Twenty-two millions of these (inclusive of women and children) are serfs—that is, persons bound to the soil, and subject to the control of the owners of estates, so that they cannot leave his employ without his permission (and for such leave, when obtained, an annual tribute has to be paid); they cannot marry without his consent; their houses, their lands, their goods, their children, and one-half their time, are held to be at his disposal. On his part, the landlord is liable for the taxes due from his peasants, and for recruits for the army when called upon; he must, moreover, provide for all his "souls," so that none die of starvation, and he must allow them each a cottage, a garden, and a plot of land for the support of themselves and families. It is on the possession of these last-named tenements that the principal difficulty of the emancipation turns. The Emperor so far prejudged the question that in his manifesto of December, 1857, he intimated his wish that the nobility of the provinces, meeting in committees, should arrange among them a scheme by which the peasant should obtain his freedom, and with his freedom something for the maintenance of himself and family, and the payment of his taxes. The tra-

ditionary feeling of the peasant class, who have been *adscripti glebæ* for more than 260 years, is that they are attached to the land by a bond that no one can justly break, as an owner is attached to his most righteous possession, and that in granting them liberty the Emperor has severed their connexion with their lords, but by no means their connexion with the land. Such a feeling, irresistible if persevered in, is strengthened by the position of the remaining peasant population of Russia, styled the "Crown peasants," who have never fallen under the yoke of serfdom. They are the inhabitants of those parts of the empire which acknowledged no private owners at the time (1596) when the edict of bondage was published. In obedience to the general law which makes the sovereign, as the nation's representative, the holder of the nation's property, these unappropriated lands are considered to be Crown lands, and their occupiers Crown peasants. In free States, the latter would be free men. No law need be abrogated to make them so, and spite of Prince Dolgoroukow's severe language concerning their degraded condition under the administrative ferule of the Crown officials, we have reason to believe that they know and feel the difference between their lot and that of serfs. Let any one converse with the drivers, boatmen, porters, or any working men in St. Petersburg, and he will discover at once a marked difference between the *Gospodskie* (private owner's) and the *Tsarskie* (Crown) peasant.

The latter are not only more independent in their bearing than the former, but they exhibit more tokens of material prosperity, a greater confidence that their labour and their gains are their own, and cannot lawfully be taken from them. It is true that the vice of serfdom, which taints all departments of the State, has spread its contagious influence to the management of the Crown peasants, who, though nominally under an admirable system of administration, arranged in communes and districts, with no inconsiderable elective powers, practically suffer much from the exactions and *ex officio* tyranny of the functionaries set over them. The opponents of the Government emancipation scheme, our committee deputy for one, affect to see in it nothing but a plan for bringing the serfs under the *régime* which presses so heavily on the Crown peasants, to the increase of the glory, power, and riches of the bureaucracy. Such a fate can hardly befall them, for the strength of the despotic official lies in serfdom, ever near as an example and as an excuse; and the abolition of serfdom will rather deprive him of the power he now has, than add aught thereto. The sufferings of the Crown peasants suffice to excite their sympathy in the cause of the emancipation of their fellow-subjects, which once achieved, must be followed by reforms demanded with one voice by a united population of sixty millions.

This is a very formidable force for the governing classes to confront in a crisis in which it is not impossible that the passions may be aroused. We proceed to notice another section of the *dramatis personæ* that will occupy a corner of the stage in the coming drama. The Russian clergy are not a highly-considered body. Sprung from the people, they have not been raised above the people morally and intellectually so as to exercise any appreciable influence over them. Their benefices are so small that they are for the most part compelled to plough their glebe with their own hands, and the presents in kind which they receive from their parishioners are acknowledged as a real boon. Their *bouhomie* and goodness of heart preserve them from contempt, but they do not pretend to any assertion of dignity. That they have no learning is not to be wondered at. The harassing ceremonial of their church, when conscientiously performed, absorbs the time not given to tillage of the ground and to the cares of a family, for every secular priest in Russia, as our readers doubtless are aware, must have a wife. No wife, no living; and widowed parish-priests have to give up their benefices, and enter the order of black clergy or monks. The latter reverend fathers, as they furnish occupants for the high places in the Church, might be expected to acquire some tolerable degree of scholarship; but the examples of eminent learning among Russian ecclesiastics are so few as to form, we fear, but the exception to the rule. Prince Dolgoroukoff devotes a chapter of his book to the "Russian Clergy," and another chapter, under the title of "Liberty of Conscience," to the dissenters of Russia. Unlike the more radical of his co-reformers, the Prince is orthodox, and expresses great respect for the Church and its means of doing good. He deploras the abject condition of the working clergy, and charges the superior ecclesiastics with base obsequiousness to the civil Government and its agents, for which they indemnify themselves by insolent pride and shameless venality in their conduct to their inferiors, while he sums up the qualifications of the monks as a "do-nothing, depraved class, and, next to the bureaucracy, the most noxious that exists in Russia."

It is more to our purpose to say that the origin, education, and domestic life of the clergy seem to identify them more with the people than with the upper classes. Their influence, as far as it extends, will be exerted in support of the peasant's right to freedom and a freehold, and their influence may at any time assume a formidable character if they consent to act as *propaganda* of popular doctrines. In the recent total movement among the peasantry, the clergy took a leading part. At a time of radical change in a nation, the dissenters from the established creed, men who hold to their religion for conscience sake, will

generally be found among the most earnest and zealous of innovators. In Russia the number of "old believers," the largest body of the dissenters, is nine millions, or one-seventh of the entire population; and although they are in disposition conservative even to bigotry, and though the original cause of their dissent was a reform operated in the ritual, the orthodox Church being the "reformed" Church, yet the persecution they and other dissenters have undergone at the hands of the Government, will dispose them for any change that may promise liberty of conscience. Prince Dolgoroukoff makes important suggestions for the reform of the Church and the extension of real toleration to the sectaries. He cites from the *Kolokol* of February 15th, 1860, a notable instance of violent interference on the part of Government officials with the peasants of *Dziernowicz*, a village in Witepsk, who from United-Greeks had become Roman Catholics. The cruelties and trickeries of which the Colonel of Gendarmerie and others, sent to "restore order," were guilty, would be incredible to any one not familiar with the habits of a hardened dog in office armed with despotic power. We only wish to quote a little sermon preached to the villagers by one Senator Stch——, who was sent in June, 1858, to bring the business to a satisfactory conclusion. Arrayed in senatorial costume, and surrounded by a little band of functionaries in full uniform, he thus addressed the assembled peasants, after telling them that the Emperor would not allow them to be Roman Catholics, and that they must profess the orthodox religion:—

"The wish of the Czar is sacred. The Czar is the representative of God. What God is in heaven, the Czar is on earth. Not to obey the Czar means to disobey God. So, my children, you must not struggle against the divine will, expressed by my mouth. The Czar wishes you all to be orthodox, consequently God wishes it. Obey!"

This bright gem of logic and eloquence not producing the required effect, the subordinates desired the peasants to show their loyalty to the Czar by kissing the senator's hand. As this injunction was obeyed, M. Stch—— gave each man his benediction, and at the end of the strange scene those who had kissed hands were declared orthodox members of the Greek Church. The senator retired in triumph, leaving gendarmes to aid the local police in flogging the recalcitrants into the true Church! If such executors of the law, and this is only one of innumerable instances to be gathered from the *Kolokol* and *Pod Soodt* of arbitrary violence committed by officials—if such men are to be trusted with a longer enjoyment of the power they abuse so frightfully, the friends of the Emperor may well tremble for him and his Government in the crisis which is closing around them.

Let us take a closer view of this terrible bureaucracy—the bugbear of every writer upon Russia. It is a creation of Peter the First's.

“In ancient Russia,” says Prince Dolgoroukow, “there was a custom grown into a law by which no man whose father, grandfather, or great-grandfather had held a higher place than the father, grandfather, or great-grandfather of any other man, could serve under the latter in any capacity, civil or military, without bringing a stain upon the honour of the family.”

The confusion to which this state of things led, and the numerous law-suits to which it gave birth, induced Czar Theodore, Peter's eldest brother, arbitrarily to abolish the institution and destroy the records of those legal proceedings which had embittered the peace of many old families. To root out the remembrance even of such an institution, Peter, who seems to have been born with a taste for opposing the prejudices of his countrymen, resolved to make ancient descent utterly valueless, and in 1722, established his “table of grades,” which regulated the order of precedence in fourteen classes of all the personages of his Court, and made the precedence to depend on the actual service rendered, or pretended to be rendered, by every servant of the Crown. *Tchin* being the Russian word for *rank*, all persons employed in the public service and obtaining any of these fourteen classes, have ever since been styled *tchinovniks*. This act of Peter's was well-nigh a deathblow to the aristocracy of birth; yet unfortunately it did not give rise to an aristocracy of talent. Some of the old families sent their sons into the service, but young men trained to a certain independence and dignity of character could not compete in the race for rank with needy men, who used every art to please those superiors who could promote or delay their advancement in the fourteen grades. Such of the ancient nobility as condescended to become venal parasites, rapidly fell to the level of the worst *tchinovniks*. The new men, devoid of all independence of action, never rose above the condition of upper clerks in the civil service, and martinetts in the military. As a powerful machine for centralizing authority and strengthening the hands of a despotic sovereign, the *tchin* at first was admirable. It spread a network of officialism over the whole empire, the controlling power of which resided in the capital. We say *at first* only, because in process of time what had been the servant became the master. The *tchinovniks* grew into a distinct class, knit together by the iron bonds of official subordination. All the working springs of the government in their hands, they held the real power, and by seeming to obey the Czar, actually ruled the country. The excessive centralization which prevails in Russia greatly promoted this state of things. There man's entire exis-

tence, from the cradle to the grave, is under watch and ward, subject to official formalities, interwoven with them as web and woof. The initiative of individual minds is completely barred. What king or emperor could really perform the duties of a government that had so overtaken itself?

"If a governor of a province," says Prince Bolgoroukow, "if a minister, if the Emperor, were to read only half the papers they are accustomed to sign, thirty hours a day would not suffice for their work. Thus the Emperor, autocrat so called, not having, in fact, the time indispensable to the examination of affairs, is obliged to rely on the ministers and governors of provinces. The ministers and governors in like manner must rely on the bureaux, and the destinies of Russia are in effect given up to an incapable, ignoble, plundering bureaucracy, which considers theft as its most legitimate property, and would rather let the government sink into perdition than consent to the establishment of real publicity and genuine control."

It is easy to conceive that a class of officials so formed, and enjoying so large a measure of irresponsible power, would not be conspicuous for the virtues of honesty, modesty, or self-denial. The writer we have just quoted gives several etched portraits, by no means flattering, of *tchinovniks* of high rank. To advance in the bureaucratic hierarchy, he tells us a man must have neither dignity nor conscience, but in their place a "very flexible spine," and abundance of cunning. "In Russia a man who unites mediocrity and finesse, and who has neither dignity nor conscience, is almost sure to advance to high office in the State, and to play a part at the Court." Let us borrow a few traits of character from him. Among Russian judges those are called dishonest who take a bribe and deceive the briber; but to promise to commit an injustice for a certain sum, and to keep that promise, is in their eyes not worthy of blame: it is an act of wisdom! We here interpolate the statement that the Law School, founded by Prince Peter of Oldenbourg, in 1835, is a nursery of magistrates of better stamp both in ability and integrity. There is a delicious *naïveté* about some of the old school of judges that one cannot but smile at, as for example:—A man had an action in a court of which his uncle was the president. He lost the action, and ascertaining that his adversary had paid ten thousand roubles to the President, he overwhelmed the latter with reproaches.

"My dear nephew," replied his venerable relative, "you are too hasty, and know nothing of business. Had I decided in your favour, your opponent would have appealed to the senate, and I should have gained nothing. I was no such fool. I took the ten thousand roubles. Five thousand I will keep; you take the other five; with that sum you may appeal to the senate, and have a good chance of gaining your cause."

So much for the bench. We have already given a specimen of what a member of the senate can do, and how he can preach. The general description of this honourable body is that it consists of

“Generals who have commanded divisions in an unsatisfactory manner, or who can no longer keep on horseback; admirals who are no longer of an age to face the sea; provincial governors unfit even for those functions still performed by so many incapables; old officials whose places are wanted by the ministers for a relation or a *protégé*.”

Really, “The Russians painted by one of themselves,” is not a flattering picture. Behold the features of two provincial governors, one a civilian the other a military man, or governor-general. One of the former class is usually selected, it is said, from among those persons who have not friends sufficiently powerful to allow him with impunity to commit open violations of the law. He confines himself to eluding the law, to walking in a path of speculation that is veiled in gloom. Not all governors of provinces are like that old soldier, who, presiding over the full provincial council, on being interrupted by a member of the council with a reference to an article in the code of laws which he (the governor) was about to violate, testily seized the volume, placed it on his chair, sat upon it, and then said to the councillor—“Well, where is your law now, eh?” A parody on the judgment-seat worthy of the comic actor Robson!

A governor-general almost always is chosen from among the friends of the ministers or of influential courtiers; he may therefore venture with impunity on the most odious or the most ridiculous infractions of the law. One bright and notorious specimen of the order was accustomed to speak with intense disgust of those *cursed laws* which hampered his administration terribly. The same terrible official received the municipality of a district town who had waited on him to pay their respects, with the following words:—“Gentlemen, I know you are all rogues! Be well on your guard; I forewarn you that I shall be extremely severe to everybody.” Another governor-general having been the subject of a complaint to the senate on the part of a merchant, and being required by that body to give an explanation of the affair, gets the minister of justice to reprimand the senate for their impertinence, and gives the merchant to understand, through the local master of the police, that if he dares to proceed a step further with his complaint, he should be sent into exile without trial or sentence.

Where Naboths and Ahabs abound, Jezebels will not be wanting, so we have a scandalous story of a governor-general's wife. She had obtained possession of an establishment of public baths,

to enlarge which she was anxious to have the neighbouring house, which belonged to a man of small means. She offered half the value for it, which was refused. Thereupon the owner was informed that the governor-general, by virtue of the powers with which he was invested, would send him into exile for his political opinions and imprudent language. It was during the reign of terror with which Russia was afflicted, in the latter days of the Emperor Nicholas, when the events of 1848-9 had made that monarch's sway cruelly oppressive. Our Naboth knew too well that he might be exiled and no questions asked; he therefore submitted, and parted with his house for half its value. We are forced to remind our readers again and again that these illustrations of Russian life proceed from the pen of a Russian gentleman whose social position forbids us to entertain the slightest suspicion of his veracity.*

The sample of vice-governor offered to us is an adept of the first quality in the art of exaction, and figures as the hero of an absurdly droll story in which he plays the part of the devil. The governor's council is described as consisting equally of thieves and incapables. The secretaries are no better. Dishonesty permeates the whole social body, and may be traced to the Asiatic absolutism of the government. A suitor knowing that the decision of his cause depends on the arbitrary will of the sovereign or of those who misuse his name and overrule all law, feels that his success will be sure in proportion as he bribes the administrators of the law. If one bribes another must bribe, and the receiver of

* In the history of books there are few passages more curious than what are to be found in a correspondence in the Russian journal *Kolokol* of the 15th June, 1860, page 612, on the subject of "La Verité sur la Russie." The author of the book replies to three questions addressed to him by the Russian ambassador at Paris, that, 1st, He will *not* withdraw his work from publication; 2nd, He will *not* consent to quit Paris; 3rd, He *does* consider himself a Russian subject, until such time as the conduct of his government may compel him to seek the protection of another nationality. He further states his intention to publish several other works on Russian history, which he is preparing. In another letter written to the Russian Consul-General in London, and declining to obey a summons to return to Russia, Prince Dolgoroukoff says, "I am 43 years old; I was born and have lived like other Russian nobles, in the condition of a privileged slave, in a country of universal slavery. This position was disagreeable to me, and I resolved to end my days in free lands, where men are not looked on as so many sheep. I shall return to my country when a system of government based on law shall there take the place of autocracy and illegality." To the chief of the secret police, from whom the summons home had come, the Prince sends a short note to the effect that, as his excellency was anxious to see him, he sends him his photograph, which is considered very like him; *that* he may send into exile if he likes! This stroke of pleasantry betrays a weakness common to Russian reformers, a frivolity incompatible with the gravity of their cause. See page 208 of "La Verité sur la Russie," for previous adventures of Prince Dolgoroukoff.

bribes has to bribe those that are set over him, and so it goes on in endless continuity of greed. The very code of laws is made a means of exaction, since the countless formalities which it prescribes being easily overlooked, enable the knowing ones to stop the best conducted case unless they are paid for silence. The venality of heads of departments and heads of offices inducing them to believe that their subordinates are like them in that respect, makes them demand a portion of the spoil collected or presumed to be collected by the latter. At p. 70 of "La Verité sur la Russie," may be seen a statement of the amount of tribute in roubles paid by the inferior tchinovniks to their superiors. The police-master of a good trading river port, pays as much as 500*l.* to the provincial council. The necessity for making these payments arises from the fact that the civil service is disciplined on military principles, where the word of a superior is law, with this additional disadvantage, that chiefs have the power to dismiss their subordinates, from the highest to the lowest; all offices being held during the "good pleasure" of the government. The vast number of the army of officials in active service or pensioned off is one of the most formidable obstacles to removing this sorest plague of Russia. The salaries paid to these men are in general excessively small, and the pensions on retirement smaller still. Should the government seriously contemplate the only step that can save the State from the paralysis with which it is threatened by this huge body of incompetency and corruption, we mean, a large reduction in the number of officials, and a retention of the ablest at really suitable salaries, they must be prepared to pension off several thousand persons with annuities sufficient to keep them above want. To do this, money will be wanted, and it is an application of the national funds as important to the future welfare of the State as the redemption of the cottage and land of the serfs.

Schédo-Ferroti, in his third *Etude*, enters minutely into this subject, and proposes a plan for accomplishing the desired object. To the question—where find a sufficient number of capable men for the public service, where all have been so corrupted and degraded? he replies that abilities may be compared to railway travellers. Before a line is opened, it is found that twice, thrice, ten times the number of the travellers on the post-road will not suffice to make the line pay. Yet, no sooner is it opened than people flow from all parts, one cannot tell where, to fill the carriages and travel by the line. Offer prizes to capacity, and you will have plenty of able candidates applying to enter the public service. Certainly nothing can be lower than the reputation for intelligence of the present holders of office, and we will conclude this part of our subject by quoting the words of the Committee Deputy, who, like every other writer, has his fling at the Tchino-

vniks, whose very name seems to sharpen the wit of unofficial men and call forth their keenest darts of irony.

The writer is comparing the respective claims of the nobility and the *Tchin* to be the depositaries of the delegated power of the Crown. He says:—

“As to capacity, it is difficult, I avow, to compete with a *tchinovnik*, but that is because what is required of him is in its very essence bureaucratic. I know not, for example, whether Lord Palmerston or Lord Derby, or Royer Collard, or Guizot would ever have become in our country what they have shown themselves in their own. I know not if they have had from their youth upwards a superb handwriting, immense assiduity, an all-satisfying officious suppleness, that tact which never offends a superior, the address and promptitude required to fulfil all his orders—not, thank God, that all this is absolutely indispensable in Russia, but undoubtedly such qualities are the best guarantees of success, and without them merit may doubtless find its way, but very rarely indeed. To be by turns a devotee and a buffoon, a good-natured fellow to some, and inaccessible to others; to be very cunning, and have the gift of never getting into scrapes, and of making underhand war against superiority of every kind—those are qualities essentially belonging to a *tchinovnik*, qualities very useful to himself, but of no good to the State. If Russians are to be condemned everlastingly to make copies and statements of accounts—to be revising one another, and to ascend by fourteen grades from the clerk to the chancellor, I fear that the *tchinovnik* has more chance than the gentleman of reaching the summit of civil honours; but if original thought, manliness, uprightness, logic, are qualities demanded for the future development of our country, I am tranquil. Among our country landowners is to be found all that is needful to form future statesmen for Russia.”

In dismissing the bureaucracy from our notice it is hardly necessary to say that so great a change in the national system as emancipation of the serfs involves, is entirely distasteful to the class in general. With native tact, they do not manifest their opposition openly, but labour in the dark subterranean passages of officialism to make every scheme proposed virtually fail.

What we have to say of the Russian nobility is meant to apply to the class of persons who would naturally have constituted the aristocracy of the country had the institution of the fourteen classes never been formed. The persons belonging to these classes do legally, according to Peter the First's ordinance, compose the nobles of the land. Yet, spite of that arbitrary measure, a certain prestige of honour still attaches to members of old families, and to the possessors of large landed estates, who are enabled to indulge in the refinements and luxuries of life, and by means of education and foreign travel, with the aid, too, of matrimonial

alliances, maintain an affinity for, and relation with, the aristocracies of other countries. In contemplating the condition of a great empire, the existence of a large class of this kind, varying in the degrees of their fortune and local importance, cannot be overlooked. Taking them as they are, their position as the holders of wealth makes them a social element of undeniable value. • Viewing them as they may become, a power standing between the throne and the people, their possible future rank in the State compels us to regard them as a class of the first importance. Hitherto, it is true, they have been greatly set at nought. Look at the list of thirty-nine princely houses, issue in a direct line from Rurik, which Prince Dolgoroukoff enumerates at p. 157 of his book. How few of those names are known in Europe as ministers or even courtiers of their sovereign. There are again eight families retaining the title of Prince descended from the once famous Grand Dukes of Lithuania. There are besides eleven families descended from Rurik who have dropped the title of Prince. These are samples of a descent that men in England, who value things of that kind, would rate very highly. The Norseman Rurik flourished 200 years before our own Norman Conqueror. Yet it is a feather in the cap of our proudest nobles when they can trace their descent from any vagabond warrior who joined William in the invasion of England. We must then either smile at all claims to honour and privilege set up by right of descent, or we must admit that the Russian nobility would be justified in placing themselves at least on a level with the haughtiest aristocracy of Europe. We may, however, gain a lesson of deeper wisdom, if we reflect that an uninterrupted line of descent from the most illustrious progenitor is but worthless chaff unless sustained by a succession of deeds of real patriotism and high renown. In reading the history of the Russian nobility, we peruse the record of an abject submission to force, that betrays an Asiatic rather than a Norman origin. We read of no one bearding a Czar on his throne rather than abate a jot of right or privilege, no combining with the people to force a charter of freedom from a despot, nor going to the death rather than submit to unjust exaction. Nothing even so noble as the conduct of the poor villagers of Dziarnowicz, who told the lecturing senator that they would pay their taxes, and do their duty to the Czar, but could not abandon the religion they had adopted, is, as far as our knowledge goes, recorded of any of the Russian nobles. Internecine wars among the princes, hideous oppression and cruelty of the Czars patiently submitted to, infamous abetting of royal treachery in promised charters impudently annulled, yielding the back to stripes and the shoulder to imperial cudgellings, corresponding cruelty and unmanliness to serfs and dependents, self-seeking,

prodigality, outrageous profligacy, dishonourable dealing—these things we have heard and read of touching Russian nobles, and confess that when the salt has so far lost its savour it had better be cast on the dunghill. And such, indeed, is the argument of the Russian Socialists in favour of their democratic communes. It may be said that we forget the *Decembrists*, those high-minded young men of noble families who in December, 1825, endeavoured by a military mutiny to overturn the throne of the Czar and establish a liberal government of some kind. We do not forget them, and are willing to express our sincere admiration for the pure motives and generous impulses which animated the majority among them. But the impetuous action of a few enthusiasts is not a fair sample of the whole nobility. Besides, conspiracies are not generally characteristic of a people fearless in the assertion of their rights, and boldly taking their stand on those rights against all comers. There is an honourable remnant yet left, however, among the Russian nobility. The closing words of our quotation from the "Deputy's Letter" indicates the writer's confident belief in the existence of good material for future Russian statesmen among the country gentlemen of the empire, and we have reasons for relying upon his testimony. Schédo-Ferroti confirms it. He admits that the ancient and true nobility have fallen very low. Thrust aside by the vast number or *tchinovniks*, many descendants of the old boyars have been induced to walk in the footsteps, and even to surpass the disgraceful peculiarities of the official classes, sacrificing thereby their historical traditions, their independence, and their feeling of nationality. The principle of government which attaches importance only to the rank or class of an individual, utterly disregarding his quality of gentleman, has resulted in the singular fact that the term *Russian gentleman* is a term never used—it expresses nothing to the imagination. A noble from Russia is the least Russian of all the Czar's subjects. Name an English lord, a French marquis, or a German baron, and the mind figures to itself certain types of certain nations, but you would not know what to expect were any one introduced to you as a Russian gentleman. He bears no special stamp, not even a vice or defect so widely spread as to be a rallying-point. Such is Schédo-Ferroti's idea, and this species of cosmopolitanism, which some philosophers count as a great merit, he regards as a great misfortune. Regarding an aristocracy as the standard-bearer of the nation, he wishes to see in the Russian gentleman a man who, in every phase of his being, shall recal the people of whom he is one, and to whom he shall bear the same relation that the flower bears to the plant—a representative of the Russian type, *ennobled*, but remaining, above all, Russian.

"I have known such Russian gentlemen," he continues, "true gen-

tlemen and true Russians, and I wish, for the glory of the nation, that there were many like them; but unfortunately they are but the rare exceptions, forming a minority so feeble that they disappear in the crowd of *employés* ennobled and of nobles in the service (*employés*), which constitutes the Russian gentry. I have found few in the arm-chairs of public offices, few in the barrack-rooms, or on the floors of gilded saloons; it is in the interior of the empire, among the country gentlemen, that I have been obliged to seek them."

He goes on to lament the rarity of country gentlemen in Russia, and the general absenteeism which leaves the administration of estates, and the pursuit of agricultural science and improvements to intendants and stewards, frequently foreigners, who have generally little or no feeling in common with the people of the country. The benefits, he argues, which Russia would derive from the permanent residence of her landed proprietors on their estates would be immense in every way—in the improvement of agriculture, and consequent increase of national wealth; in the gain to the morality of their order by a rural life, and especially in the development of a truly national spirit in the upper class of society, where hitherto it has been most wanting.* The importance of the last consideration stands out in strong relief when we connect it with the thought of a reformed administration and a constitutional government. With a population of seventy millions, the chances of establishing a republic, one and indivisible, in Russia seems very small, and few persons will venture to suggest the dissolution of the empire and the formation of a confederation of States. Every other hypothesis of a reformed government will require the existence of a class of men superior in intelligence and in wealth, which shall side with the people in the maintenance of their right, and support the monarch in the exercise of such authority as the nation may confide to him.

At present the Russian nobility have but a modicum of rights or *privileges*, as they are designated by the Russian code.

Every three years they assemble to elect certain judicial and honorary officers for the province, as well as a chief constable for the district. The chief officer so elected, the "Marshal of the Nobility," is empowered by the code to defend the interests of the province; but in practice his power is a nullity. The triennial provincial assembly, in which the elections are held, are also said to be instituted for the purpose of watching over the interests of the provinces, and examining into grievances; but the government takes good care not to permit any inconvenient discussions.

* Our readers will find the history of a not unworthy specimen of the Russian country gentleman in M. Aksakoff's "Familien-chronik," a true record, translated from the Russian, and published at Leipzig in 1858.

So lately as December, 1859, there was sent down from St. Petersburg to the various assemblies of nobility, met according to the law, "to occupy themselves with whatever might concern the interests of their provinces," a ministerial ordinance forbidding them to discuss the question of emancipation. This was too much for Russian submissiveness even. Several assemblies declined to transact any business at all after this illegal interference of the minister's; others, specially that of the government of Tver, disregarded the ministerial document, and proceeded to discuss the emancipation question. The "Nobility Marshal" for Tver was a gentleman named Ounkovski, who had distinguished himself as an advocate for the emancipation of the serfs in the largest and most liberal sense, and had also been one of five "deputies" who petitioned the crown for a redress of grievances, and a general reform in the government. Whether it was the remembrance of his old sins, or the unpardonable nature of his last offence, we know not, but it is certain that he has been exiled to Viatka, and his colleague, M. Evropéous, to Perm.

Prince Dolgoroukoff gives an ironical enumeration of a Russian noble's privileges (p. 230). Their exemption from corporal punishment dates no further back than 1762, when it was obtained from that tipsy and unfortunate youth, Peter III., in a singular manner. Meditating an infidelity to his mistress, and desirous to conceal it from her, he bade his secretary make out an "oukaz" of the highest significance, which would justify his assurance of having passed the night in transacting business of importance.

The next morning an oukaz was presented to and signed by him, which exempted nobles from the infliction of the rod, allowed them to quit the service at pleasure, and abolished the secret chancery (p. 194). The last-named institution has been revived in the form of a political police, known as the third division of the *gendarmérie*, to which Prince Dolgoroukoff devotes a chapter of his book; but the remainder of Peter's "make-believe" edict has remained in force.

Both Prince Dolgoroukoff and Scéhdou-Ferroti offer suggestions for the reconstitution of the *unclassed* nobility as a body in the State, and for rendering their assemblies and provincial elections something more than nominal. The Committee Deputy also has evidently his ideas on the same subject; but beyond intimating that a decentralization of the ruling power, and the exercise of local self-government in the provinces are absolutely necessary, he commits himself to little. With a modesty strikingly contrasted with the audacity which marks "La Vérité sur la Russie," he says:—

"I cannot explain myself more clearly, howsoever strong my desire to do so. It is not given to a single individual, whatever he may be,

still less to an unknown member of a large society, exactly to define the wants of the whole society. Those wants, however, exist, and resemble the growing appetite of a youth, who feels himself becoming a man, his force increasing, his chest widening, his heart beating more strongly, added to which he has a conviction that milk porridge will not satisfy him. Power, especially when limited by the will of one, *cannot remain absorbed entirely in its starting-point*; it must be transmitted to secondary agents in order to become productive."

This is a broad hint delicately put to an autocrat. The bestowal of political power on the nobles would be a handsome compensation for the loss of their power over the unfortunate serfs.

As far as we can make out the feelings of the nobility on the emancipation question, the majority of the well-to-do among them is not opposed to the measure. Provided that they can get paid for the cottage and land with which the Emperor wishes to endow every manumitted serf, they seem to feel that exemption from the onus of paying the taxes of their people, of providing for the aged and infirm, and of supplying the army with recruits, together with the ultimate rise in the value of land, which is naturally expected to follow emancipation, will not do them much harm. In fact, there can be little doubt that, should the change be operated without a serious convulsion, the condition of the landowners will be considerably improved by the measure. Any obstinate opposition on their part will be short-sighted and perverse. The case of the *poor* owners of serfs, who are exceedingly numerous, is different, as many of them have no land at all; and the miserable pittance taken from the earnings of their slaves, let out to various handicrafts and menial employments, must disappear. As from the nature of the case, they are mostly the hardest and most oppressive of serf-owners, their ruin will excite little sympathy.

For these reasons we conclude, upon the whole, that the non-official nobility will not seriously oppose the abolition of serfdom; and that the enlightened few among them will strenuously promote the various reforms so urgently required in the government of their country.

Seeing that three out of the four classes we have described—namely, the peasantry, the clergy, and the nobility, that is, the majority of the population and wealth of the country—are more or less anxious for the emancipation of the serfs, while one class alone, the bureaucracy, is seriously opposed to their real liberation, it becomes a matter of importance to know how the military arm of the State is likely to act should the critical hour of conflict arrive. The opposition of the civil servants of the Crown is formidable, on account of the actual power they possess in the existing form of government, the desperation with which they

cling to power held so long, and the unity with which their forces can be brought to bear by their compact organization and severe discipline. The army, combined with the bureaucracy under the command of the Czar, can defeat and keep in subjection any combination of all the other classes of the country, as it has kept them down for so many years. But let the Czar and the army cross over to the other side, and the third power must fall amid the execrations of the people who for generations have beheld in them nothing but the cruellest oppressors. The Emperor has already proclaimed himself on the side of the people, and whatever wavering the intrigues of interested persons may excite in his mind, he cannot recede from his popular position without sudden ruin to himself and family. Let us examine as best we may the dispositions of the army. Before reading Schédo-Ferroti's able "Étude" on this subject, we had become convinced, from personal observation, that the Russians are not naturally a warlike people.

The writer we name, after describing his countrymen as formerly being an inland nation, dwelling on the banks of certain great rivers which joined the sea in foreign territories, goes on to say that the necessities of their political position made them aggressive neighbours. Now, however, that the mouths of the Volga, Don, Dnieper, and Dwina have been acquired by Russian prowess, and the territory rounded off so as to make the nation one compact body politic, it is high time for the Government to abandon her aggressive practices, and recognise in her legislation that the pursuit of peaceful industry is the true business of the nation. In this advice we cordially concur. A smaller army, of better organization, better fed, better paid, and better led than the hundreds of thousands that now encumber the land, would conduce more to the safety and the honour of Russia. At present, the condition of the Russian soldier is most unenviable. Taken from his home for fifteen years (it was recently twenty-two, and before that twenty-five), he is cropped and shaven,* he is drilled with a needless severity, and marched to distant parts of the frontier, from the Baltic to the Black Sea, from Novgorod to Poland—he is miserably paid (a guardsman's pay is about 1s. 6d. a month)—half starved when in distant cantonments, ill clothed, ill shod, beaten and bullied by his superiors, of whose rascalities, in the way of stoppages and false returns, he

* It is no slight grievance to the Russian peasant, especially to some of the religious sectaries, to lose his beard and great part of his hair on entering the army. It appears that there are between 7000 and 8000 barbers in the military service of the Czar—"quite a small army," says Schédo-Ferroti, "to shave a large one, the cost of which might be saved by simply letting soldiers retain their beards."

is the silent witness. The peasant's native dislike for a soldier's life is not removed by the respect the soldier ought to feel for his officers. On parade and other public occasions he hears the general often address the subalterns in the grossest language of abuse. The discipline of the troops comes to be merely apparent and external. Privates discuss among themselves the conduct of their officers with excessive freedom, and revenge the ill-usage they receive by bestowing injurious epithets upon the men in whose presence they display marks of abject submission. It has been said that the power of discipline in any army is so great that a soldier would shoot his own father if commanded to do so by his colonel. Such discipline does not exist in the Russian army. There fear, not respect, is the parent of obedience, and the temper of the soldiery, in case of a civil conflict, would be sooner exasperated against their commanders than against their fellow-peasants.

We had purposed entering into some detail respecting the Russian military force, but are admonished that our space is limited. In Schédo-Ferroti's fifth "Etude" will be found a remarkably clear statement of the organic defects of the army, and many excellent suggestions for amendment. We will simply say, for the general information of readers, that the huge military force of Russia is divided into four categories—the Imperial Guard, the army, the garrison, and the companies of invalids. The guard is composed of the tallest and best-looking men that can be found among the recruits, and is always comfortably quartered in and about the capital. So much attention is given to sorting them according to regularity of feature and colour of the hair, that some companies look like rows of born brothers. These are the men for show, and a very fine show they make on a grand field-day. The army is the working part of the military machine, and is kept constantly on the march by the demands of an empire which includes Warsaw and the river Amoor, Archangel and the Daghhestan. Beauty of feature is not a necessary qualification for a soldier in the army, as visitors to the prison at Lewes during the late war may have convinced themselves.

Garrison duty is not performed by the army, but by a distinct force of some 50,000 men appointed to various districts, where they are permanently stationed to support the civil power, keep order, &c. This force is called "the garrison," and being made up of the refuse of the army, bears a very bad character for honesty or any of the civil qualities necessary to the keepers of order; the best men among them—"the sweet-peas of the force," as our authority styles them—are the men rejected by the army for their ugliness. The invalid companies are not, as we should expect, bodies of Chelsea pensioners reposing on their laurels, but some 60,000 men, the worst conditioned and the worst paid of any men

in Russia. They are the scum of "the garrison," and the hideous ugliness of their honest men is perfect beauty compared with the moral deformity which is attributed to the entire force. Their duties are to convoy convicts to Siberia, and to guard the precious metals on their way from the mines. Schédo-Ferroti's remarks on the two last named sections of the army are well worthy the consideration of Russian statesmen.

As, upon the whole, we incline to consider the army favourable to the popular cause in Russia, we have only to inquire what line of action the head of the army and of the State will follow in order to form an opinion on the probable issue of the controversy of which Russia is the theatre. The favourite epithet now applied to the Emperor Alexander II. is "well-intentioned," a qualification of ominous sound in the ears of those who remember the place which is paved with good intentions. Since the days of the Emperor Charles V., few persons born to sovereignty seem to have been equal to the exigencies of a great historical crisis. Peter I. made, we think, more than one mistake in his endeavours to trample out the traditions of his country and stamp his people with an entirely new brand. Catherine II. was a ruler of masculine understanding and determination, but she was blinded with vainglory, and indifferent to the welfare of the mass of her subjects. Frederic II. and the Emperor Joseph were not tried in the fire of revolution. A "novus homo" seems to be requisite for a time when a new order of things begins; a man of good general capacity, of great power of application to business, of stern resolution and little scruple. Louis Napoleon, we fancy, could master the difficulties of the situation in Russia. To us, as distant spectators, with, we confess, but imperfect *connaissance des causes*, there are fewer difficulties for a czar of Russia of the present day than those which usually beset kings and emperors in trouble. The demands of the subject population have been clearly stated: emancipation of the serfs and allotments to each of the houses and land now occupied by them, the abolition of bureaucratic despotism, the admission of the nobility to certain constitutional rights, the re-organization of the old village communes, the purification of the courts of law, and the free publication of the financial and legislative transactions of the Government. To grant these things now would be to bestow a boon upon the nation, which will be most gratefully received. To wait till they are wrested from the Crown by the overwhelming mass, who so far have been patient in waiting, will bring damage, if not ruin, on the Imperial family, and incalculable mischief to the country. Alexander II. obeyed a generous impulse when he invited his people to consider the best means of emancipating the serfs. It would have been more prudent, if less generous, to have elaborated

some scheme or other *before* he announced his good intentions. Had his ministers been able and patriotic men, they could have done their sovereign and their country this great service. But the Czar was compelled to seek advice elsewhere, and he did so in the most public manner. That advice has now been tendered in tones of distant thunder, and the dismay of the court party—the “*camarilla*,” as Prince Dolgoroukow loves to style them—is unmistakable. The Emperor’s purpose is shaken; he was born and nurtured in a palace, and the voices he has ever listened to are those of haunts of palaces. He is a brave, humane, well-informed gentleman, but no genuine autocrat. By his own mere fiat he could pass all the measures so eagerly desired by his subjects. But the very greatness of the deed seems to confound him. He must envy the position of a constitutional sovereign; one who can live in ease and plenty, surrounded by honour, respect, and popularity, with the responsibility as well as the labour of public business thrown upon the shoulders of ministers. If report speak truly, he is not indifferent to the comforts of life, the pleasures of the table, of the chase, and the society of wits. Wisdom surely would counsel him to throw off the burden of despotism and make himself the head of a self-governing people. The best native writers advise it, the educated classes demand it, the people having gained their own immediate desire, will cheerfully accept it, and by the clergy and the army such a step would, we feel sure, be steadily supported.

We have little room to write of the Czar’s ministers. They are men of the old regime, brought up under Nicholas’s reign of terror, and unequal to the task assigned to the Government by the circumstances of the day. Somebody has said they are like old hackey coachmen set to manage a locomotive. One of them, the best abused man in the empire, has been set at the head of the commission appointed to draw up the new law for emancipating the serfs (*La Commission de Redaction*), and his very appointment was received as a sign of reaction in the Imperial mind of terrible significance.

The *Kolokol*,² democratic though it be, had upheld the Emperor in his policy toward the peasantry up to the moment of this appointment to the Minister of Justice. It now cries out against “the fatal reaction” which has set in, a reaction that relies on “the stupidity of the Government and the ignorance of the people;” and it sneers at the impotence of the Czar whose “autocracy cannot achieve the exploit of liberating the peasants with their land.”

The justice of this sneer is more apparent than real. The most absolute of monarchs must have information on which to form his opinions, and the only authentic sources of information to

him are the ministers he has appointed to their offices. If they deceive him, who can undeceive him as long as he retains them in his service? This necessary, not to call it forced confidence, is the strength of the bureaucracy and the "camarilla," and Alexander II., we fear, is not the Samson to break through such withes of the Philistines.

We have spoken but incidentally of the merits of the great question which is at the root of all the reforms which Russians are demanding. Taking for granted that the serfs are to be emancipated, are they entitled to receive houses and land with their freedom, and from having been working bondsmen to become independent freeholders? Such is, in substance, the destiny that is held out to them, and however great so ever the changes involved in the proposal, we believe that it is founded on justice, and replete with national benefits and the "happiness of the greatest number." The history of land tenures in Russia would illustrate in a striking manner the doctrine set forth in a former article in this *Review*,* that the soil belongs to the nation, and that the sovereign is entitled to dispose of it as of a public trust. National services and services to the Crown were rewarded with grants of land *for life*. The appanages of the Princes changed masters even many times in one life, for the Princes of the Grand Ducal house *moved up* from one possession to another according to seniority on the occurrence of a death in their family. The grants therefore that they were accustomed make to the boyars who followed their standard, or formed their court, could not have been *in perpetuo*, since the tenure of the Princes themselves was so completely transitory. It is not impossible, we think, that the present landholders of Russia might be puzzled to find in a majority of cases any better title to their possessions than that of "immemorial use and custom." At any rate, it may be assumed that the Czar has a right to resume, for purposes of public utility, portions of the grants made by his ancestors as the national trustees. In bestowing on every enfranchised peasant a small holding, and providing a recompence in money or labour for the lord, the Czar is doing a work of great public utility, giving liberty to labour and enterprise, warding off pauperism, increasing a hundredfold the capabilities of the soil and the resources of the empire. Whether the land thus acquired by the peasantry should be formed into communes and be administered on a communal system, is a question of too wide a scope to enter upon now. In England the development of the individual has been productive of great results in national glory, wealth, and civilization. The dead level of communism is repulsive to us. But it

* "The Government of India," vol. lxxii. p. 119.

remains to be seen whether a state of society be not possible in which individualism will be less despotic, where the good things of this life may be distributed a little more equally, where the aids of mechanical invention may be felt in as direct a manner and as soon in the working man's cottage as in the capitalist's mansion. The spirit is beginning to work among ourselves in commercial associations; and strikes, as was recently shown, are but demands of workmen to be admitted into partnership (if only at the smallest rate of profit) with the capitalist. The Russian Communists feel that they have a grand opportunity of displaying the soundness of their principles, when their country is passing from a state of serfdom to a state of free labour, and we will not wish them bad luck.

The most pressing danger with which Russia is threatened arises from disordered finances, approaching, according to newspaper reports, national bankruptcy. The excessive use of paper money with notes for sums varying in value from 15*l.* to 3*s.*, has been one main cause of this; the extravagant expenditure of the Court, another—and, most fatal of all, the dishonesty of public servants of every rank. The shortest proposed method of emancipating the serfs demands a large supply of ready money. Prince Dolgoroukow meets the demand with characteristic boldness. Valuing the liberty of each serf at 16*l.*, he proposes that the Government shall pay this sum at once and in the following manner. Reckoning 10,850,000 souls at 16*l.* each (women and children not being counted as souls, are to be liberated gratis), the amount required will be 173,600,000*l.* sterling, which may be met by

Remission to the landowners of Govern- ment mortgages on their estates . . . }	£80,000,000
A loan at 5 per cent. of	82,000,000
An issue of bank bills bearing interest at 3 per cent. }	61,600,000
	<hr/>
	£173,600,000

The Government will recover this large sum by the annual receipt of 16*s.* a head from the enfranchised peasants. For immediate wants, the Government should proceed to the sale, by auction, of Crown demesnes to the value of 55,000,000*l.*, the deficit of 1,700,000*l.* thereby occasioned in the annual revenue of the Crown being made up by a legacy duty and an auction duty. Every purchase from the desmesnes of the Crown to be paid for in the bank bills before mentioned, and in no other money, so that in a limited number of years the issue of this 3 per cent. paper will be recalled. The audacity of this proposal to alienate the desmesnes of the Crown for a national purpose seems to have

wounded susceptibilities that we should not have expected to find near a throne whence came the shameless grants to the Orloffs, Zouboffs, Korsakoffs, Lanskoys, &c.

Sacrifices of some kind will attend any changes the Government may resolve to make. Some reforms they have already accomplished since the accession of Alexander II. Let them now proceed boldly to decentralize authority and grant a communal and self-governing organization to the people, and the power bestowed will be used within the limits of local necessities. Delay and disregard of the popular feeling may bring on a convulsion that will endanger the supremacy of the Imperial power and the unity of the nation. All Europe is interested in the tranquillity of Russia. We heartily wish for her rulers the wisdom and the courage which may guide them in best developing the national resources, so as best to secure national peace and prosperity.

ART. VII.—OUR NATIONAL DEFENCES.

1. *Report of the Commissioners on the National Defences of the United Kingdom, presented to both Houses of Parliament.* 1860.
2. *Parliamentary Debates.* 1860.
3. *On the Defence of England.* By Gen. Sir HOWARD DOUGLAS, Bart., G.C.B. Murray. 1860.
4. *Notes on the Defences of Great Britain and Ireland.* By Lieut.-General SHAW KENNEDY, C.B. Murray. 1860.
5. *National Defensive Measures.* By Lieut.-Colonel J. P. KENNEDY. Effingham Wilson. 1860.
6. *Memorandum on Naval Reserves.* By Vice-Admiral W. F. MARTIN. Ridgway. 1860.
7. *Considerations on National Defence.* By General Sir ROBERT GARDINER, G.C.B. Byfield, Hawksworth and Co. 1860.
8. *Système de Defense de l'Angleterre.* Par A. BRIALMONT, Capitaine L'Etat Major. Paris. 1860.

IF the dictum of Solomon be true, that "in the multitude of counsellors there is safety," we ought long ere this to have discovered the right path to national security and confidence. Never, perhaps, were brains and pens so prolific as those which have been engaged for several months past in analysing the subject of our national defences. Where so many offer advice, the conflict of opinion must be necessarily great; but in the case before us, it is

not that the doctors disagree only, but besides them, we have to deal with the opinions of many most thorough quacks, who know nothing whatever of the subject upon which they attempt to lay down the law. Every one, in fact, considers himself as competent to give an opinion on military subjects as those who have been brought up to the profession; and what is more, many conceive themselves even military engineers by intuition, and capable of passing judgment upon arrangements which are of the most complex character; they see errors which are generally acknowledged to be such; and invent remedies for them, without perceiving that in doing so, they run into others which are ten times more injurious.

The military, in fact, is more of an art, and military engineering more of a science, than most men are apt to suppose.

On this subject of the national defences, even military men, and among them some of repute, entertain great differences of opinion; there is therefore a large field open for argument, and as no subject, from its importance and magnitude, is of deeper interest to the country, it is not surprising that it has raised a considerable amount of discussion.

The question is further complicated by the opposition of various parties, some of whom deny the military, and others the political necessity of further measures of defence; while a third party, holding extreme opinions, denounce all armaments of any kind whatever. On one side, we have the solemn warnings of nearly all the military and naval authorities, and of the statesmen of various administrations, that our position is one of danger, demanding immediate and considerable measures to be undertaken to avert the consequences of a possible calamity; another party, weak in numbers, but proportionately clamorous, consider it to be altogether a false alarm, and that there is neither power nor inclination on the part of our rivals to molest us. The influence of this party is entirely supported by pictures of the frightful outlay demanded for the defences, and of the effects of the consequent necessary taxation—burdens on industry and commerce—and no text is so well calculated to arouse a popular feeling in their favour.

And here we may as well clear the ground by defining at once what is the Power against which we require to be prepared—and we may say distinctly, that it is France, and France alone. A war with other countries might cause us direct losses and evils, or, at least, great expenditure, but from France alone could we sustain a blow that would be immense and irretrievable; therefore it is with reference to a war with France that all our arguments will be directed.

Opinions may and do vary very much as to the probability of

our being attacked, but the arguments against it of the most sanguine are insufficient. Such arguments should prove an invasion to be not only *improbable*, but *impossible*, before they should induce us to forego measures for our security. We know it to be most improbable that our house will be burned down, but that does not prevent those who are duly provident from insuring, and taking other precautions to prevent the calamity. But in what do the improbabilities consist? First, they say, in the good dispositions of the French Emperor towards us; and secondly, that it is not his interest nor that of France to be involved in hostilities against such a power as ours. None have yet been bold enough to assert that no subject of differences can with any probability be expected to rise between us, and it is well known how soon such differences may remove the most friendly feelings, and engender the most bitter animosities. At such a period, reason is rendered powerless; for when national disputes take place, each country, with one voice, espouses its own cause of quarrel, and, as justice cannot be with both, pride and ambition, assumed self-interests, and all the passions which spring from national rivalry, take the place of reason and carry the day; nor is it in the power of the greatest advocates for peace to make it otherwise.

Let us also study national impulses on this subject, those of our neighbours being, necessarily, our guide of action. Now, clearly, those of France are warlike; ours, peaceful. One has incessantly in its mouth, the glory of France, while the other talks of the interests of England. One, in its very expression, breathes war; the other, peace. Have we not, however, acts as well as expressions, indicating every readiness for warlike operations? There was anything but reluctance on the part of France to send armies into Italy, to China, or to Syria; on the contrary, no Power is so manifestly ready to engage in any military enterprise.

The French may have no present intentions nor desire to attack us, as is strongly urged by those who object to the contemplated precautions on our part; but at least, we have the greatest indications of their determination to be prepared for the conflict, should it occur; and by such strenuous efforts and vast expenditure, as must show how strongly they believe in the possibility of such an event. We would not draw this inference merely from the large amount and efficiency of their army, much as that should be guarded against; the magnitude of their land forces may be due to the position they require to hold in relation to the Continental Powers. Their fleet, however, which has been enormously increased of late years, can be for no other service than to act in hostility to us; and although it is said to be only rising to the

strength always contemplated by preceding rulers as necessary and legitimate, most certainly the scale thus adopted was designed for no other purpose than to establish a power to rival Great Britain in its most tender and vulnerable point, and the accomplishment of that design, at any time, would have given the same grounds for alarm.

Then we have accounts from all parts of the world of the military preparations and resources collected, at stations of which they are already in possession, and the formation of new establishments, wherever a position can be found to threaten or control a British colony, and our Government has full reason to be aware of the minute researches that are made systematically into the military state and condition of all our territories. In short, nothing can be more perfect than the system which the French have organized for obtaining every advantage, wherever it may be thought advisable to strike a blow, in the event of hostilities occurring with this country. Nor is all this stated in disparagement of the French, or of their Emperor; far from it. They know that Great Britain, of all the great Powers, is the one which could most effectually oppose them in any ambitious views, and they think it worthy of the greatest efforts to make us cautious in presuming to interfere with them, and in the ultimate event of hostilities to enter upon the contest with every advantage on their side

Self-defence requires us to oppose France obtaining any large increase of power by further aggrandizement, and we can only preserve an influence sufficient to prevent it, by a determination not to allow our warlike means to reach so low an ebb, as to render us unable to object to her aggressive measures, or what would be worse, to be forced to yield any of our most precious interests, or even to be absolutely at her mercy, if she chose to turn upon ourselves. Reliance may be placed by some in the offensive and defensive alliances we might form, to counteract these dangers, and to some extent they might afford us essential support; but alliances may also be formed against us, and where these are contracted with nations of more or less naval means, our dangers will become augmented in the same proportion. Considering, then, the vast military and naval power and means at present in the hands of France; her preponderating influence over the Powers of Europe, owing to those means; her warlike propensities, to say nothing of ancient rivalry, and the circumstance of its being within the memory of man, that we were chiefly instrumental in checking her ambitious views; and the many ways in which disputes may be engendered; it would seem to be utter infatuation were we to neglect whatever measures may be necessary to save us from insult and degradation. Admitting the perfect possibility of a collision with this great Power, and that it

may take place at short warning, we come to the consideration of what may be the nature of the contest, especially in its early stages ; for it is for the early stages essentially, that we require previous preparation.

The danger to be apprehended is, that unless we shall be far better prepared than we have hitherto been, a French army might land on the coast of England, and by one great enterprise obtain possession of London. We consider it needless to reason upon the consequences of such a success ; there cannot be a question but that it would be attended by such a thorough disorganization of all our means, that we should lie prostrate at the foot of our enemy, and submit to any law which he might be pleased to impose. The conquest of England may be considered an impossibility ; but her humiliation and deprivation of power and riches would produce substantially equivalent effects. The formidable strength of the French army, all of which would be available at the period selected for a quarrel, and its perfect organization, are so thoroughly out of proportion to anything we can habitually produce in the field, that were the road open to them, there can be no doubt of the success of a well devised and rapidly executed scheme of invasion. Fortunately, however, we have the intervening barrier of the sea in our favour, with its three defensive attributes :

1. Difficulty of transporting across it, with sufficient rapidity, the necessary forces with all their accessaries.
2. The advantage of position of the defending force against the operation of landing.
3. The opposition of our own fleet and floating means.

Many persons place full and entire reliance on these impediments ; some are even satisfied with any one of them ; but when they are examined and analysed, it will be readily seen that none of them can be deemed sufficient.

With regard to the transport of large forces across the English Channel, it is important to remember that the operation differs in many essential particulars from other undertakings of a similar character in which we have been engaged. In this case, there is no long sea voyage, requiring the employment of a large class of vessel, and the concentration of a huge flotilla, whose approach can be signalled, and whose course can be watched, until the final disembarkation of its contents upon the shore. Here the passage is short and certain ; a vast number of men can be conveyed in steamers and in other vessels towed by them ; which, issuing independently from all the ports on the north coast of France, would so time their departure as to arrive at a given moment, upon any part of the English coast selected as the point of rendezvous. Across so narrow a channel, every tolerable-sized fishing-boat

would make a transport, and several could be towed by one steamer, and there can be little doubt that, in this manner, a force of 50,000 infantry, with its proportion of field artillery, could be conveyed at one trip, and thrown on shore at any point of the south coast. Every vessel, on the discharge of its cargo, would hurry back to the nearest port, and return with reinforcements, running backwards and forwards independently. Thus, in from twelve to twenty-four hours, the force first thrown on shore might be doubled, and afterwards rapidly increased by successive reinforcements. It must, however, be admitted, that the operation of landing in face of an enemy of even moderate force, supported by artillery, is a most desperate undertaking. The men, crowded into boats, which can make but comparatively slow progress to the shore, and which, necessarily perfectly passive, are exposed for a considerable period to the artillery and musketry of an enemy; added to the disorder in which those will land who succeed in reaching the shore, altogether render it a most hopeless effort. Nor can much confidence be placed in a prevailing idea of many officers, of the power of covering the disembarkation of troops by the fire of gunboats and other armed vessels of light draught of water; the upper line of a beach generally affords banks and undulations which give much cover; but even should it be otherwise, the soil, sand, or shingle, at any practicable landing-place, is so easily turned up, that in a very short time troops and guns could be, not to say entrenched, but placed sufficiently under cover, and the guns so arranged in flanking positions, as to be thoroughly protected from the fire of any vessels at sea. Where a force, then, can be brought down to oppose a landing, that resource should never be lost sight of, and every officer in command within reach should hasten down even with the first dribblets of troops that could be collected, to meet the enemy on the beach; and it would be a most legitimate attempt, since, from the nature of the proceeding, a retreat would be always available in case of being too late or of any false alarm. Where the places convenient for landing are limited in number and in space, such, for instance, as was the case in the Crimea, the defenders might have a good chance of producing a respectable force to oppose the attempt; but even there, the Russians abandoned the idea beyond a certain distance from their main resources, and allowed the Allies to establish themselves on shore without opposition. The coast of England, however, is peculiarly favourable for the invader. For hundreds of miles there is scarcely a yard on which troops might not land; a circumstance which was often remarked by the late Duke of Wellington, and which is so well proved by the habitual practice of beaching colliers wherever required. It is not absolutely necessary that the first footing of an enemy should be made in any of

the numerous bays so favourable for the purpose. Where such places occur within the probable radius of operations, there might be standing defences prepared beforehand to resist the attempt; but unless supported by a moveable force, such defences could be readily turned by the disembarkation of an advanced-guard on either flank, where the shore, being more rugged, had been left without defence. The enemy, so landing, would then take possession of the neighbouring bays, or small adjoining harbours, for the disembarkation of his main body. The defences on the open coast are necessarily calculated to resist a landing in their immediate front only, and not an attack from the flank or rear. The martello towers, studded as they are along the shore, are quite incapable of any self-defence, and would be reduced at once.

The great network of railways all over England, would afford large means, if properly organized, for a rapid concentration of force on any point, and this might lead to a defeat of the object, if the real place of attack could be known in time; but that again is very problematical. The attacking forces would issue from all the ports of the Channel, from Brest to Dunkirk, and by steam power could be concentrated on any given point, at any given hour; regulating their movements so as to render it quite doubtful on what part between Margate and Portsmouth was the doomed point of attack. Telegrams of alarm would fly from all quarters, so as to bewilder the Generals in command, who would necessarily have to await the development of the plans of the invaders, which would only be made clear by an actual landing in force, for many a demonstration might be made by landings followed by early re-embarkations. Thus it might prove very difficult to meet the enemy on the beach in sufficient force to oppose the real attack. Then would come the trial for the next available operation, namely, that of a rapid concentration of superior forces, to bring on an action with the invader, as soon as possible after the disembarkation. Thus, assuming that 50,000 were first landed, and that it required from twelve to twenty-four hours to reinforce them, the question is, whether 60,000 or 70,000, or even 50,000 good troops could be brought to the field to give them battle within that time. And here we must calculate upon having to quit the railway conveyance at least ten or twelve miles from the ground occupied by the main body of the enemy.

Thus far, then, we have considered the undertaking as unopposed by our fleets; and so we hold that it must be considered, for without a decided naval superiority in the home seas at the time, an invasion would be decidedly impracticable. There is a very prevalent opinion that our national protection should be confided entirely to the navy. This is a dangerous delusion, and would be an impolitic principle, even if it were practicable. It

would require the constant presence in the home seas of a strength equal to cope with the entire aggregate naval force of any enemy, or combination of enemies, to which we might be opposed at the time; and that in addition to what might be necessary to support our foreign possessions; and it is well known that the colonies are generally heedless about their own defences, relying, in a similar manner, on our fleets for their protection. It is impossible to contemplate so great an extent of naval resources. Such a course would also tend to leave our navy always in a passive, defensive position, without daring to move in search of any enemy; as, in the event of their doing so, he might double back and be before us on our own shores, where he would make short work of it; for this trusting solely to the navy, if it means anything, implies an abandonment of all precautions on land, and leaves the country at the mercy of the first body of men who obtain a footing in it. There is, however, generally a fallacious compromise in the mind of those who hold these opinions:—they would admit of a certain addition to the military power of resistance, but object to so large an expenditure of means upon it; that is, they would adopt a half-measure, certain to incur considerable expense, and thoroughly inefficient for its purpose.

But it may be said, why not watch the proceedings of the enemy on his own shores, and thus act offensively as well as defensively at the same time? We have, however, the experience of the French wars at the beginning of the century, when our aggregate superiority in force and in skill was enormous, which teaches us how thoroughly impossible it was even then, to prevent the enemy getting out of port, and directing his course where he pleased. So much was this the case, that Lord Nelson sailed on one occasion to the West Indies, in fancied pursuit of a French fleet which was quietly going in quite another direction; and on another well-known occasion, there is little doubt that, had Admiral Villeneuve acted up to his instructions, he might have entered the Channel and maintained an entire superiority in it for the week; which was all that Napoleon demanded for his invasion of England.

The essentially defensive course of action then, to which we should be driven, would afford great confidence to the enemy, who might rove where he pleased, and act in force against any of our most valuable colonies without anything to guard on his own part; it would be disgraceful and damaging to us, without being effectual, even for its object; whereas, if we can feel safe on shore at home, (and the argument applies, though in a less important degree, abroad,) our fleets will be at liberty to protect our trade, and to act against the enemy in any direction. We should not be forced to confine our effort to warding off the blows

of our opponent, but have a power of inflicting them also, which is the only way of succeeding in a contest and of making an enemy desirous of peace. Naval forces, too, must be always subject to casualties arising from rocks and shoals, explosions, conflagrations, accidents, or injuries to machinery, serious results from negligence or mismanagement, which may considerably affect the relative superiority of fleets; and although no one will impugn the devotion, energies, and spirit of our navy, nor their perfection in the management of the means put into their hands, ship by ship; still, the changes in gunnery, and in the whole system of navigation by the substitution of steam for sails, since the latest maritime war of any note, will open a new era for competition; new principles of tactics will be introduced, and many new and unexpected results may be anticipated. There is no reason to doubt but that we may excel in these also; still it would be great presumption to suppose that we must necessarily monopolize improvements, in which other nations have shown great ability and skill. All these are sources of possible contingencies, which should prevent our considering the navy as the sole prop on which the safety of the empire should depend. Among the difficulties and objections to an exaggerated provision of naval forces, is the abstraction of the crews, whether seamen or engineers, from the social industry of the country. Almost every man on board a man of war, unlike those of the army, is of a skilled profession, and consequently more valuable to the country; it is true that many are taken into the service, as what they call landsmen or labourers, but even these are immediately under an apprenticeship which, by degrees, gives them the same skill as others, while the art of a soldier leads to nothing useful in after life. It is this fact, of the naval service being a profession, and one which is ordinarily not overstocked, which leads to the difficulty of rapidly manning our ships;—apparently it can only be accomplished by very high offers, in which the Admiralty must compete with the merchants, whose wants are increased by the extra demand occasioned by the emergency. It is a problem not yet solved, how this force, which is required on a large scale in the event of threatened hostilities, can be raised. The maintenance of a full war establishment throughout peace, which may be of indefinite duration, would lead to an enormous and unjustifiable expenditure; and the desideratum is, how otherwise to be sure of resources which shall be available at the period of danger. The coast-guard has been combined with the naval service with this intent, and, it is believed, with great success, and it is a subject for inquiry and examination whether the transport and packet, as well as every other Government naval service, might not also be combined with it, with more or less advantage; no doubt, there

are objections and difficulties, but as in all changes some interests must suffer, the question is the arrangement which will be least prejudicial to the national interests taken as a whole.

Among the armaments for the maritime defences are the block-ships and gun-boats ; and in neither of these instances, it is to be feared, has the advantage of the employment of this description of vessel been thoroughly considered. The block-ships seem to be devised on an idea of economy, by adapting certain obsolete old line-of-battle ships to the purpose, arming them powerfully, and giving them a very moderate steam power to help their movements. Thus they figure very well in the great estuaries and in stationary position, but the system has great defects. They absorb large means in armaments, steam power, naval stores and equipments, and above all, in seamen, gunners, and crews, all which are so much wanted for the sea-going fleets. It is probable that the means applied to three of these block-ships would amply provide for two first-rate vessels fit for all purposes, and of far superior value ; the saving is effected by the erroneous expedient of fitting up an old article, and that even in an imperfect manner ; for they are neither well adapted to one thing nor another. If required to join the manœuvring fleet, where there will always be a great temptation, or even necessity, for employing them, they will be slow, unwieldy, and comparatively inefficient, adding to the nominal, but not to the effective force, hampering the movements of the fleet, and compromising its credit ; while for the protection of ports and estuaries, they will draw too much water, and not be sufficiently active and divisible ; at the same time presenting great masses, on which the fire of the enemy, from dispersed positions and at long ranges, may be concentrated. Nothing can be so impolitic for the reputation of the country, for success in war, and even for economy, as such a system of expedients, by endeavouring to turn to account material, because it happens to be available, although it is ill-adapted to the purpose. The great pride of our country, and a leading principle of its success, both in its commercial and military undertakings, should be to employ nothing but the best means it is possible to obtain.

With regard to steamer gun-boats, if a class of small vessels, powerfully armed, of great speed, thoroughly seaworthy, and able to carry a reasonable provision of necessaries, including fuel, and consequently fit for service anywhere, could be devised, they would, no doubt, be of admirable use ; but if, as is feared, they again are but an expedient, fit only for sheltered harbour and coast services, and consequently only applicable to distinct limited localities, the system will be anything but judicious ; separate equipments of them will be required to be in readiness everywhere ;

for it will be too late to send them when the attack takes place; consequently, the provision of them must be enormous, while far the greater part will remain inactive. Their great cost will be in the construction of the peculiar kind of vessel for the purpose, its steam engine and apparatus, and men to manage and work both engine and vessel; and they must necessarily be in great numbers in the aggregate. A substitute for these local floating defences has been suggested, which must be considered far preferable. It is, to divide the fighting and the moving power of the gunboat, taking for the former, either a well-constructed and appropriate vessel, or on an emergency, any capacious lighter, or even a raft, such as Captain Coles, R.N., employed in the Black Sea; such a vessel could be prepared in an exceedingly short time, and if armed with one or more heavy guns, the necessary ammunition and stores, and manned chiefly by local seamen or other volunteers, would be both an efficient and inexpensive arrangement. Its motive power might be supplied by the small steamers found in all our rivers and ports, which would not require the least alteration or adaptation for the service, nor be disturbed from their habitual occupations till the last moment, when there cannot be a doubt but that, on a previous understanding, all their energies would be freely given for the protection of the place and the property in it. An alternative system has more than once been proposed, of requiring passage and other steamers to be built so as to fit them to carry guns in time of war; this would be far too great and inconvenient an interference with private business and enterprise, to be tolerated, and would cramp the progress of improvement by a demand for two requisites which might be frequently, indeed it may be said, would be generally incompatible. There is one speculative use anticipated for the gun-boats, to which we entirely demur: it is in assuming that they may be brought to act powerfully against the transports which are conveying the enemy's troops to our shores. We have already declared the opinion that no invasion could be attempted (unless our army means were of a more miserable character than any party is inclined to admit) without the enemy had a decided local naval superiority; and with that, he would clearly be able, with his men of war, and armed vessels, great and small, to sweep the coasts and narrow seas of all such petty floating forces, which would be forced to seek refuge within the few scattered harbours along the coast, where they must remain for the time perfectly harmless. Another fallacy is prevalent regarding the gun-boats; that a number of them would subdue the larger, and even the largest men of war. It is founded on the idea that at long ranges, the large object would seldom be missed, the small one seldom or never be hit; whereas from the motion of the gun-boat, in the

quietest of times, in the open sea, increased by its heavy gun, and other cumbrous dead weight, the practice would be very far more irregular from it than from the steadier and larger craft; and in a degree which it is well known by naval officers, would more than compensate for the difference of size. This, added to the difficulty of judging the precise distances at sea, would render its fire most ineffective; while the larger vessel, by its number of guns, could fire from twenty to sixty guns at each single antagonist; and by its steam power, if not quite so fast, would have a faculty of movement which would be greatly embarrassing to these hornets.

The system indeed was practised by the Spanish gun-boats in the Gut of Gibraltar—these vessels, being fast sailers, and provided with sweeps, did occasionally annoy single ships even of the largest class; but it was only at periods of dead calm, when the ship could not turn her head round to bring her broadside to bear—as soon as the lightest wind sprung up, the gun-boats, in spite of their numbers and superior power of locomotion, at once retired, and took shelter in their ports. At one time, a small sloop of war, commanded by Captain Usher, R.N., which they were sent out expressly to capture, made such havoc among them as greatly reduced their ardour upon subsequent occasions.

When we look at the enormous efforts made by the French to increase their navy, we are somewhat surprised at the coolness with which they accuse us of unnecessarily arming in self-defence; the very title by which we designate our proceedings, our national defences, mark our object not being offensive. The vigour with which our Parliament disputes every item of expenditure on war-like preparations which cannot be proved to be for decidedly defensive purposes; the very nature of the greater part of the measures, which are purely local, are amply sufficient to calm the mind of Europe as to our motives. The real object, however, of our accusers is clear; it is, to induce us to forego preparations which may impede their becoming our masters. Great efforts are now most wisely making to augment and improve the condition of that primary element of our security, the navy, and not at all too soon.

If the above statements and reasonings be correct, it is impossible to dispute the absolute necessity of our adopting strong measures for our protection on land as well as on the sea. It is not a question of pounds, shillings, and pence, for the alternative is frightful, and the direct losses sustained by it would throw any such expenditure into the shade; it would be in fact ruin and desolation. At the same time, the country has a right to demand that although the means provided be ample, they shall be on the best and most economical system: that is the real

problem which we have to solve, and it is one most difficult of solution, even among those who have always been engaged in the profession of arms; nor is the difficulty diminished by the confident and sometimes plausible specifics of those who know nothing at all about it.

Our means of defence on shore consist of the regular army, including infantry, cavalry, artillery, and engineers, the militia, yeomanry, pensioners, volunteers, and fortifications. The Duke of Wellington pronounced a dictum, which no one would dispute, even from a less eminent authority, that our essential reliance must be placed on an adequate moveable army in the field. The whole course of his military career, however, will prove that he was, by that sentiment, far from repudiating the great advantage to be gained from fortification as an accessory and support. As Master-General of the Ordnance, he was uniformly zealous in encouraging works for the distinct objects now recommended by the Royal Commissioners.

Of our army in the field, the regulars must form the basis on which all must rest and depend; an army composed exclusively of the other classes, even the militia, good as they become after a lengthened embodiment, would yield rapidly before a French force of even inferior strength. Some branches of our regulars may perhaps admit of improvements; but the infantry and field artillery are, to say the least of them, admirable. If the vanity of any country in Europe would admit that the army of any other could compete with it in quality, it would name the British; certain it is that the French who served with ours in the Crimea would do so. It is admirably organized, and never fails in doing its duties brilliantly; nor would the greatest economist, looking most minutely into details, say that *per se* it was more costly than absolutely necessary for efficiency. Whatever may be the gross amount of expenditure on the military establishments, that of absolute pay, accommodation, and maintenance of officers and men—including pensions, hospital and other attendant personal expenses, are far from being extravagant; and this fact is here put forward as an argument for an increase to the regular army, because an addition to the *personnel* of the forces by no means carries with it a proportionate increase to the great aggregate of military expenditure. Our regulars, however, are in very small numbers to fight a great battle. Looking at the host which may be brought against us in an invasion of this country, we ought to have at least 200,000 good troops fit to take the field, available to resist them. The French would have double the number available for the attack, but it may fairly be assumed that with such a force we could, by as early a battle as possible, meet upon equal terms all that they could by that time have landed in the country.

By good troops, we would not mean to imply that they must necessarily be all regulars; but so composed as to form a really efficient army for its strength; thus, two-thirds regulars, and one-third militia, or even one-half militia, provided they are in the state they arrive at after being for some time embodied; would make an excellent army. When we speak of admirable troops, we cannot include as entirely of such a character the whole of that force of regulars which appears in the estimate. It must be borne in mind that a large number are recruits, and very young soldiers in the course of training; and these not in proportion to the strength at home, but to that of the entire army, of which more than a half is abroad.

Great doubts are entertained respecting the policy of the mounted yeomanry. Of all the branches of an army, the cavalry and field artillery are the least applicable to irregulars, that is, to bodies only occasionally under arms. Those two services, to be at all efficient, require to be constantly kept together, and exercised under closely watched and precise arrangements. Horses of a light active irregular cavalry, composed of races peculiarly adapted to this service, co-operate to effect with certain armies on the continent, but the conditions are very different from what could be expected from the yeomanry corps in a warfare in England. They might be in some degree useful as escorts, orderlies, guides, &c.; but their service would hardly, under the existing system, be worth their cost, and the embarrassment attending their employment and the regulation of their necessary supplies. The pensioners, being old soldiers, could be turned to useful account. Their defects are, want of physical powers, and, no doubt, a spirit of irregularity, and probably intemperance, arising from a want of occupation, in a large number of them. They would not be equal to active service in the field, but would be valuable within works of fortification, and for supplying other guards of a local and stationary character.

The great volunteer movement affords a new source of strength of a most promising nature. It is only at its commencement, and will require great tact, judgment, discretion, and good feeling, to obtain from it the value of which it is clearly capable. It has started from the spontaneous energy of the people, in a manner which is most encouraging to ourselves, and discouraging to any who might feel inclined to attack us. Hundreds of thousands of men suddenly appearing, animated by the highest spirit, fully armed and accoutred at little or no cost to the public, and submitting to the active practice and exercises of soldiers, cannot be held to be otherwise than a most powerful reinforcement to our defensive resources; but so great is the enthusiasm for this description of force at the present period, that there is a fear lest

by estimating them too highly, we may run into the danger of relaxing in other efforts of more importance. The notion that the most animated spirit, and the attainment of the mechanical part of a soldier's exercises, will render these bodies able to cope with anything like an equal number of the veteran troops by whom they would be opposed, must be abandoned: while at the same time, the most strenuous exertions should be made to render them as efficient as possible, for those services which they are clearly capable of performing.

And here it may be necessary to advert to what appears to be a prevalent delusion with a large portion of the public, that there is a positive advantage in such corps being what they denominate "Irregulars." Now the term irregulars, if it means anything, must mean troops imperfectly organized:—whether this imperfection arises from their training or their constitution, or from both causes combined, it must always be a defect, and render them, *pro tanto*, inferior to regular troops. In discussing this question, the moral effect of the soldier's training must not be overlooked. It is possible that the mechanical portion of a soldier's duty may be learned in a few weeks; but the process which forms the *morale* of regular troops, the most valuable quality of all, is of far slower operation, and we know by the testimony of every officer of experience, that it requires at least a year of unremitting service in the ranks, and in military duties, to make a good soldier; and he is not at his best until two years have elapsed. There is then a steadiness, a confident aplomb, a manly habit of obedience, and a knowledge of the business under every circumstance, which cannot be exhibited or proved by the most creditable marching and manœuvring at a field-day in Hyde Park. It cannot be too strongly inculcated upon the minds of the volunteers and of the British public in general, that no comparison can be drawn between success gained by armed populations in a prolonged contest, in perhaps a wild and mountainous country, over disseminated bodies of regular armies, and the opposition which our volunteers would be able to offer against large concentrated forces marching on London.

Great expectations are entertained that the volunteers will have a great advantage over regular troops from their perfection as marksmen, but it is much to be feared that this anticipation will not be realized. Ground for rifle practice is very difficult to be obtained; in populous districts, those in which volunteer corps must most abound, the difficulty is more peculiarly great; and where several miles are to be travelled to reach it, much imperfection must be expected in this accomplishment, on which so much stress is laid. We must not rest our confidence too much on the prizes obtained at shooting matches by a few crack marksmen;—

there must necessarily be many in the classes of which the volunteers are composed, well conversant with the use of the fowling-piece and rifle; but these are the exception as individuals, and not to be deemed samples of the great mass. It may thus be more than doubtful whether the steady practice of the regular troops at their appropriate stations, may not render them superior generally, even in this particular.

A serious defect also in the volunteers would be in the qualities of their officers and non-commissioned officers. It is not but what they would be as fine, gallant fellows as any in the regular army, and probably if anything superior to the rest of the volunteers, as being selected from among them, but excepting those who may have been previously in the army, and who ought to be earnestly sought for, they would not have those professional acquirements which are only to be got by the constant professional practice in barracks, camp, or the field, and which are of far greater consequence than is commonly supposed. The reason why regiments of mere recruits often distinguish themselves in their first actions, is entirely owing to having officers and non-commissioned officers of older standing, and in whom they place implicit confidence. Thus, if the officers and non-commissioned officers from a regiment of the line, could be at once attached to one of volunteers, at the commencement of a campaign, that regiment would be worth far more than another with its own officers. A little campaigning, that best of all schools, would soon produce a very valuable class of volunteer officers; but at first they would be at a loss, and assuredly the men would not have the confidence in them which is absolutely necessary to make good troops.

With all its disadvantages, however, the volunteer movement is most noble and creditable to all who have entered into it, and of great value to the country. Besides the moral effect which it will have on the world in general, it will add great intrinsic strength to the country; a large proportion of volunteers will have the ingredients for making good troops, which will be developed by further practice, and by efforts to remove existing defects; a military spirit and military exercises will, by it, be diffused over the country, the effect of which will react upon the general service, making the recruiting less difficult, and the army more popular.

The proposed addition to be made to the defensive capabilities of the country by fortifications, has been most diffusely and minutely discussed in and out of Parliament. It is not that any party repudiates such measures *in toto*; for instance, all would have sea-batteries, to keep ships from approaching our arsenals too nearly; but, with that exception, there is scarcely an item that has been proposed, to which objections have not been made

more or less ; while there are some who would even add to the Government propositions, and that to a considerable extent. Military engineers are accused, in the usual hackneyed terms of abuse, of being bigoted to routine, and not to be trusted with designing such considerable works of defence ; but, as far as we can perceive, with much injustice ; as in other professions, they must not abandon the results of experience, which it is easy to call routine, for fancied innovations. So prolific are would-be engineers, that Mandar, more than half a century ago, gives a description of one hundred and twenty different systems of fortifications which had, up to that time, been promulgated with some parade. New schemes still continue to pour in for consideration ; all to remove acknowledged defects, but running into others of far more importance. Government therefore determined to adopt a course which they might reasonably suppose would give more confidence than trusting to any single professional body. A mixed Commission was composed of officers of different branches of the service, Engineers, Artillery, and Navy, and even a civilian was added, who, known to be an able man in other pursuits, had recently turned much of his attention to the art of fortification. This Commission was instructed to take under consideration, on a full and effective scale, a system for standing defences for our naval arsenals, and a few other points, which had generally been acknowledged as deserving of attention, and to that extent they have delivered a very valuable Report. An objection has been made, that the Commission were not charged with a full investigation into the great question of the whole measure of defence for the country, by every available means and arrangement in our power ; but such a course would have led to abstract principles and considerations which would have afforded food for discussion without end, and terminated in no result. For such a comprehensive object as this, the Commission must have been differently constituted ; and it was, no doubt, far better to clear off some definite and practicable object, the necessity for which in a greater or less degree was indisputable. The investigations of the Commission, then, have been limited to the protection chiefly of the following stations—Portsmouth, Plymouth, Pembroke, Portland, Dover, Sheerness, Chatham, the Thames, and Woolwich. These comprehend our principal arsenals, and are, besides, of considerable interest from their connexion with the general defence of the country.

London is so near to the most accessible parts of our frontier shore, and its loss would be so fatal, from the vast interests, both public and private, concentrated within it, that it is generally admitted that an invader would direct his attack in the most rapid and decided manner upon this, the vital point of the empire. A

reflection, then, naturally arises that we should, at all events in the first instance, concentrate our efforts distinctly against that attack, and not waste them at more remote stations ; but although the security of London may be the most essential object for our attention, it is not the only one, and it would be most improvident to leave important arsenals, on which our naval power is greatly dependent, subject to assault, either in combination with, or independent of, other enterprises. It is well known that all projects of invasion of Great Britain comprehend a distant attack, to divert our attention and draw off our forces, as well as for specific objects of injury and annoyance, and for this purpose, our naval arsenals would be decidedly the most advantageous points to aim at.

But in addition to other strong reasons for affording security to these important establishments, the nature of the defences proposed for them will be such as to convert them into capacious strongholds, which will form most useful rallying points, depôts, and places of refuge for considerable districts. Under cover of their defences, scattered detachments, volunteers, and the armed population might be gradually collected, organized, equipped, and then disposed of as might seem most advisable. Dover, Portsmouth, Plymouth, and Pembroke are all well situated for becoming each of them such a focus for refuge or action. Without them, a few thousand men of the enemy might be thrown into those districts, who would spread consternation far and near, and would break up all efforts to arrange and combine any measures of protection. Secure strategical points of this nature in our possession, would render it great rashness in an enemy to attempt such enterprises, while they would, at the same time, give great confidence to our own countrymen. These places, however, cannot be improvised ; they must be prepared beforehand ; but when once established, they would be lasting, and always ready as a basis of defence. Another great consideration in their favour is, that they need not necessarily become a drain, except in the smallest possible degree, on our regular forces. For exclusively defensive action, their garrisons may consist almost entirely of volunteers, and would not even require those that are most elaborately equipped and prepared for the field. Bodies of a local stationary force ; men remaining at their own homes, and engaged up to the moment of the emergency in their ordinary occupations, without marching equipments, but instructed in the use of the different arms, and the most necessary and simple exercises, under a few good staff and departmental officers, may be expected to make brilliant defences within fortifications ; and if this be doubted, we may refer to the conduct of the Turks, who, under the most imperfect military organization, show an obstinacy in

defending even inferior entrenchments, which frequently neutralizes the efforts of the finest troops of the most powerful military States.

But the defence of Portsmouth, Dover, Chatham, and Woolwich has more or less a direct bearing on the immediate protection of London itself. In the recent debates in Parliament, it was assumed that the proposed improvement of the defences of Dover, had reference to the great harbour of refuge which has been commenced there, and that under the circumstances of the doubtful progress and future advantage of that undertaking, the construction of extensive works of defence at this point must be considered at least premature. This, however, is not by any means the true version of the case, and the slight apparently put upon the military importance of this station by the Commissioners in the cursory remark, that if much had not already been done towards its protection, they would not have recommended any works to be undertaken for this purpose, is a view of the matter in which it appears difficult to concur, in the face of the well-known opinion of the late Duke of Wellington, and the prominent situation of the place, on the main line of operations of an enemy. Dover, in fact, is the nearest point to the coast of France, and lies directly on the high route between London and Paris. It presents many naturally favourable features for enclosing a considerable space within a moderate extent of works, and thus can not only be strongly fortified for a moderate sum, by works which can be defended by a comparatively small garrison, but it is likewise capable of sheltering, if necessary, a very considerable force. It is well situated for a place of dépôt and reserves for the coast of Kent generally, and for a place of refuge and rendezvous, for the collection of bodies of men to act on the flanks and rear of an invader. With the proposed works for the right bank of the Medway at Rochester and Chatham, and viewing the nature of that river below those places, and the defensive line it presents from the mouth up to Maidstone, Dover and Chatham, well secured, would have a somewhat similar effect to the famous quadrilateral in Italy; and the whole coast of Kent, which would otherwise be the most assailable part of our frontier, is rendered, by these works, one on which it would be anything but favourable for an enemy to establish his base of operations; and the more he can be restricted to given localities, the better we can be prepared to oppose him. Viewing the works in detail proposed for Dover, they can by no means be considered excessive, nor beyond what are necessary for the objects they are to serve. Nor is there much to remark on the details for those on the right bank of the Medway at Chatham. The object of these works is not so much to cover the dockyard from injury; for the enemy at this period

would be approaching the heart of the kingdom, and in contention for a far greater prize; but rather to serve as a strategical point, and *tête de pont* in aid of the operations of the field force; and it is with this view that the works should be designed. An important distinction should be drawn between the works for the right and those for the left bank of the Medway: the latter would come into play under very different conditions, and be of doubtful value. They would form, in fact, an extended entrenched camp, without influence of any kind, unless within the focus of the principal contest; and if there, abstracting, by a division of forces, from the means available at the decisive moment. The enemy, concentrated between the defenders of this line and the main body of our troops, would cut off the communication between them, and have all the advantages of the central position, nor would it be a time to attempt to secure the dockyard from bombardment; when the invader is in force on the left bank of the Medway, every consideration must be absorbed in the means for opposing his gaining possession of London. Chatham is not a place like the other arsenals, which could be left long to its own resources. Sheerness is not a port of primary importance, and it is not so placed as to induce an enemy to make any great efforts against it, as they could not be combined to any effect with any other leading operation. We could wish no better than that he would expend his means in such a corner, where even success could have no influence upon the general issue of the campaign.

The defence of the river Thames has been a subject of anxiety to many, under a persuasion that little attention has been paid to it. In importance, nothing could well exceed that of preventing an enemy penetrating up the Thames; but at the same time, nothing could be much easier than to render such an enterprise impossible, by means which could be very rapidly collected; and the idea of his running up to Woolwich, with his steamers, is supposing a want of spirit and energy of which it would be preposterous to accuse our countrymen. Against such an attempt, there will be our standing batteries, with the advantageous circumstance of a very narrow passage to guard, where the vessel's course would be thoroughly defined within a few yards, and where by the windings of the river, the guns may frequently be in a position to rake the ships throughout their approach.

And here it may be as well to say a few words on the relative power of ships against shore defences, for there is a vague notion existing that ships may silence batteries, or run by them with impunity. It is certainly possible that such an event might happen through mal-arrangements on shore, and sometimes it may be impossible to avoid the chance of such contingencies; but under ordinary circumstances the land defences will have enormous ad-

vantages. Batteries on shore placed at a height of from 50 to 150, or even 200 feet above the water, will make most perfect practice, and be little susceptible of injury from the fire of shipping; if additional security be needed, the guns may be very much dispersed: and if placed in a flanking position, while their direct front to the sea is covered, they can scarcely be opposed at all. The battery presents only a few minute parts that are vulnerable, except to a very heavy and concentrated cannonading, while every shot striking the ship will do more or less palpable damage; nor is the battery, like the ship, combustible, or liable to be sunk. The vessel certainly may choose her position, but this would of course be considered in the arrangements of the battery; she may likewise retire at pleasure, which is precisely the object which the battery is intended to effect. But, above all, it is said, by those who have confidence in the power of steam-vessels under such circumstances, they may pass the battery with rapidity, and they may have shot-proof sides. The effect of the rapidity of their passage may be obviated where the passage is of any length, by placing the batteries in succession; and the difficulty of hitting them in their course, however rapid, is not so great as would be imagined, considering that the vessel will not run her own length in the time of the shot's flight to her; therefore, firing the gun when her bow is on its alignment, the shot will be sure to strike her somewhere; but a very serious impediment to great speed in the immediate vicinity of the land will be the smoke. In most cases also, where so bold a course is advocated, the fact of the vessel having to return past the same battery, and probably in a more or less damaged, or even dismantled condition, is left out of consideration.

Great researches are now making, particularly by the French, into the possibility of rendering ships invulnerable by a coating of iron plates: and if any degree effective, the result will be of great importance. There are so many difficulties to be overcome, and the cost will be so enormous, that it is impossible not to admire the determination of the French to effect this object, as evinced in the spirited efforts they are making to accomplish it. The first result to be established is a coating which shall be shot-proof. Hitherto this has been but partially obtained; very heavy shot from moderate ranges, striking the plates fairly, have merely made dents in them; but when they have struck near any joints, they have usually made extensive cracks, and displaced portions of the plates; and even where the surface has not shown much injury, the planks within have been broken by the concussion, so that at best, although they might not have suffered essentially from single shot, anything like constant battering on them would rapidly break them up. But in addition to this, Whitworth

with his guns, and with shot prepared for the purpose—a stock of which may always be at hand—has completely pierced through these plates with a single shot; and it may be fairly expected that the additional power which will be given to artillery, by new inventions, will more than keep pace with the protection afforded by this defensive armour. The enormous weight of this iron covering will also detract greatly from the capability of the vessel for carrying its armament, provisions, stores, and, above all, a desirable amount of steam-power and fuel. Nor is it quite clear how far so great a weight, applied in so different a manner from that in which it is usually adjusted, may not affect the vessel's seaworthiness in bad weather; certainly, on inquiries being made as to the motion at sea of one of these gun-vessels, an old seaman, with a disapproving shake of the head, observed that, in a tolerable breeze, her motion was very peculiar! Then, again, the decks, not being covered with iron, are always vulnerable; and to a fire directed on the ship from elevated ground, or from distances requiring elevation, they will be as much, or even more exposed than the sides. Any resistance, likewise, which can be obtained for ships by this means, can be much more readily obtained for shore batteries against them, and with so much more effect, that the weight presents no impediment whatever, and cost would be the only consideration. The expense of covering a single frigate would be ample for that of a very powerful battery on shore: there is little doubt that in very important and confined situations, iron *revêtements* will eventually be provided for all the more vulnerable parts of a battery.

To return to the protection of the Thames against a hostile attack by means of ships. Our standing batteries are at present confined to the powerful pass between Gravesend and Tilbury, with some smaller posts, at commanding sites, a few miles in advance. Circumstances are so favourable at Gravesend for defence, it is so easy of communication with London, that the chief increase of means of resistance may be well accumulated about that place. Besides the permanent batteries which already exist, others open, and of earth, may be run up in a very few days, or even hours, on any part of the shore, on either side; while floating lighters, or rafts well armed can be moored, to any extent, in the channel itself. Along a river course, like that of the Thames, of only a few hundred yards' width of available channel, floating obstructions of all kinds may be accumulated; and that terrific power, floating or partially submerged mines, could be used with great effect. These may be exploded by galvanic batteries from the shore, if the passage is required to be open to our own vessels; or by percussion, if the channel can be closed. No flotilla could force a passage where such measures could be readily taken to oppose it; nor could

boats, the usual means employed to clear a passage, venture to proceed between two banks, in face of rockets and musketry within thoroughly effective range.

To attempt such an enterprise by means afloat may therefore be deemed impracticable; to succeed at all, then, will require a combined operation, so as, by landing a force on shore, to take possession of the batteries, and remove the other impediments. This may be effected by the adoption of one of two courses:—either that the fleet or flotilla be accompanied by a division of troops for the purpose, or that the great effort of the enemy's army be made along the banks of the river. The first might be effectually opposed by local forces and volunteers, aided by divisions from our main force; and being a wide and isolated effort, (for it could not be combined with any other great advance on the south side of the Thames, without greatly hampering it,) would be readily defeated by an overwhelming force, temporarily thrown upon the spot.

An enterprise of this description could be more readily combined with an advance on the Essex side, but there are reasons why that is not so favourable for the line of attack as Kent or Sussex; and after all, possession of one bank would not secure the free passage of the flotilla.

That the advance of the main army of invasion should be up the banks of the river, is out of the question; the military key of a country, either for penetrating into it, or for resisting an invasion, in most cases lies on the commanding ridges, and not along the valleys. No advance that can be expected from the south coast, could extend in force to the Thames; one on the Essex side might do so; but in all these cases of the co-operation of troops, it would be the troops who would gain the mastery on the river, without the aid of any naval force; and the proposed defences in this case are to resist attack from floating means. Although fears have been entertained by some, that an enemy's flotilla might force their way up to Woolwich, it has not been under any such apprehension that the Commissioners have suggested defences for that arsenal; for the proposed work for Shooter's Hill is to protect it from the land side, and could only be of use in connexion with a great measure for entrenching London itself, when it would form part of the line of defence. This is an undertaking much advocated by some military men of repute, and very generally considered expedient by civilians, under the plausible impression that, as London is the great object on which invasion will be directed, London is the place which ought to be fortified. To this measure, however, the greatest difficulties and objections exist. The expense, however enormous, as it certainly would be, ought not to be an impediment, if the

measure were really very desirable for the security of the metropolis, and hence, virtually, of the country, in case of a formidable invasion; but we consider that the undertaking would be futile, and that the outlay could be expended to far better effect for defensive objects, in other ways. The protection of the great naval arsenals, and a few other points of importance, by works of fortification, rests on distinct and different grounds altogether. ●

No city scarcely, could be under less favourable circumstances for defence, or its precincts less favourable for defensive positions, than London. It is true that some commanding eminences, so far as regards their height, may be found in most directions at five or six miles round the capital, but their real value is greatly reduced by their distance asunder, and by the broken ground, buildings, enclosures, trees, &c., which are completely interwoven with them;—these could never be interfered with so long as measures of defence were merely preparative, and they could not be converted into effective arrangements for defence, in the short period of panic and confusion which would attend the actual emergency. The suburbs, or accumulated detached buildings, extend in nearly every direction, both between and beyond the radius of defences. Every building amongst them is combustible; while shells, carcasses, and rockets would effect conflagrations in the more compact masses of buildings and premises in the rear. All this would tend to cause the greatest confusion, and very much impede any system of defence, however well arranged. While the enemy would threaten a great extent, and thus oblige the defenders to disseminate their forces, he could concentrate his own troops for the real attack within a limited front; and if the lines are forced in any single point by one great effort, the whole system of defence falls to pieces. The permanent works, that is, such as occupy any commanding position, must be in most cases, from the nature of the ground, at very great intervals, and could not prevent the enemy from penetrating between them; the intermediate lines or smaller works constructed to maintain the connexion, would be weak, and liable to be broken through; and the loss of any one of the more influential works, would at once cause an effectual opening to be made. Even if it were not captured, we might well contemplate lodgments of the enemy being established, and maintained so near as to enable a powerful fire to be brought on it, from masses of artillery and riflemen, which would reduce its co-operating power to nothing.

It is not to be supposed that the first great effort for encountering the enemy would be, delayed till he was so far advanced, or would be left to be made under such disadvantageous circumstances as must indisputably attend a contest at the very metropolis. The preparations round it, then, must be contemplated to

afford a refuge and rallying-point for the army, which had retreated upon London, after losing a first great battle in advance; and the selection of the position would not be made on account of its favourable character for the purpose, but with the desperate hope of saving the heart of the empire. The enemy then would be encountered with all the available force we could muster at an earlier period, where the localities were the most favourable for the purpose, and before he could be entirely provided with all his means. Such a battle would not be one of simple manœuvring, nor would the field be abandoned by a retreat even in tolerable order, on account of the enemy obtaining some technical advantage, such as the partial turning of a flank. The conflict would be of the most severe kind; a defeat, should it occur, would be thorough, the disorder complete, and the enemy would reach London within two or three days, at the heels of such of the retiring bodies as took that direction.

We may then consider, in addition to the ordinary military disadvantages of that circumstance, and a faulty defensive position, the social and moral elements involved in such a state of affairs:—the thousands, or hundreds of thousands of the population suddenly thrown out of the means of existence by the interruption of all business: the confusion, plunder, and intemperance that would prevail; the outcries against the generals, and want of confidence in the military management; and the despondency which could not fail to exist in a country so constituted as ours, and so totally unaccustomed to warfare on its own territory. As a type of national character, the most deteriorating influences of panic amongst a great community in times of disorder, are not incompatible with the highest spirit displayed when in smaller numbers, and under due regulation. It is impossible, then, to expect that sort of vigorous defence, which can be so placidly reasoned upon in quiet times, on an assumption of the regularity of proceeding of the ordinary circumstances of war. When we come to analyse even the arrangements which are essentially military, many of them will be found to be most difficult;—among these, are the previous provision for food, ammunition, and other necessities, for forces of uncertain numbers, for an uncertain period, established so as to be available for all parts of the immense circumference to be more or less occupied; an occupation of which the circumstances differ so essentially from those of an ordinary military position prepared for a like purpose.

The only case of which we are aware, of decided preparation for defence of a considerable capital, is at Paris; but there the circumstances are far more favourable. That city is particularly compact: a contour of probably not above half the extent of that of London, in which is comprehended all its suburbs, is surrounded

by a continued line of respectable works ; this is again surrounded by exterior detached forts, and round both lines is unencumbered, open, plain country. And yet, notwithstanding these circumstances, the cost greatly exceeded five millions sterling. Paris, also, is free from the vast establishments connected with a great commercial port, and extensive manufactories, elements of conflagration and increased confusion at such a period. The population is of a far more military character, and the Government one of peculiar vigour and power for making everything absolutely subservient to the military requirements, not only at the moment, but for an indefinite time before.

The most influential writers on the defence of London seem to have been carried away by the idea of a standing refuge and stronghold at the metropolis, the great stake of the country, and by the existence of some striking features in the eminences around it, well adapted for defensive purposes ; but none of them could have analysed the subject in detail, if the above remarks are at all correct. Thus, in estimating the quantity of land required for the works, they propose to take merely the ground on which the few permanent works which they project would stand, leaving the land around, up to the very edges of the ditches, in the hands of private individuals. They calculate on obtaining such lands at 200*l.* per acre, and that the whole system would be completed for 800,000*l.*, that is, not more than one-seventh of the cost of fortifying Paris, which is scarcely one-half of its extent ; and as regards the system of defence, the French have surely sufficient military intelligence not so greatly to overdo what was necessary. The great fallacy, however, in treating of defences for London, is in assuming that, with a few forts, dotted at four or five miles asunder, the rest could be prepared rapidly, at the period of the emergency ; whereas, to make even a tolerably efficient contour of works, the preparations must be long, and very costly, and the attendant devastations would never be submitted to in this country. It can be readily shown that the defence of the lines of Lisbon, of Sebastopol, and other places, which are sometimes advanced as examples, were undertaken under totally different circumstances.

It is not a question of the importance of saving London, but of the way in which it is to be done. It is not the part of resolute men to be deterred from a bold effort by too much thought as to the results of a failure ; but some consideration may reasonably be given to such effects, where the chance of success is more than doubtful, and the consequence of defeat entails no less than the sack of the city ; the horrors of which, in spite of all the boasted civilization of the present day, would be much on a par with any similar catastrophe by the Goths and Vandals.

To the army in the field must be confided the charge of protecting London from the invader. It would be collected from all quarters, by previously well-understood arrangements, in the greatest force and with the utmost rapidity, so as to meet him at the earliest period, before he can be strongly reinforced, or his forces well consolidated. In every direction between London and the coast, favourable defensive positions are to be found, which will, of course, be thoroughly examined and defined beforehand. Ample information, collected by competent officers, should be in the hands of the Secretary of State for War and Commander-in-Chief, of every capability the country affords, and every arrangement that can be made on all sides for resistance. These reconnaissances should be separately considered by all the military authorities, and will require revision from time to time.

Among the most essential arrangements, there is one which has been so much regarded as a matter of course, that it has not hitherto been considered and organized in detail—that is, the use of railways. Partial researches have been made into their capabilities for conveying troops and warlike appurtenances; but a more important requisite is some recognised power for making them entirely subservient to the military requirements, to the exclusion of all others. This will be comparatively easy at a distance from the scene of action, where the demands for the military service, and the extra wants for others, will not be of an inordinate character; but in proportion to the vicinity of the operations will the confusion be increased. Large numbers of people will be hurrying away, carrying with them goods and valuables, in a state of panic and alarm, which will probably affect and paralyse the efforts of the railway officials themselves. This will produce a state of confusion which will overpower all efforts to control it, unless a most stringent military organization be adopted. It is very important that some system should be previously considered, with a view to meet the contingencies in question.

A point has been urged as to the propriety of taking up certain positions between the coast and London, and throwing up at once a few works on their leading features; but it is a course to which there are many objections. It is very seldom that generals of repute have ever had recourse to the preparation of fields of battle long beforehand, or that such preparations have been of avail. It is only done when the enemy has no other possible direction to take or course to pursue in his attack, or where the extent to be protected is comparatively small, as in the case of the Lines of Lisbon. Where the enemy has many routes and lines of operations available, and considering that the actual field of battle seldom comprises an extent of more than two or three

miles, it would be impossible to be duly prepared everywhere; and entrenching certain positions may be the means of deterring an enemy from encountering us on the very ground where it may be most advantageous to draw him. Thus, for months previous to Busaco and Waterloo, the Duke of Wellington had contemplated fighting those battles on the very ground on which they were subsequently fought, and had ordered the most careful reconnaissances to be made with that object, but he would never allow a pick or shovel to be applied to the ground, until the contests were closely approaching, and could not be avoided; and then every exertion was made to extemporize defences as much and as rapidly as possible, and such sudden preparations, however hasty, have, on repeated occasions, been of the greatest service.

As regards the selection of the point of attack by an enemy, there would be great advantages in adopting that which should give the shortest sea passage. The greater part of the coast of Kent would present that advantage, but it has been shown that by making strongholds of Dover and Chatham, with the formidable natural features of the Medway, that line would be rendered very unfavourable to him in other respects. The coast of Sussex comes next, and while the voyage is but little prolonged, does not present the same obstacles; it is, moreover, the nearest to London.

The shores of Hampshire, Dorsetshire, and Essex, being further removed, would require a greater effort. The operation would partake more of a regular voyage, larger craft must be employed, and the subsequent communication would be more dilatory. Still, all of them are accessible, and demand a thorough consideration of the available measures for resisting a descent.

The propriety of fortifying the points on the coast, that have been recommended by the Royal Commissioners, appears to be generally conceded; but some differences of opinions have arisen in some instances, regarding the system and extent of defences, proposed for certain localities.

Thus, with regard to Portsmouth, considerable discussion arose whether the line of Portsdown Hill should be occupied or not.

There are two operations which an enemy may attempt against our naval arsenals, distinct in their character and effects, and which require separate consideration in designing works of defence to guard against them. One is, the bombardment of the arsenal from a distance, in order to effect conflagrations of all the combustible material which is contained within it: the other, to effect an entry into the place and take absolute possession of it.

The works which have been hitherto constructed were designed to meet the last contingency only, and these are by far the most essential. It is now contemplated to add an exterior contour of

detached works, with a view of preventing an enemy from approaching within bombarding distance, or what would have the same effect, to keep him out of view of the place. In considering this question, it is important to draw a distinction between the effect which would be produced by a bombardment from a distance, and the actual occupation of one of our arsenals by an enemy. In the first case, the evil is confined to the value of the combustible stores and building destroyed, and the inconvenience caused by their temporary deficiency; the docks, most of the machinery, and large quantities of non-combustible stores, such as anchors, guns, &c., would receive comparatively little injury. On the other hand, absolute possession by an enemy, supposes complete destruction of everything, such as years of outlay would not repair—machinery and stores would be utterly destroyed; the docks overthrown by charges of gunpowder placed under their foundations; and everything portable carried away, or rendered permanently useless.

Some idea of this difference may be derived from the late operations before Sebastopol. There the bombardment and cannonading against the place was unexampled, and yet, until we took possession of it, and after operations extending over several months, there were many vessels which had escaped all damage by constantly shifting their berths; and the docks, and several other naval establishments, were scarcely injured at all.

Till within the last two or three years, when the great power of rifled ordnance became apparent, the projects for fortifying Portsmouth comprehended lines across the only two accessible approaches, by Hulsea and Gosport. These will occupy strong features of ground, and require but a moderate development of works, while they enclose a very large space, and can be defended by a comparatively small garrison. It will be therefore most desirable to perfect these works as a primary consideration, in order to obtain a stronghold of importance in that locality, and to secure the arsenal from entry by an invader.

The enormous ranges and the precision of fire of the rifled cannon, have, however, opened a new element of danger—that of the power of cannonading any considerable space with effect, from ranges of 9000 or 10,000 yards; that is, from distances of upwards of five miles.

Thus, from the commanding heights of **Portsmouth Hill**, the dockyard and all the ships in the harbour are distinctly exposed to view at less than that distance, and it becomes an object of some importance to save them from this evil. Unfortunately, the measures necessary to obtain this result are of considerable magnitude; no less than the occupation of a position of, at least, seven or eight miles in length; and this occupation must be so

complete, as not to admit of the possibility of establishing upon it a single battery of four or six guns, which would be amply sufficient for the purpose of bombardment. Such a contour of works would require the presence of a very considerable force, which may, or may not be forthcoming. The preparation of the position, however, while it might be of great service, can be attended with no disadvantage except the cost. At worst it would be imposing, and however imperfectly occupied, would entail upon the enemy the necessity for some kind of formal proceedings, and at least a day or two's delay, which might be of value; but it would be most objectionable and dangerous, if considered a substitute for the more compact lines in its rear.

It is rare to find so many natural advantages in one fortress as occur at Portsmouth. Situated at an extremity of the island of Portsea, it is entirely surrounded by broad sheets of water, except on one front, at Hilsea, where the water becomes narrowed to the dimensions of a wet ditch, but still presents a formidable defensive obstacle. Portsea, therefore, when the works now in progress are completed will form a fortress of the first class, the only access to which is by the narrow neck at Hilsea, and this front, in addition to the natural strength afforded by its wet ditch, will be powerfully protected by works, whose flanks will be rendered bombproof. The fear expressed by some that these works will be commanded by the hill at Portsdown, is entirely unfounded, that hill having no command whatever, in a military sense, over the proposed works.

On the other side of the water at Gosport (where the approach of an enemy, although it would not give him access to Portsmouth, would enable him to destroy the dockyard and shipping), Portsmouth will be strongly protected by a line of detached works, whose flanks, resting on the water at either side, are rendered perfectly secure.

The circuit round the head of Portsmouth harbour, between these two fronts, is so divided and long, that an enemy could hardly attack both simultaneously, while the communication between them for the garrison would be comparatively short and easy; thus the great military desideratum is obtained, of an easy communication at the centre, whilst the enemy is forced to operate round a very extensive circumference.

Besides these advantages of the position, a very considerable extent of country, namely, the entire island of Portsea, and the Gosport peninsula, is covered by the works, leaving only two comparatively small fronts open to attack, and those situated at a great distance asunder.

Another feature peculiar to Portsmouth is the facilities afforded for covering not only a great district of country, but what may

be almost called an inland sea, including the whole of the Solent, Southampton Water, and Portsmouth harbour, with all their floating resources, by the simple occupation of the Isle of Wight; and the connexion of its defences at the two ends with the mainland, at the narrow passage opposite to Hurst Castle on the west, and across the shoals of St. Helen's on the east. The back of the island, consisting of impracticable cliffs, broken by a few small bays and landing-places, may very easily be made defensible.

Thus we shall have a fortress, a naval arsenal, and an anchorage for a considerable fleet, enclosed as it were in one strong *enceinte*, and not easily assailable from any direction.

Many of the general remarks made regarding Portsmouth are applicable to Plymouth, but others will be peculiar to it. In the case of this arsenal, some of the most important establishments, such as the steam-yard of Keyham, have been placed, from want of space, outside the original *enceinte* of works, and are thus even open to a *coup de main* on the part of an enterprising enemy; and to secure the dockyard and harbour from bombardment, at distances of five miles, will be even more difficult than at Portsmouth.

The principal effort of an invader will hardly be made at so great a distance from London; but it is not improbable that a detached force of 10,000 or 20,000 troops, might make a contemporaneous attack on Plymouth, as a diversion, and to commit ravages in so important a naval arsenal. The readiest way to do this, would be by landing within ten or twelve miles either on the east or west side, seizing that side of the entrance of the Sound, and from thence cannonading the naval establishments; two or three days would suffice for such a purpose, if no precautions were taken to guard against it.

It becomes then a matter of urgent necessity to secure the two flanks: the one between the sea and the river Tamar on the west, and the other between the sea and the Catwater on the east; and the first measures of defence proposed for this arsenal, are designed with a view to this object. Any operations by an enemy against the extensive land front between the Catwater and the Tamar, would necessitate his penetrating into the interior, and force him to maintain a difficult communication with his base on the sea, and would be altogether a much more formidable enterprise to undertake.

- As in the case of Portsdown Hill, this position offers somewhat favourable ground for entrenchments, but is of great extent; its occupation may be attended with considerable advantages if troops are forthcoming to defend it, and, in the meantime, the entrenching of it can do no harm. The works on the west of

Plymouth, at Tregantle and Anthony, are already in a state of considerable forwardness.

Portland has as yet no naval establishments, but affords a magnificent bay or roadstead, sheltered from all winds, and of great capacity. All that is proposed at present, for it, is to occupy the Verne, a rocky height of great natural strength, by a very strong fort, now in progress, and which completely commands the anchorage. The advantage of this work is, that it can be held by a small garrison, and so long as we retain possession of it, it entirely precludes an enemy making use of the roadstead, and, assisted by some outer batteries, affords a refuge for our own ships against the approach of any hostile fleets or cruisers.

A few words may here be said, respecting the doubts expressed, whether the principles of fortification hitherto adopted may not require great alterations to resist the new rifled cannon.

The only systems of fortification approved by modern engineers, require the works to be well provided with casemates, *i. e.*, with bomb-proof cover for their defenders; and to have their escarp and flanks, and all their masonry-constructions, so disposed that they cannot be seen from a distance, so as to be cannonaded. The usual method of effecting this object, is by sinking the escarp walls below the level of the ground by means of a deep ditch; consequently, to breach these defences so as to effect an entrance, batteries must be established close to the walls, and on the very edge of the ditch; this is the most difficult operation of a siege, and that which requires the longest time. It is evident, that for such ranges as are necessary for these purposes, the old ordnance will be as efficient as the new.

Milford Haven will be powerfully protected against insult from an enemy's shipping, and it is to be presumed, that during a war, it would never be without such local forces, as would be ample to resist a *coup de main* on shore by any but a large force. It would hardly be politic for an enemy to send an expedition in force to such a remote locality, where the injury to be effected would be far less than at any other naval arsenal; the dockyard at this place being used for building only, and the ships sent elsewhere to be fitted out. The effects therefore of the evil would be prospective, and rather a money loss than one liable to cripple the immediate resources of the navy.

In a similar manner, all the commercial harbours will have batteries in proportion to their importance, to check any hostile approach to them by shipping; and it is to be hoped that local levies of some strength will be forthcoming, to oppose any attempts on shore by an enemy's cruisers.

In connexion with our national defences, the Channel Islands may claim a few passing remarks.

The Duke of Wellington was particularly sensitive on the question of maintaining these islands; more, however, as a matter of national pride and honour, than for any military or other importance they possessed. They have formed part of the British dominions since the Norman Conquest, and their population have always been, it may be said, romantically attached to the British Crown.

Before the time of steam navigation, they possessed considerable natural strength from the rocky reefs and shores, and the rapidity of the currents, by which they are surrounded; the direction of the wind thus gave an accurate clue to the only points by which they could be attacked. Although steam-power has greatly lessened those advantages, they still present difficulties to an attacking force, from the nature of the coast, which is unapproachable, except in the bays and inlets, and makes each island as a whole, very defensible with moderate garrisons. Moderate, however, as these garrisons need be, they could not be provided without great difficulty unless our present land forces were considerably increased.

The Channel Islands possess another element of strength in a well-organized local militia, on the same principle, but somewhat more expensively regulated, than that which has been here advocated for local volunteers near our own ports.

Jersey and Guernsey have fine anchorages: but none of them with very ready access to the Channel, nor are they very defensible.

Alderney has, however, a small artificial harbour in active progress, of deep water, with a direct opening to the sea, and always accessible, day or night, with safety. It is the nearest of the islands to our own shores, immediately opposite to the fine roadstead of Portland, and is small and compact, of great strength by nature, and still more so by permanent works, which have been recently constructed and armed, and to which others of a more temporary nature can be added, in times of emergency, by the moderate garrison which is needed for its defence. Alderney is also so near the French coast (only seven miles distant) that it would afford a great check on the coasting communication along it, and would altogether become a very favourable post for cruisers to watch that side of the Channel, and a port of refuge for merchantmen or vessels of inferior force, which might find themselves intercepted from our own shores.

The only objection ever made to Alderney, is that its harbour is small; that is, it will not contain a fleet of line-of-battle ships; to which it may be replied, that even if it could, the fleets of line-of-battle ships should decidedly be stationed at Spithead, Portland, Plymouth, or Torbay, in preference, where they would be more

available for every contingency. At the same time, it must be confessed, that the parsimonious spirit so often evinced by the Legislature of this country, has caused its natural effect upon our public officials, who have designed and commenced many important national works, without venturing to look forward to any grand and final result. This has been the cause of reducing the capacity of this harbour as well as of others, and it is the more to be regretted, as the additional space might have been obtained without increase of expense, had the project first been devised on the scale since acknowledged to be appropriate.

Notwithstanding this circumstance, Alderney will always be a most valuable military post in time of war. It is of great natural and artificial strength, and forms, with Portland strongly fortified, the gates of the English Channel.

It cannot be too often repeated, that so long as a neighbour has a gigantic and powerful sword waving around us, we ought to keep an effective guard to parry its effects. Let us then consider in a general way, of what that guard should consist.

The navy has the first place, and there is no dissentient voice to its increase to almost any extent; although how to enable our fleets to be augmented with sufficient rapidity to meet emergencies, remains apparently still a problem.

Of the land forces, it is the regulars on whom the brunt of the battle in the field must rest; these should decidedly not be less than 120,000 men in the British Isles; and when it is considered that this number will comprehend all the recruits and very young soldiers, for the entire army, at home and abroad, there will not be above 80,000 or 90,000 at most of all arms, at all fit to take the field, and this is the only force which will be immediately forthcoming. As arguments in favour of such a minimum force (150,000 would be far better), it may be stated that this would not give in reliefs an equal period of home-service for that abroad; and against the plea of expense, it must be recollected that the gross amount of army estimates is by no means in proportion to the strength maintained, because so large a part of it is necessary for establishments of all kinds, which require but very little addition as the forces are augmented.

The militia will be an admirable reserve force, if sufficient time for embodying them can be obtained, before they are brought into action; but in our rival's constant state of readiness, the blow might be attempted within a few days after the rupture, the immediate intention of which would be carefully hid by an appearance of a desire for reconciliation; for so great an advantage as taking us by surprise, would be studiously sought for, and the importance of it has often been alluded to and recommended by French military writers.

The pensioners would be speedily got together, and available and at their best for the service of which they are capable.

Of the yeomanry and volunteers, we have already discussed the merits. The latter, possessing such magnificent material and hearty good-will in the cause, are provokingly near forming a most powerful force; and will do so in proportion as they are able to remove the imperfections in the system which have been indicated. One, of very much importance, however, is inseparable from their very composition; which is, that they cannot be embodied for moving till the very crisis arrives, a very great drawback in the efficiency of any corps; nor even will the precise strength of each body for service be known till then; and they will have to be collected from all parts and distances. In the case of some corps, as for instance, those composed of the clerks of Government offices, the ordinary work of the members will be increased at the period of an invasion; and they will more injure than serve their country, by leaving their desks, at the time when there is the greatest demand for their services, to ramble over the country in search of a foe.

Bodies of the class of our volunteers will never, and cannot reasonably be expected, to abandon their business and occupations, perhaps for several weeks, in anticipation of an attack, however threatening it may be. A force of essentially local volunteers, raised in the immediate neighbourhood of all our ports, and not to be removed from thence, has not yet been organized; to such an arrangement we are inclined to attach the greatest importance, as without abstracting from the industry of the country, and at the smallest possible expense, (which expense should be borne by the public in order to obtain greater numbers,) very good garrisons for enclosed works will be everywhere on the spot; and by their numbers will afford an effectual security against predatory excursions from cruisers.

Lastly, whatever may be our forces and means, a great essential is, that each department of Government should study deeply, and in detail, every measure for turning all to account with rapidity, system, and order; even at the risk of being accused of red-tapism and routine; and that powers be understood and sanctioned, by which all may be carried out, however sudden the emergency. It is this, which will be least easy of accomplishment, as much of it will require an interference with many ordinary private rights, which will be repugnant to an Englishman's feelings of independence.

ART. VIII.—W. M. THACKERAY AS NOVELIST AND
PHOTOGRAPHER.

1. *Irish Sketch Book*. 2 vols. 1845.
2. *Vanity Fair*. 8vo. 1848.
3. *Pendennis*. 2 vols. 1849.
4. *History of Henry Esmond*. 3 vols. 1852.
5. *English Humorists of the Eighteenth Century*. 1853.
6. *The Newcomes*. 2 vols. 8vo. 1854.
7. *Miscellanies in Prose and Verse*. 4 vols. 1855.
8. *Christmas Books*. In one vol. 1856.
9. *Virginians*. 2 vols. 8vo. 1859.

IT is not in the region of nature only that we find a correlation of Forces. As motion transforms itself into heat, and heat into electricity, so the pursuits and manners, the arts and discoveries of an age, pass into its literature, and the literature in its turn into them. They may be regarded as the complementary portions of national life. Viewing them, however, as distinct, the apparent re-action between these two agencies is not a constant force. Books, indeed, in the long course of things, are beyond question the greatest instruments of change to which mankind is subjected. Plato and Aristotle have affected the human race more deeply than Alexander or Octavius. Cromwell has held a less imperial authority over England than his Latin Secretary. But whilst writers are alive, the position seems reversed; the world appears to make them most of what they are. Genius, we often hear, is the child of its age; it may be accounted for, like any other element in national wealth. Shakspeare and Bacon summed up the tendencies of their time; the Waverley Novels were a phenomenon inevitably deducible from the England of sixty years since.

This fatalistic view, which we meet in other fields besides that of criticism, is itself a reaction from the tendency prevalent in the last century to regard genius as a form of successful patience, and will no doubt in its turn be superseded by some fresh theory. Without discussing it further, we may remark that the sympathetic unity between books and men is, as we have noticed, not constant in its intensity. The *representative* character of writers has

greatly varied. There have been centuries when the manners reflected in the literature were the manners of a class rather than of a nation, and when the literature, again, influenced the people at large much less than the partisans of a peculiar fashion. Such has been the case when (as in the Dark Ages) writing and reading were the profession of the few, warfare and colonization the business of the many. Such has been the case when (as in Europe some centuries after) legend and poetry flourished among the many, logic and theology among the few. Or literature itself, as in England during the latter half of the seventeenth century, has at times fallen into widely separated divisions. The court and the people have had their distinct authors: the popularity of Baxter was antagonistic to the popularity of Congreve; Dryden charmed the town, and Bunyan entranced the country. Unlike as these periods were in general character, it may, however, be affirmed of all that the divorce between the writers and the people at large indicated either immaturity or decay in the body politic. Nor can it be doubted that we may expect to find national vigour and health concurrent with a literature which stands in close relations of sympathy to the nation. Athens flourished most at the time when ten thousand citizens assembled to hear the histories of Herodotus or the Agamemnon of Æschylus. Florence flourished most at the time when Boccaccio was unfolding to crowds the mysteries of the Divina Commedia. Luther gave a purer faith and a popular literature at once to his countrymen. With exception of the period mentioned above, the mass of readers and the mass of writers in England have been united by a strong community of sentiment since the reign of Elizabeth. And that this sympathy was never more prevailing than it is at present, we take to be one of the most animating amongst the many signs of national sanity which England presents to thoughtful and impartial observers.

Be this as it may, modern society is without question intellectually so homogeneous, so much an organic whole, that it is subject at once on every point to every influence that touches it, and, like the cloud which to the imaginative eye of the poet appeared as a living creature —

Moveth altogether when it moves at all.

We should therefore be prepared to find that an analogy, not only close but vital, connects the intellects and the arts of the day, the tone of our country and the tone of our literature. Regarding this on the whole as a sign of national health, we must allow that it exposes us to the danger forcibly announced by Mr. Mill—the danger that genius will forfeit its main prerogative independence; the probability, not that the few will leaven the many,

but that the many will pervert the few. We wish here to speak of a very distinguished contemporary who has, we think, in some degree descended to the level of the world's majority; but who has also been eminent beyond most men for vital sympathy with his own age. For of the assimilation already dwelt on we know few instances more marked than the resemblance between our latest developed art and our greatest living novelist; between the mirrorlike narrations of the one, and the permanent mirrors presented by the other; between what we shall venture to call the photography of Mr. Thackeray and the photography of Mr. Talbot.

We think that the term is applicable to this great writer with an exactness far beyond the sense in which it is now often applied. It is given by travellers to their own hasty sketches, by critics to successive superficial novels of society; it is a title assumed by a host of writers who resemble Mr. Thackeray as little in genius as in genuine photographic power. For the epithet, unless used as simply synonymous with minute description, implies not only a peculiar force and vivacity of imitation, but a specific peculiarity in the imitation itself, and in the sphere of objects to which it is turned. Each of these points deserves a notice more complete, profound, and philosophical than we can hope to give; yet on each a careful re-reading of Mr. Thackeray's writings, *sine ira et studio*, has suggested some remarks which may interest those "from whom" (as with the novelist himself in a more emphatic sense than is true of most men) "nothing human is alien."

We begin with that quality which, in certain degrees essential to all art, is in the highest degree exhibited in photography. Imitation of nature is at once the fundamental idea and the perplexity of art; it is difficult to say whether it should be more followed or more avoided. All would agree that without imitation the work is unreal; lifeless, if it has nothing but imitation. But on the method and the amount of imitation the warfare has raged in the schools from the days of Zeuxis to the days of Millais. We have never thought it of much use, on this curious and disputed problem, to repeat, as a solution, the fine aphorisms which no doubt, to the men of genius who employed them, had a vital meaning; to say with Sir T. Browne, that nature is the art of God, or with Goethe, that art is called art precisely because it is not nature. These sentences are available only for foregone conclusions. It is not even enough to say, although we thus approach a more practical definition, that in a work of art the scheme or whole should be more complete than nature would ordinarily suggest, but that the details should be closely true to nature; that we may invent or select the characters, but that their words and actions must then conform to actual humanity. For the result thus obtained will always be incon-

gruous ; we shall have the groundwork magnificently impossible and the filling-up tamely true ; the story incredible, and the conversations insipid. How many novels and pictures of the season are already described in this description ? Let us see whether an examination of practice may guide us to theory. It is quite otherwise that a great artist, although unable to define his art, deals with his matter. We also cannot say how it is done ; yet we see that he keeps a kind of inverse proportion between outward imitation and essential truth ; that he gives the minor characters or less important detail with the most careful realization, the loftier characters and the critical points with the deepest vitality. Thus in " *Coriolanus*," the gossip of the streets is presented with almost literal exactness ; the hero speaks in splendid poetry ; his wife is described through her silence. Shakspeare has followed the manner of Plutarch in the citizens, he has idealized him in Caius Marcius, he has added a grace of which the good Chaeronæan was incapable in Virgilia. Every part is equally finished ; yet the finish everywhere differs in character with gradations of subtlety which we feel but cannot analyse. The ideal and the real are blended by Shakspeare with such unaccountable skill that each seems in its turn not only true, but the whole truth ; as near perfection when Autolycus gives the catalogue of his basket as when a country girl enumerates the flowers of Proserpine in verses which might have been envied by Sappho or by Theocritus.

This is an art
Which does mend nature,—change it, rather ; but
The art itself is nature.

We see the same mystery transacted before our eyes in the arts of design. The governed gradation with which the finish is given in Titian's " *Bacchus and Ariadne* " or in Hunt's " *Christ in the Temple*," is more wonderful than the charm of the finish itself, and escapes, from its subtlety, the notice of any but reverent and loving spectators. Except by those who look thus, Holbein's work is pronounced too little generalized, and Tintoret's not sufficiently definite. So critics dogmatize. Meanwhile, unless we were Tintoret or Holbein, we could not hope to decide why these fine proportions of execution were observed. The difficulty here is analogous, in fact, to that which Science finds when she endeavours to explain the vital processes. To define how far imitation should be carried would require another art beyond art itself. Perhaps our conclusion should rather be, that detailed rules are dangerous, but that a few general limitations may be laid down with advantage, all dependent on the one cardinal principle of human art—that in no portion of it

the creative working of the human mind shall not be perceptible. This principle at once excludes deceptive imitation; it requires that a certain organic unity shall be maintained—that accessories shall be subordinate in treatment, but never without bearing on the main purpose; that, whatever mode of presentment may in the particular work give the deepest truth, this shall be reserved for the rendering of vital character. This view of art seems to leave free play to “man, that inventive creature,” and supersede disputes on imitation by removing the controversy from the technical sphere into the imaginative. It is satisfied when Sterne attains his perfection by literalism, and Milton by ideality: it recognises that the plastic force of nature reproduces itself in art: that the idea of the work predetermines the method of its realization: that truth is accessible not by one road only.

The pride, however, of photography is its amazing literal reproduction; and though not to be altogether excluded from the precincts of art, yet undoubtedly it is distanced from art by the very success which it aims at. Its excellence is not the excellence of human skill. Thus a peculiar risk will attend the artist who should make his first studies in the school of minute literalism, and his first aim to photograph society. He would take a limited range, and within that range imitation would be directly dominant. Most painters of character begin with more or less vagueness. The heroes of a first picture or a first novel are most frequently as indistinct and cloudlike as the heroes of Ossian. Yet the artist's friends will generally recognise in the details of his work the reminiscences of his actual life, and the features of his family. The scene is often “Utopia, a Garden;” but the garden proves (naturally) the one where they spent their childhood. It is certain that Mr. Thackeray's earliest acknowledged essays in literature are marked by qualities antithetical to the qualities just enumerated. The plots of most beginners are imperfectly constructed, badly rounded off, and possess no unity but the unity of sequence. The plot of the “Hoggarty Diamond” is complete as the O of Giotto. Most young writers introduce us to domestic portraits, or to an autobiography gently disguised: from the “Miscellanies” it would be difficult to infer even the native country of the author. It is a common remark that a first novel, from the febleness with which it exhibits society, fails in art. Thackeray's fail in art from the photographic accuracy with which they exhibit little except society. And, like inferior photographs in another respect, the burlesque pieces excepted, they are devoted to the mean and truly commonplace side of life: they show us neither the glories of labour, nor the glories of genius: they paint villas, not cottages; houses, not homes: they reproduce wigs and whiskers, dishes and furniture, with more than

stereoscopic fidelity. Hence the collection, as a whole, has now a faded, almost a dreary character. In place of the freshness of the writer's youth, we find the tawdriness of outworn fashions. We have examined these works with the interest, we trust with the deference, due to the initiatory sketches of an artist so distinguished; but readers not acquainted with the "Lyra Hibernica," "The Adventures of Major Gahagan," "The Fatal Boots," "The Yellowplush" or "The Lyndon Memoirs," are not invited to expose them to the dangers of familiarity. A great contemporary of Thackeray's has acted, we have no doubt, with wisdom in suppressing most of the youthful essays which led him to the *avia Pieridum loca* of Maud and In Memoriam. And it must be deplored that the editor of "Miscellanies, by the author of Vanity Fair," should have given to the many who hate and envy eminence an opportunity which has not been wasted. The lesson, indeed, which they might draw would be how much great genius is indebted to great industry. The lesson they have drawn is that Mr. Thackeray has perpetually copied himself, that his ultimate success proves the limitation of his power. Cynics remark that he has been cynical from the beginning. They draw comparisons between certain feeble efforts at humour or incident in his early works (the story of the children in the "Curate's Walk," and the same story in "Vanity Fair," is an example of our meaning), and the reproductions in the later, not to honour his triumph, but to sneer at his antecedents. Perhaps a high-minded man may despise such hostility; but there are stronger reasons why the mysteries of the study should not be published. They are in place where some half-mechanical art is concerned, in which good fortune and experiment have co-operated more than genius. But they are fatal to that vivid and single-stroke effect which genius should exert upon us. If Mr. Talbot has preserved continuous specimens of his invention, he may show them with a legitimate pride, through every gradation from feebleness to finish. That is a proper subject for what we may call a historical treatment. There should surely be a nobler reserve in the higher spheres of intellect. For his own private study the artist may, indeed, preserve his youthful sketches; and perhaps they are of value in aiding the frequently questionable labours of the biographer; but these are subsidiary circumstances. Looking to the world at large, in the fine arts what man should give to man is only the more or less perfect work, the treasures of the mind in its bloom and its maturity; not the cradle efforts, the promising schoolboy theme, and caricatures on the margin of Schrevclius. Works also written, as some of these were, at ungenial moments or for immediate ends, should obviously be put away with other childish things. How much most great modern

writers have suffered by the contrary practice! No man is so immortal that the world can afford to lose no drop of him. What a dead weight (comparatively) hangs on Petrarch and Tasso, on Scott and Wordsworth! Some authors have been sunk by the mass of their own wealth: we have a little too much even of Shakspeare—But we are wandering again into the wider circle.

In painting, however mechanical, the painter's mind finds always some expression. We see that it is the work of a human creature, however limited in capacity. In photography it is difficult for the most accomplished artist to put into his mirror any trace of individual genius. We have said that in Mr. Thackeray's early writings there is an absence almost entire of the writer's personality. One, indeed, in which he gave his own graceful, humorous, and pathetic fancies with a skill not unworthy the author of the "Sentimental Journey," has been excluded from the "Miscellanies." Hence, although that collection is dedicated exclusively to human life, we find in it, as we find in photographs, a strange want of human interest. We can illustrate this again from art. A landscape by Turner is hardly less a living effort of creative nature than the landscapes of Baiae or of Monte Rosa. At every point where, in the actual scene an imaginative spectator would seem to feel the presence of superhuman power, we feel in the work of the great artist the presence of a human soul. Turner's mind takes the place of the *Anima Mundi*. It requires, however, some thought and knowledge, and the holy enthusiasm without which, as Plato said, there can be no poetry, to grasp this. Not so in the photograph. Here the least qualified spectator can at once say, the greatest artist cannot equal the delicacy of the detail. Yet there is a chilling character in the work. Perfect and admirable as in its way it seems, it is a cold and lifeless image of what, in the reality, was animated with the breath of God. We find this photographic quality in Thackeray's early writings. There seems to be no sympathy between the writer and his characters. They are, as it were, on the further side of the glass he holds to them. He scrutinizes them with an anatomical microscope; he submits them calmly to vivisection. This attitude of mind gives a peculiar tone to his productions. For to one who looks on the world thus, it is a scene of humorous or of tragic irony. In actual life, whilst acting meanly or acting generously, a man is, for the time, subjugated by the feeling which impels him. To himself, or to those immediately affected by his dealings, he appears consistent—"all round and self-contained," as the poet has it. But to the calm spectator, watching with his "larger other eyes," the reverse of the medal is always in view. He delights to think that the churl of to-day will be the bountiful of

to-morrow ; that the greatest warmth of heart has its limits ; that there is a selfishness which springs from unselfishness itself ; that the whirligig of Time brings about its revenges, not only on our fortunes but on our characters. Insight, however, so keen and rare as this has a disadvantage. Like the taste for rhetorical figures in writing, it tempts the speculator to exaggeration of the perpetual antitheses of human nature ; it leads him to say almost that man is an animal consistent only in his inconsistencies. Even in his later works we think Mr. Thackeray has been over-influenced by this negative element. In "Pendennis" it is the lesson embodied in the hero. The beauty and sweetness of Helen are intentionally toned down by a severity and injustice to Fanny inconsistent with Helen's good sense, everywhere else exhibited. The Colonel of the "Newcomes," of all Thackeray's creations the noblest and the most gracious, is sacrificed to his daughter-in-law by a certain odious and improbable identification in the displays of her folly and pettiness. But it is in the "Miscellanies" that we find this impersonal and photographic manner of painting most displayed. Many, indeed, of the scenes here, to take a term from the art itself, are little else than negatives printed as pictures. The "Barry Lyndon," the "Gahagan," the "Yellowplush Papers," show like the "world turned upside down" of Salvati's satire ; whilst in the "Snobs" we have, as it were, a left-handed panorama, from which the natural aspect of life is almost excluded by implication.

What we have named the negative element in Thackeray, and ascribed to his early habit of viewing life and reproducing it with an impassive and mirror-like fidelity, is a quality which, under the name Cynicism, is familiar to all his readers. From those who know that his delineations are true, from those who wish to believe them false, it is the constant accusation against him. We think the charge incorrect, and the epithet applied unjustly. It is, indeed, far most frequent in the mouths of those who are what they speak of. There are certain forms of this disease, at once the vilest and the commonest, which, however, rarely characterize the man's whole nature, but break out at intervals. Such is the cynical disbelief in human virtue seen in Iago, or Talleyrand, or Charles the Second ; the disbelief in humanity hardly less cynical however blandly disguised, of such writers as A'Kempis or the extreme Calvinist theologians ; the cynical tendency to doubt all human nobleness, or purity, or disinterestedness which appears in worldly old age, and which not unfrequently makes others old in what should be the freshness of youth itself:—passing by these partial forms of cynicism as not here relevant, the term, we apprehend, can be with accuracy affixed only to those who entertain a pervading contempt of their fellow-creatures from ascetic

ignorance (as Saint Anthony of the legend), from selfish hardness (as Diogenes), or from practical scepticism (as Montaigne and Pascal). But Thackeray's asserted cynicism arises partly from that impersonal and unsympathetic point of view whence he regards his characters, which, though questionable in art, has no direct moral bearing; partly from an element which, although moral, is in truth in origin (though not always in result) the reverse of cynicism properly so designated. This tone of sad satire springs from disappointment that human creatures so rarely realize even the least arduous ideal; that, as in the days of Empedocles of old, "he sees them choosing for their portion the life which is no life;" that men are petty and women heartless, not because it must be, but because they will have it so. Perhaps the mere sight of things as they are, to a man of generous temper and deep insight, may alone suffice to lead him to such a tone of speculation. Perhaps personal experiences may have borne their share. Such a tone (we may think) is the bitter reaction of unreturned warmth of nature, the revenge which defeated hope wreaks on its own bosom. It is the rebound from impossible aspirations; it is a sense too keen of the irony of the universe. Only once has it been given to man to feel this, and not be led into some over-severity toward his fellow-creatures; to judge them truly, and yet to love them impartially. Nor could even that supreme and almost superhuman equipoise of nature which characterized Shakspeare restrain him in the "Sonnets" from the expression, as he summed up his experience of life, of a shame and a sorrow which have no parallel in their intensity, except in the lamentations of David and of Jeremiah, of the Preacher on the dunghill of Uz, or "the Preacher, the King of Jerusalem."

Thus it is natural that a peculiar ironical sadness, a negative element, should rarely be unfelt in the pages of this great writer. But he has been hence exposed to a peculiar risk and temptation. In the sphere of ethics there are some points where all but the truth is hardly distinguishable from extreme falsehood. The sense of the irony of things suggests a true picture of the world, so nearly like the false picture which might be drawn by the satirist, that we must not be surprised if Mr. Thackeray has more than occasionally fallen into satire or mockery, if he has transgressed at times that fine limit which in all art divides the *poco più* from the *poco meno*. A tone of over-severity, more than a hint of irony, infect "Esmond" and the "Virginians," are painfully prominent in "Vanity Fair" and in "Pendennis." It is true that Thackeray's admirable humour, a quality of his so well known and appreciated that an allusion to it will be enough, springs from the contrasts in life which this irony affords him,

and is his justification for recurrence to it. It is equally true that a hundred examples may be produced, displaying the sweet and noble nature, the scorn of baseness and the "love of love," which in reality underlie the sneer and the smartness. Yet these naturally tell on readers with the greater vividness. Sneer and smartness are introduced with power so wonderful that at first we say, and the young especially, there is no escape. Here is ultimate truth. Women *are* all hypocrites; the best of men much more selfish than not. Perhaps in "Vanity Fair," we read, "There are no better satires than letters. Take a bundle of your dear friend's of ten years back—your dear friend whom you hate now. Look at a file of your sister's; how you clung to each other till you quarrelled about the twenty pound legacy! Get down the roundhand scrawls of your son," &c. Or again, "I'm of the opinion of my old friend Leech: 'Gad, sir,' Leech used to say, 'he was so poor that he couldn't afford to know a poor man.'" "Backbiting is all fair in society. Abuse me, and I will abuse you; but let us be friends when we meet." "Fancy your wife attached to a mother who drops her h's, or called Maria Marire! Good God, what would be the trifling pang of a separation in the first instance, to the enduring affliction of a constant misalliance and intercourse with low people?" "There must be a certain distance between me and my son Jacky. There must be a respectful, an amiable, a virtuous hypocrisy between us." Or that grand cry, "O let us be thankful, not only for faces, but for masks!"—When first in presence of these remarks we bow to the Great Photographer; we prefer the Pall Mall philosophy to Plato; we subscribe the "Pendennis" creed, "neither hoping much, nor caring much, nor believing much."

Yet there is a better and truer, a sweeter, and, let us say, a manlier view of life than this; something at once more brilliant than its satire, and broader than its apparent breadth. The preacher who calls everything not in Exeter Hall or not in the cloister the world, and the preacher who calls the world "Vanity Fair," are not so far apart in the result of their morality. There is a similar narrowness in each; for neither sincerely recognise the goodness and nobility which exist beyond their sect. Each is far too fond of repeating "we are all miserable sinners." Each has a standard of wrong, but the standard is not in agreement with the natural conscience. Cumming will not admit excellence without the consciousness of conversion. Thackeray will hardly admit it without the intermixture of pettiness. There is a sense in which the world they satirize is nearer truth than either—a common sense which defines some men as simply generous and great, some as depraved and heartless, with a just decision. We have Pall Mall, it is true, and the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and Pen-

dennis getting his little lecture ready by Wednesday afternoon at the club, and the Major and Barnes in the window; but in "Vanity Fair" there are many, also, who have not accepted the two main articles in Mr. Thackeray's so often repeated "Symbol of Faith," that every one has his or her private skeleton, and that life, after the flush of youth, affords little but the remembrances which, in Dante's Hell, added torture to the tortures of Francesca. He tells his readers somewhere, with a bitter derision, to take a pencil and a scrap of paper (a very small scrap), and try to fill even this with the names of real friends. The present writer followed that amiable suggestion, but found quite another result: he believes most of those on his list would find the same. He ventures to think it would be so with the biographer of Pendennis. Let us honour him for the noble courage with which he proclaims what, not without reasons only too powerful, he holds the truth; but let us hope, also, that all the truth is not ever, or often, or always as he holds it. Even in Baker or Harley Streets, monotonous perspectives to which our clever artist has so often adjusted his focus, may be men honest and true without the eccentricity of Bayham or the feebleness of Olive: women thoughtful, generous, and affectionate, yet free from the shallow sweetness of Amelia or the shallow vivacity of Rosey, the conscientious worldliness and practical scepticism of Ethel, or the demure duty-play and reserved sensible coldness of Laura. And beyond these, or in these (to step through the metaphor of London), are there not the pure air and untarnished sky, the eternal youth, and freedom, and exultation of nature? The world has surely in it much authentic force of feeling, and faithfulness, and unselfish friendship, and holy enthusiasm, and love without folly, and happiness without alloy, undreamed of in the Pall Mall philosophy; hearts too high for pettiness, and knees which will never bow down to Dives. "The blood of the Gods," as the poet said of old, "is not yet extinct amongst us;" there is more of "simplicity, generosity, affection, the richest blessings of our nature," than the editor of the *Newcomes* reckons for.

It is not that such things are not recognised by Mr. Thackeray, but certainly these more heroic and manly elements are too un-conspicuous in much of his delineation: they are recognised, but too often removed, as it were with a decorous bow, into some other world than the "Vanity Fair" which is the scene of all his novels. "We will shut the door, if you please, on that scene." "Our history is of the world, and things pertaining to it. Things beyond it, as the writer imagines, scarcely belong to the novelist's province." A weaker man might naturally speak thus; he might avoid with propriety what he could not handle with taste: but

this assuredly cannot be pleaded as Mr. Thackeray's reason. There is, indeed, something extremely characteristic and diverting in his treatment of the solemn turns or solemn ideas of life. Ordinary novelists preach on birth or death, for example, or shun such matters altogether. Mr. Thackeray, as it were, walks round his serious images, making them, as we have said, his very best bow, and paying God the most lofty compliments. Even what is commonly held the peculiar property of the romance, passion, is far oftener suggested than presented. It is too sacred for a novel, he says in the *Newcomes*. Hence in these narratives we find much more passionateness than force of feeling; an abundance of love-making, but very little love. In a word, the negative principle, the "denying spirit," pervades the atmosphere, and cramps the generous impulses and higher real nature of the writer:—

"She gave him her hand, her little fair hand. The quarrel was all over. The year of grief and estrangement was passed. They never had been separated. His mistress had never been out of his mind all that time. No, not once. No, not in the prison; nor in the camp; nor on shore before the enemy; nor at sea under the stars of solemn midnight; nor as he watched the glorious rising of the dawn: not at the table where he sate carousing with friends, or at the theatre yonder where he tried to fancy that other eyes were brighter than hers. Brighter eyes there might be, and faces more beautiful, but none so dear. What is it? Where lies it, the secret which makes one little hand the dearest of all? Whoever can unriddle that mystery?"

When he dares to be himself, as in that admirable scene of which we cannot venture to quote the conclusion, few have equalled, perhaps none have surpassed him; but he has dared thus too rarely. So the final tone of most among these narratives is uncomfortable. Conscious of this, after a severe touch, Thackeray himself will insert an expostulation. "It is not so; the world is not so bad as this cynic would have us believe." And then he appeals to the reader's own selfishness to verify his satire. But in truth the world is as bad as he paints it, only in a more simple and truer way. In his works, generally, the total good and evil in things has not been exaggerated; but at every unpleasant point we have been told, *this must be so*. People grow with strange vitality in his novels. But it is more strange how rarely they grow better. What a magazine of sarcasm against our neighbours Thackeray has given us! And we may use it without reserve, for do we not willingly confess ourselves no better? "Vanity Fair" is a kind of latterday Eden; the inhabitants are all once more in the Paradisiacal state, naked and not ashamed. We feel, at last, that if he heard Pilate ask "what is truth?" our philoso-

pher would deride the question ; that we have been led round the Fair, not by Faithful, but by Fatalist.

We cannot sum up this criticism better than by suggesting a contrast to the reader. Compare the tone of mind impressed on us by the writings of that great-hearted man to whose honours as laureate of living novelists Mr. Thackeray has unquestionably succeeded. Perhaps limitations not less than those here hinted must be allowed in the case of Scott. "The Bride of Lammermoor" certainly contains not less than "Pendennis" of the meanness of man and the coldness of woman. Each has the same defect, want of depth in passionate delineation. Each is deficient in what it is fashionable to call a "high view of life." Each, again, presents a drama of human existence with magnificent power. Yet, in final impression, the difference we feel is wider than the difference between the atmosphere of a theatre and the atmosphere of Freshwater ; of a ball supper-room and of the "incorruptible sea." We close the "Bride of Lammermoor" with a sense of healthy pain and healthy pleasure ; Pendennis with a "Vanitas Vanitatum."

We return to our former figure. By one artist we find ourselves often in a darkened chamber, where the manipulator is at work amongst acids and films and fumes, producing a marvellous likeness of waistcoat and dress, scowl and simper ; by the other, looking on the world from Arthur's Seat, or the Cheviots, or some similar "mount of speculation," whilst he sketches the scene with far less detail, indeed, and individual accuracy (and at times even over-sedulous on a robe or a cuirass), yet on the whole rendering the deeper human interest dominant, and in all points approving himself not as photographer but as painter.

By the analogy hitherto employed there is no childish intention to imply that our distinguished contemporary is not a real artist also ; that he draws life only in details, or sacrifices altogether the larger view and broader truths of imaginative genius to minute subordinate accuracy. The writer of "Esmond" and the "Newcomes" has a high claim to high art, clear and royal as Correggio's. He may show us the early days and the last days of the Colonel, or the reconciliation in "Esmond," or the charming scenes between George and Theo, and cry "*Auch'io son pittore.*" Envy would not dispute this, and folly is not listened to when she disputes it. Yet by virtue of that secret unity which, like the soul of the world in the visions of philosophy, appears to pervade the ages in succession, a real and organic correlation, as already stated, appears to exist between the process of Mr. Talbot and the process of Mr. Thackeray. He is not indeed absolutely alone in his method. Many novelists have filled volumes of delicate detail. Miss Austen, with modesty equal to her genius, described

her masterpieces as mere miniature-painting. It is easy to call to mind others who, without her modesty or her genius, have given us works which might be justly so described. But the microscopic accuracy of passages in almost every page of "Pendennis" or "Vanity Fair," is as much beyond the rivals of the author as Mr. Kilburn's portraits are beyond Denner's. It must be regretted much that he republished his first sketches; but the Miscellanies, as we have them, allow a curious glimpse into the working of the writer's mind, show from how early a date he has made it his aim to photograph society, and explain the bearing of his later progress.

"The tip-top men of the Bootjack Club were two bachelors, and two as fashionable tradesmen as any in the town. Mr. Woolsey, from Stultz's, of the famous house of Linsey, Woolsey, and Co., of Conduit-street, tailors, and Mr. Eglantine, the celebrated perruquier and perfumer of Bond street, whose soaps, razors, and patent ventilating scalps, are known throughout Europe. Linsey, the senior partner of the tailors' firm, had his handsome mansion in Regent's Park, drove his buggy, and did little more than lend his name to the house. Woolsey lived in it, was the working man of the firm, and it was said that his cut was as magnificent as that of any man in the profession. . . . There is about an acre of plate glass under the royal arms on Mr. Eglantine's shop window; and at night, when the gas is lighted, and the washballs are illuminated, and the lambent flame plays fitfully over numberless bottles of vari-coloured perfumes—now flashes on a case of razors, and now lightens up a crystal vase containing a hundred thousand of his patent toothbrushes—the effect of the sight may be imagined. You don't suppose that he is a creature who has those odious, simpering wax figures in his window, that are called by the vulgar dummies? He is above such a wretched artifice. On one pane you read in elegant gold letters 'Eglantina'—'tis his essence for the handkerchief; on the other is written 'Regenerative Unction'—'tis his invaluable pomatum for the hair."

"Benjamin Baroski was one of the chief ornaments of the musical profession in London. . . . he had a school at his own residence, where pupils assembled in considerable numbers, and of that curious mixed kind which those may see who frequent those places of instruction. There was Miss Grigg, who sang at the Foundling, and Mr. Johnson, who sang at the Eagle Tavern, and Madame Fioravanti (a *very* doubtful character), who sang nowhere, but was always coming out at the Italian Opera. There was Lawley Limpiter (Lord Tweeddale's son), one of the most accomplished tenors in town, and who, we have heard, sings with the professionals at a hundred concerts; and with him, too, was Captain Guzzard of the Guards, with his tremendous bass voice, which all the world declared to be as fine as Porto's, and who shared the applauses of Baroski's school with Mr. Bulger, the dentist of Sackville-street, who neglected his ivory and gold plates for his voice, as every unfortunate individual will do who is bitten by the music mania."

This manner of work, which not only fills page after page of the "Ravenswing," but is, in fact, the whole substance of that random story, is a wonderful feat after its fashion. It rivals Nature in accuracy and sharpness: it is almost more photographic than photography. It is at the same time inexpressibly wearisome and provoking. Like Dogberry, when he found his humour appreciated, the relentless writer has "inflicted all his tediousness on your worships." Let us quote one or two later scenes by the same hand:—

"What could equal the chaste splendour of the drawing-rooms? The carpets were so magnificently fluffy that your foot made no more noise on them than your shadow. On their white ground bloomed roses and tulips as big as warming-pans. About the room were high chairs and low chairs, bandy-legged chairs, chairs so attenuated that it was a wonder any but a sylph could sit upon them, marqueterie tables covered with marvellous gimcracks, china ornaments of all ages and countries, bronzes, gilt daggers, Books of Beauty, yataghans, Turkish papooshes, and boxes of Parisian bonbons. Wherever you sat down there were Dresden shepherds and shepherdesses convenient at your elbow; there were, moreover, light blue poodles, and ducks, and cocks, and hens in porcelain; there were nymphs by Boucher and shepherdesses by Greuze, very chaste, indeed; there were muslin curtains and brocade curtains, gilt cages with parroquets and love-birds, two squealing cockatoos, each out-squealing and out-chattering the other; a clock singing tunes on a console table, and another booming the hours like Great Tom, on the mantel-piece—there was, in a word, everything that comfort could desire, and the most elegant taste devise. A London drawing-room, fitted up without regard to expense, is surely one of the noblest and most curious sights of the present day. The Romans of the Lower Empire, the dear Marchionesses and Countesses of Louis XV., could scarcely have had a finer taste than our modern folks exhibit; and everybody who saw Lady Clavering's reception-rooms, was forced to confess that they were most elegant; and that the prettiest rooms in London—Lady Harley Quin's, Lady Hanway Wardour's, or Mrs. Hodge-Podgson's own, the great railroad Cræsus' wife, were not fitted up with a more consummate 'chastity.'

"Poor Lady Clavering, meanwhile, knew little regarding these things, and had a sad want of respect for the splendours around her. 'I only know they cost a precious deal of money, Major,' she said to her guest, 'and that I don't advise you to try one of them gossamer gilt chairs. I came down on one the night we gave our second dinner-party,' &c.

Or again:—

"Though I would like to go into an Indian Brahmin's house and see the punkahs, and the purdahs, and tattys, and the pretty brown maidens with great eyes, and great nose-rings, and painted foreheads, and slim waists cased in Cashmir shawls, Kincob scarfs, curly slippers, gilt trousers, precious anklets, and bangles; and have the mystery of

Eastern existence revealed to me (as who would not who has read the 'Arabian Nights' in his youth?), yet I would not choose the moment when the Brahmin of the house was dead, his women howling, his priest doctoring his child of a widow, now frightening her with sermons, now drugging her with bang, so as to push her on his funeral pile at last, and into the arms of that carcase, stupified, but obedient and decorous. And though I like to walk, even in fancy, in an earl's house, splendid, well-ordered, where there are feasts, and fine pictures, and fair ladies, and endless books, and good company; yet there are times when the visit is not pleasant; and when the parents in that one house are getting ready their daughter for sale, and frightening away her tears with threats, and stupifying her grief with narcotics, praying her and-imploing her, and dramming her and coaxing her, and blessing her, and cursing her perhaps, till they have brought her into such a state as shall fit the poor young thing for that deadly couch upon which they are about to thrust her. When my lord and lady are so engaged I prefer not to call at their mansion, number 1,000 in Grosvenor Square, but to partake of a dinner of herbs rather than of that stalled ox which their cook is roasting whole. There are some people who are not so squcamish. The family comes, of course; the Most Reverend the Lord Arch-Brahmin of Benares will attend the ceremony; there will be flowers, and lights, and white favours; and quite a string of carriages up to the pagoda; and such a breakfast afterwards; and music in the streets and little parish boys hurrahing; and no end of speeches within and tears shed (no doubt), and his Grace the Arch-Brahmin will make a highly-appropriate speech, just with a faint scent of incense about it as such a speech ought to have, and the young person will slip away unperceived, and take off her veils, wreaths, orange flowers, bangles, and finery, and will put on a plain dress more suited for the occasion, and the house-door will open—and there comes the SUTTEE in company of the body”

Not only are these passages, chosen from a perplexity of wealth, admirable in their way, but they have also the far higher merit of absolute subordination to the main lines of the narrative. It is here that they differ essentially from the earlier specimens. Minuteness without purpose is pettiness in its most annoying form. But minuteness which makes part of an organic whole is the finish of nature transferred to art. In union with this fine accuracy, Mr. Thackeray uses a further method to heighten the vivacity of his realization. Whilst some novelists (as Scott) have placed fictitious characters and characters of history on the same stage, or (as the much over-praised Balzac) create another, but not a better world for the performance of their puppet-show, Thackeray's "Vanity Fair" is a kind of *demi-monde*, which, at a word, will be ready to transmute itself into London within the bills of mortality. He has sometimes carried this trick of art into the false taste of deceptive imitation. We use with reluctance a word which is rarely heard except on the

lips of those to whom it is applicable; but we think that the effect thus produced, like the effect of that very childish toy the Stereoscope, has a certain character of vulgarity. Thackeray, however, occasionally employs this artifice with much grace, and generally with discretion. And it enables him undoubtedly to point his moral with greater force, by rendering the fable itself more credible. He knits his narrative, it has been well remarked, "at every point to some link of our every-day experience." We are always on the brink of the transformation in the pantomime; we expect each moment to come on our friends, perhaps on our own selves, and often, it must be confessed, in some mean, or selfish, or ludicrous attitude. We can name Lord Steyne or Mr. Newcome; we could say, "Drive to Great Gaunt-street," quite naturally.

The day must be very far off when these brilliant delineations shall have lost all their interest, or the chronicler of our century be with the chroniclers of the Middle Ages. Yet, turn it as we may, this marvellous photography in words, even when subordinate to the general truth and scope of the picture, seems to have held often an influence too dominant and tyrannous over the artist. The likeness already dwelt on is not confined to the general similarity and power of the imitation. It extends to what we spoke of at starting as the special peculiarity of the imitation itself, and of the sphere of the objects to which it is directed—the limitations of the actual art are reflected in Mr. Thackeray's work not less accurately than its powers. In both the gloom of nature is exaggerated. In both the high lights tend to monotony. Cloudland and the clear heavens are beyond the effective province of either. In both, the wider the landscape, the less the veracity of the rendering. Hence both give us rather a brilliant sequence of scenes than a perfect whole. Although brilliant exceptions may be found, the sphere of both is always rather the products of art than the masterpieces of nature. And in both the dress is apt to surpass the features; the features are transferred with the utmost truth to momentary expression or gesture, but rarely are lighted up with the flash of the soul. We are shown rather the manner than the character. The work is all from without inwards. It has been complained that we find in Thackeray an absence almost total of forcible ideas; that his thoughts are never those "that lie too deep for tears;" that his persons have no serious aim in life; that they are not exhibited except within the sphere of society. These criticisms in substance are more or less correct: but the points criticised are inevitable on the method chosen. A great artist will express the silent discourse of the soul within the soul through his chisel or his colours; will reveal to us, by some

mysterious magic, not what Burke or Tompkinson would say, or how comport themselves in actual conversation; but the secret processes of the mind, the hidden nature of which their best words or most energetic actions will be but the partial and incomplete representatives. So in poetry. Before Homer brings Ulysses on the scene, we know his character from the results of his absence. We know what will be the reply of Antigone before the song of "Love, love, unconquered in the battle," has ended. As before observed, we know what Virgilia will say from her silence. Shakspeare makes us at once strangely intimate with Hamlet, and removes us from him by the vitality and force of the delineation. We see Hamlet's heart, but are afraid to examine his dress until he calls our attention to its colour. Or, in another manner, Fielding, to whom except in some superficial types the inner man was a world inaccessible, is able to withdraw his figures to the background with success by his noble command of manly thought and true philosophical reflection. In his Warrington and Esmond, in the George of the "Virginians," and the Colonel of the "Newcomes," Thackeray has also initiated us into the mystery of life, has painted the character from within, and enabled us to look at it in its unity. But he generally will not place the spectator or himself very near or very far from his actors; he keeps a good photographic distance. Viewed from a distance, his world affords only a few generalizations, not from life, but from society.

In his works the limited range of photographic pictures is also reproduced. Serious art in figures hardly falls within the grasp of photography; the fine gradations of landscape escape it. In an analogous manner Thackeray excludes generally from his drama not only, as we have said, the larger views of life as a whole, but almost every mode of life which does not fall within social precincts. The Markborough of "Esmond" is hardly shown except in his meannesses; the Pretender only in his vileness. The Waterloo of "Vanity Fair" is transacted without Wellington and without Napoleon. Even in the "Virginians"—a historical picture of yet unappreciated excellence—a hero far greater than either is rather indicated than presented. Yet even thus, the presence of Washington adds a nobleness to the narrative. The author on this point clearly follows a well-considered plan, which it might be presumptuous to criticise. But as the general is inadmissible in his novels, so are the common soldier, the common labourer, the common people. None of these have any definite place in "Vanity Fair": an insolvent banker is the nearest approach Thackeray will make to poverty. The poor in his pages are represented by women in service and men in livery.

[Vol. LXXIV. No. CXLVI.]—*New Spars*, Vol. XVIII. No. II. M M

who act as foils or caricatures or masters of their masters. It must be owned that high success in this region of narrative is of the last rarity. "The short and simple annals of the poor" do not lend themselves to a romantic treatment. They are often tragic, but seldom poetic. The just and generous interest in the condition of the labouring classes, which is now so marked a feature in English life, has had an unhappy effect on English novelists. It has led them to present the poor, not as pictures of real life, but as subjects for experiment and vehicles for declamation, often religious and almost always morbid. It would be most unfair to deny that much good has been effected by men who fancy that political economy is a heartless thing, and sentimental economy a heavenly thing. But if anything could render this acknowledgment distasteful, it would be the jargon of "social problems" which infects philanthropical romance. Thackeray's good taste and good sense have led him to reject such elements of partisan interest. Ethel Newcome, indeed, in penitence, the least successful of his characterizations, is reduced to the level of the heroine in a High Church story. But this conclusion is mathematically necessitated by her antecedents, and is only suggested to the reader. We think Mr. Thackeray right in *excluding from his novels matters uncongenial with their scope, although matters on which he undoubtedly feels not less deeply and justly than novelists who have made the relations of rich and poor their subject.* But we must allow ourselves to regret that he has not been led to enlarge the scope of his delineations. Perhaps he might think this the idle wish that a man should be other than he is; the wish that Milton had possessed Shakspeare's dramatic genius, or that Byron had given his poems the finish of Tennyson. Such are indeed vain aspirations. But when a man has noble powers, it may be lawful to desire that he should not restrict the sphere of their operation. Thus we may hope that, like Goldsmith, Thackeray may in due time show the sweet and noble aspects of honest poverty. Without complaining that he is not Fielding, we may be sorry that the hand which has drawn a second Amelia has not also drawn another Andrews. Without complaining that he does not revive mediæval Europe in his stories, we may wish that we did not look in vain through his gallery for pictures analogous to the pictures of Edie Ochiltree, or Meg Doda, or Jeanie Deans, of the Fisherman of Musselcrag, or the Farmer of Liddesdale, or the many other living portraits of the children of the soil which ennoble the dramas of our second Shakspeare.

Too much, may be, of such considerations. It is enough to point out that Thackeray keeps his characters within a certain circle. So small a portion of our nature do his men and women

cover, so remote are they from the idea of essential manhood, that in them Plato or Pascal would hardly recognise their common humanity. We might almost say, what Paris is to France, London is to Mr. Thackeray: that his day is not our waking hours, but only our hours in the drawing or the dining-room. When Clive or Pendennis leave it, it is difficult to fancy that they leave it to act or to think in real earnest; we cannot imagine them alone; like the phenomenal world in Berkeley's philosophy, when not looked at they appear to sink into non-existence. Their inventor, no doubt, follows them home: but he drops the veil there with wonderful grace and humour. Hence it has been superficially argued that they have no definite aim in life. Mr. Thackeray has defended himself against the charge that he only paints persons at leisure, by stating that it is then only that they become dramatic and entertaining. In another place he says, "Since the author of 'Tom Jones' was buried, no writer of fiction among us has been permitted to depict to his utmost power a man. We must drape him, and give him a certain conventional simper." A better reason is, that only by the treatment he has adopted can his figures be brought within the requisite social focus.

Our analogy fails in one respect. There can be no question that Mr. Thackeray's portraiture is on the whole less successful or less complete with men than with women. In this point he has held the mirror to nature with too much truth for his popularity. He has thoroughly drawn some lesser heroes,—Dobbin, Osborne, father and son, the Major, Costigan, the Colonel in the "Newcomes," and in "Esmond," and as skilfully as thoroughly. But the necessity to keep his delineations within the sphere of social life, has placed the whole life of his principal male actors beyond his attempting. Pendennis, and Warrington, and Clive, in their integrity, are either too feeble for effect or would outrun the limits of the canvas. A further ground for this comparative—shall we say failure, or limitation? lies in what we have called the negative element of the writer's mind. From another point of view it might have been called the feminine element. He sympathizes heartily with manliness and spirit; but he believes less heartily in warmth of nature and unselfishness. In other words, his sympathies are towards the nature of man, and his convictions with the nature of woman. This statement rests, indeed, on a very general induction, and in the "number numberless" of human creatures, admits exceptions of course, which every reader will make, many or few, from personal experience. Yet no one who, uncorrupted by prejudice or flattery, examines the subject, will doubt that women differ most from men, not in vividness of intellect or in capacity for serious aims, in strength

of character or will or courage, but in comparative coldness of nature. They have a narrower and less diffused affectionateness, and this affectionateness itself is lessened by its concentration. For the strength of human faculties is precisely and inevitably proportioned to their exercise; and reserve loses even the talent she had hoarded. It is true that Mr. Thackeray has once described unselfishness as the characteristic of women. His own extensive female portrait-gallery amply shows that this cannot be his formal or genuine decision. The character of Amelia, he tells us, has been considered a failure. It is a failure only because it is felt to be too successfully true. Some better and higher elements in *Laura* are brought to nothing, in part perhaps from the circumstances of her story. An allusion is enough to Rebecca and Blanche, to Lady Kew and Beatrix. Examination of their characters would bring out the inventor's subtle and amazing truth of insight; but without further analysis, it will be sufficient if we take the heroines of what (were it needful to choose) would probably be selected by competent judges as the most perfect of his novels. Ethel Newcome is Thackeray's avowed favourite: he has lavished labour on her which will assuredly render her a living creature beyond the days of the author's great-grandchildren. But Ethel after all defeats his intention: her nature is too powerful for her delineator. He tells us she is generous; she is only proud and prodigal: affectionate, and she cares for no one except those whom she can patronize, and those to whom her affection is of little value. With a truth the more fatal from its unconsciousness, Thackeray paints the genuine girlish energy with which she loves her father after he is paralysed, and her uncle when broken-hearted by her rejection of Clive. What she has is "not fairness, but May-fairness;" smartness mistaken for wit, caprice for imagination, and crafty candour disguised as openness. She is truly religious; but her religion is only her worldliness sentimentalized: her wishes are her conscience; and it must be owned she obeys it without hesitation. But meanwhile, beneath all professions of faith, she holds that deadly practical scepticism which arises from disbelief in her fellow-creatures. It is not worth her while to care for anything. Ethel's conduct deserves the admiration which it draws from her designer: it is a triumph of cold sensible selfishness; a masterpiece of the wisdom which is not from above. Thackeray himself wishes to believe, but cannot believe, that she rewards at last the constancy of her cousin:—that Lord Farintosh is successful next season, that Ethel dies a Marchioness, we should think few readers do not know is the real conclusion of the chronicle. •Whilst Miss Newcome is presented as a type of the loftier woman, Rosa Mackenzie, with equal force and clearness, typifies an ordinary nature—simple, sweet, passive, and

caressing, until she can secure the be-all and end-all of life in a good establishment: then sly, vain, wilful, and cold-hearted when there is no need further of hypocrisy. These two characters are drawn as direct opposites, yet in essence they are not far apart. The necessity of truth, stronger if not stranger than fiction, has united them in a common bond of ungenerous selfishness.

The absence of forcible thought complained of in Thackeray, harmonizes perfectly with what we have called his photographic process; but in justice it should be noted, also, that this absence is common to almost all his predecessors. Beside Fielding and Goethe, both in many points far his inferiors in romance, it is difficult to name novelists proper who have not shared the deficiency. We except such writings as Swift's, or Sterne's, or Johnson's: Gulliver, Shandy, and Rasselas, masterpieces in their way, are hardly masterpieces of the novel. There is no sustained thought, no "ideas" as such in De Foe, or Richardson, or Smollett, or Miss Austen; in the "Vicar of Wakefield," or the Waverley series. What was meant for thought in some other celebrated novelists has not added to their fame. More justly it may be complained of Thackeray that the "generalizations from social observation" which fill the place of reflection in his stories, are overtinged with the negative spirit already noticed. Remarks that all men are selfish, all women hypocrites, that all born Britons worship wealth and rank, no household without its skeleton-closets, youth only worth living, life a compromise, and love a folly or a transaction, are put with such variety, vivacity, and force, that we forget not only the larger and sweeter remarks which are hardly less frequent though less emphasized, but also that the course of the story itself does not always confirm that negative philosophy. Right and wrong, courage and meanness, work out their results in "Esmond," in the "Newcomes," and in the "Virginians," with an approach as near as one man can make to the experience of everybody. Thus it is in these novels that Mr. Thackeray shows himself a creative artist in the full force of the term; preserving his minute accuracy, and yet rising above it to larger truth. It is worth noting that the books named, we believe, obtained at the moment of their appearance a progressively diminishing popularity. If so, there was nothing wonderful in this false judgment: nay, it was strictly necessitated by their antecedents. It is but another form of the difficulty and repugnance with which ordinary spectators turn from photographic landscapes to the landscape of Turner. When, conquering the inevitable reluctance to confess and to comprehend originality, men have fairly embraced the style of a great writer, they become even more reluctant to recognise new developments of his originality. This will be the case above all if the first style in any

way appealed to their lower nature. And by the character of his early works, Mr. Thackeray had eminently exposed himself to such misconstruction. It is impossible to worship moderation and extravagance together: to believe in burlesque, and to sympathize with mere simplicity. Readers who profoundly admired the *divitias operosiores* of "Jcames" or "Lyndon," could do no genuine homage to "Esmond" and the "Newcomes." The reluctance they would have to overcome is perfectly natural. For there is no tendency, whether in morals, or taste, or intellect, which grows with such portentous speed as the tendency to pettiness. It is gratifying to us in a hundred ways. It is the most comfortable of doctrines. It is under the powerful and constant influence of female patronage. It is the Gospel of the Drawing-room, the Philosophy of the Immediate. And Mr. Thackeray's own genius has in part allured the world into this vice by accustoming it to the minute detail, to the minute and applicable sarcasm which are the pure delight of pettiness. Hence readers regretted that the later narratives ran on in a broader and more historical stream, or supplied less microscopic detail and smartness of satire on neighbours slightly disguised: whilst again, familiarized with these by "Vanity Fair" and "Pendennis," they were not ready to recognise the higher aim, more ideal at once and more real, of the "Esmond" narratives, or do justice to the calmer breadth, subtler humour, and more complete characterization of the "Newcomes." In a word, there has here been perhaps a temporary preference of the mannerism to the man.

When a writer has reached eminence such as this one, or distanced so far his fellows in so arduous a race, it may be idle for the critic (who is nowhere) to make professions of respect, or express his conviction that the books named above will one day be more truly valued, and pass into the pleasure and the pride of many generations in every quarter of our planet. Mr. Thackeray is already far beyond some of the most celebrated names on the list of the Humorists. But we desire to remark, in summary, that the first practice of this great artist has held an injurious influence over his development; that the element in his work which has been spoken of as photographic has a real analogy with that process in power and vividness, in its force and in its limitation; that this power, wonderful as it is and almost essential to narrative excellence, is of value only when subordinated to larger unity and poetical insight; that the permanence and the value of Thackeray's work rest on those higher faculties of imagination and sympathy, on the vital truth in character and inner vision, which are not so much in the background as in the foundation of the world he has created. It is from the wish to

bring out these points more clearly that we have ventured on analogies which must not be pressed far, and, with reference to a too-prevailing mannerism in his writings, have compared the processes of Mr. Thackeray and of Mr. Talbot. It is not meant to suggest that far higher elements are absent from any one of the mature works of the novelist. Yet there is a certain sense in which the two processes touch. And we think the moral will be found true on reflection, that these are charming and delicate arts; but Art is quite another matter.



CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY.

M. ERNEST RENAN, with indefatigable industry, presents us this year with a translation and illustration of the "Song of Solomon,"¹ on the same plan as his translation of the Book of Job. He gives his distinct adhesion to the opinion, which is now adopted by the best Biblical investigators and Orientalists, that this composition is neither a sensual epithalamium, nor a mystical prophecy, but a remarkable remnant of the secular Hebrew literature; that it is of a moral tendency according to the standards of the East, describing the temptations of a rural maiden by the seductions of the royal harem and her fidelity to her peasant lover. It is true that this explanation is not without difficulties, particularly when the parts of the poem have to be distributed to the several supposed actors in the drama. Drama properly so called was never developed among the Semites as it was by the Greeks and Hindus; and in recognising something of a dramatic action in the "Song of Songs," we must be prepared for an entire disregard of what we are accustomed to call the dramatic unities. This composition was probably performed or sung at marriage celebrations—the parts of Solomon, the maiden, the peasant, the chorus, being assigned to different performers, who give expression to the feelings and imaginations proper to those different characters, rather than develop in order a continuous tale. According to more classic models, we should first have been presented with the courtship and betrothal of the rural lovers, and the carrying off of the maiden, through the betrayal of her family, to the royal harem—then with a description of the voluptuousness of the seraglio; the attempts and repulse of the king; the pursuit of the lover; his recognition, and the escape of the virgin; the night wandering in Jerusalem and final escape to the country. In the poem these parts do not follow in any regular order, and are, some of them, not so much presented by the actors as remembered or imagined by them. These allowances being made, the difficulties of the composition are very much diminished. It need not be observed, that a double sense is out of the question. M. Renan traces the historical growth of the mystical interpretation to the principle early adopted by Jewish and Christian interpreters and consistently developed by Origen—that an inner sense must be sought for all which in the sacred books is unworthy of the divine Spirit. But when once the secular character is acknowledged of such compositions as this Canticle, or Psalm xlv., the necessity for

¹ "Le Cantique des Cantiques, traduit de l'Hebreu avec une étude sur le plan, l'âge et le caractère du poëme." Par Ernest Renan.

this artificial interpretation at once disappears. As to the date of the poem, M. Renan places it after the death of Solomon and the division of the kingdom, at all events between that event B.C. 986 and B.C. 924 when, on the building of Samaria, Tirzah ceased to be the capital of the kingdom of Israel (see chapter vi. 4). He accounts for the apparent Chaldaic forms which are sometimes thought to indicate a date approaching to that of the captivity, by pointing out that the native region of the poem is to be sought in the North of Palestine, where the forms of the language would approximate to the Chaldaic, and that much stress is not to be laid upon the occurrence of a single word (*παράδεισος*, *παράδεισος*) apparently of modern date. The philological part of the discussion might be carried on interminably and with very little result, but it is very important to notice that the local allusions in the poem are found to be to places in the North—and that Solomon himself plays but a very indifferent part in the action—is almost openly held up to contempt. His grandeur even is much less exaggerated than in the late compilations of Kings and Chronicles (comp. vi. 8 with 1 Kings xi. 3), consistently both with an earlier date and an Israelitish origin. Lastly, we must mention with approbation, as we have had occasion to do more than once in reviewing the works of this most able, clear-sighted, and fearless Biblical critic, the respect with which he treats old opinions, at the same time that he is courageously uprooting them, and the tenderness with which he speaks of doctrines, as historical phenomena, which he may think to have no sound critical basis.

“Ce n'est jamais sans crainte que l'on porte la main sur ces textes sacrés qui ont fondé ou soutenu les espérances de l'éternité, ni que l'on rectifie au nom de la science critique, ces contre-sens séculaires qui ont consolé l'humanité, l'ont aidée à traverser tant d'arides déserts et lui ont fait conquérir des vérités fort supérieures à celles de la philologie. Il vaut mieux que l'humanité ait espéré le Messie que bien entendu tel endroit d'Isaïe ou elle a cru le voir annoncé; il vaut mieux qu'elle ait cru à la résurrection que bien lu et bien compris tel passage obscur du *Livre de Job*, sur la foi duquel elle a affirmé sa délivrance future.” (Pref. xii.)

We are exceedingly sorry to see that Dr. Donaldson has brought out a second edition of the very wild book which he entitles “*Jasher*.” It is an injury to his own reputation and to the cause of free Biblical inquiry. On the appearance of the first edition some people took it for a hoax—others thought that some cause of excitement had for a while destroyed the balance of a studious person's faculties. No excuse that we are aware of can be valid for its reproduction. There is no point whatever strengthened in this edition—no proof that the “*Book of Jasher*” was such as this author describes it to have been—no proof of its date—much less of its date as a whole book—not the slightest evidence that any passage whatever now to be found in the Old Testa-

“*Jasher. Fragmenta Archetypa Cæmiam Hebraicorum in Masorothico Corpus Testamenti Textu passim tessellata collegit, ordinavit, restituit, in unum corpus redogit, latine exhibuit, commentario instruxit.*” J. G. Donaldson, S. Th. Doc. Col. SS. Tripartite apud Oxford. quondam tpe. Editio 2da aucta atque emendata. London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate. 1860.

ment ever was included in the Book of Jasher beyond the two where reference is made to it. Dr. Donaldson ought at least to have published his second edition in English; if his German judges would have none of him, he should have "appealed to the people"—more would have read his book in English than will ever read it in Latin; and there is nothing in it—not excepting the far-fetched etymologies, which remind us indeed of the days of "*napkin, pipkin, cucumber*," on which the ordinarily educated Englishman would not be competent to give a verdict, though it might not be such as would please Dr. Donaldson. The learned Doctor must not flatter himself that his reconstruction of the "Book of Jasher" is only ridiculed by those who would stickle for the reality of the astronomical miracle in Joshua, or for the universality of the deluge, or for the literal acceptation of the history of Adam and Eve and the serpent. It is marvellous, if he is really in earnest in this book, that he should have no misgiving he may be under a mistake. Or if his ambition is to carry on a war like a Bentley, he should choose a better battle-field. There are a few pages in this edition amusing enough in Preface Latin—though they would be flat enough in an English translation—those in which the author vents his resentment against Ewald for the contempt with which he has treated his book; he says, fairly enough, that Ewald assumes in Germany the airs of a literary Dictator, with Bunsen for his Master of the Horse:—Ewald will, of course, be able to retort, that Donaldson would be critical Dictator in England—but he has no Master of the Horse.

Dr. Credner's³ posthumous work on the "Canon of the New Testament," edited by Dr. Volkmar of Zurich, is a very fair historical account of it from its earliest formation to the period of the Reformation. There are no inferences intruded into it which do not properly belong to the subject in hand. The most interesting disquisition in the volume is that concerning the evidence supplied in the works of Justin for the existence in his day of an evangelical history like that contained in our four Gospels. The more probable conclusion seems to be that Justin, when he speaks of the memoirs of the Apostles, cannot be proved to have referred to the four Gospels as we now have them—he seems to have used in his own quotations a single gospel, or a single collection, not corresponding precisely to any gospel now extant—although Credner thinks that he must have been acquainted with three of our four Gospels. Meanwhile the gap between Justin and the date of the events of the life of Jesus is already very wide, and the most remarkable thing is, that nothing like our Gospels is cited in any of the Apostolical Epistles.

In a supplementary volume to his Greek Testament,⁴ Dr. Bloom-

³ "Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanon." Von Carl August Credner. Herausgegeben von Dr. G. Volkmar, Prof. d. Theologie an der Universität Zürich. London: Williams and Norgate. 1860.

⁴ "Critical Annotations, Additional and Supplementary, on the New Testament, being a Supplemental Volume to the sixth edition of the "Greek Testament with English Notes." By the Rev. S. T. Bloomfield, D.D., Vicar of Blythbrooke, Rutland, Canon of Peterborough. London: Longman and Co. 1860.

field has collected a great mass of critical matter, the result of extended collations of MSS. and of a minute weighing of evidence, internal and external, on their various readings. It is a valuable addition to the *apparatus criticus* of the student in a small compass.

Dr. Lamson's "Church of the first three Centuries"⁵ is a repertory of information concerning the development of the doctrine of the Trinity. The history of its growth is given with great fairness, embodying by ample quotations from the ante-Nicene Fathers what they really thought and said on the subject of the mode of existence of the Divine Being. Dr. Lamson puts aside as spurious, and at any rate as full of interpolations, the writings of the so-called Apostolical Fathers, and introduces his readers to Justin as forming the first ascertained link in the succession of patristical authorities. All orthodox Trinitarians, we apprehend, will acknowledge that Justin is unsound according to their views with respect to their cardinal dogma, and popular Evangelicals must do the same with respect to their favourite tenets of justification, atonement, and grace. The opinions of Justin are cited for the most part by Dr. Lamson as they are given by Dr. Kaye, late Bishop of Lincoln, an unexceptionable authority. After Justin we touch slightly on Tatian, Theophilus of Antioch, Irenæus, and Tertullian, and come to Clement of Alexandria. A very complete analysis is given of his principal works where they present anything bearing on the present subject. The same may be said concerning Origen, the review of whose complicated theological views is very able and interesting. We thus approach the Nicene period itself, and the framing of the creed so denominated. "No little difficulty was experienced in framing a symbol which would prove generally acceptable, and at the same time have the effect of excluding the Arians." They would have accepted any formula composed of scriptural expressions. Eusebius the historian offered a creed which was at first approved by all, but unhappily it contained no term which the Arian must necessarily reject. At length it was discovered from a letter of Eusebius of Nicomedia, that he and the Arians had a great dread of the word *consubstantial*; it was therefore precisely the term which was wanted, and notwithstanding the protests of the minority founded upon its unscripturableness and its novelty, it was inserted in the creed. The distinguishing doctrine of Arius was, that the Son was originally produced out of nothing—the first and chief of all derived beings, yet that there was a time when he did not exist.

Dr. Lamson and Neander observe that Arius probably intended not to introduce a new dogma, but to defend the old doctrine of the Church—or at least we may say an inference from it. The definition of the nature and functions of the third person in the Trinity as now recited in what is called the Nicene Creed, was not added until the Council of Constantino in 381. The same personifying process which

⁵ "The Church of the first three Centuries; or, Notices of the Lives and Opinions of some of the early Fathers, with special reference to the Doctrine of the Trinity; illustrating its late origin and gradual formation." By Alvan Lamson, D.D. Boston: Walker, Wise, and Co. 1860.

had first been applied to the reason or wisdom of God was afterwards applied to His illuminating operation. But not even as supplemented at Constantinople does the Nicene Creed express the doctrine of the Trinity as it was afterwards held. Dr. Lamson sums up this part of his inquiry as follows :—

“The principal points of difference between the views of the fathers who lived before the synod, and the asserters of the genuine Trinity afterwards, may be stated in few words. The former taught the supremacy of the Father, and the real and proper inferiority of the Son, without qualification; making them in fact two beings. The latter asserted, not simply an equality of nature between the Father and Son, but their individual and numerical identity; though this was not originally the doctrine of Athanasius, nor of the Church till some time after the middle of the fourth century.” (p. 227.)

• This is not, however, a complete statement of the Trinitarian hypothesis, which supposes a numerical identity of essence, and a numerical diversity of function corresponding with and founded upon an existential distinction in the one essence, and if the Trinitarian hypothesis was a mere speculation, so likewise was the Arian. As to the temper of the two parties, though there was often much to blame on both sides, the Arians would willingly have accepted a creed which could also have been subscribed by the Trinitarians. In reviewing the whole movement during the three first centuries, Dr. Lamson has omitted, as we think, to observe, in fairness, that in one point the Trinitarian hypothesis affiliates itself to the primitive doctrine of the Divine (Logos) Word or Wisdom better than the Arian. The Reason or Wisdom of God is of the essence of God and of His eternity; so that the term *homoousios* “of the unity of the Divine essence,” would be more proper to express it than *homoiousios*, “of a likeness to the Divine essence.” And further, in tracing very justly the doctrine of the Logos to a Philonian source, he has omitted to remark that the views given in the fourth Gospel are from the same source—that the Logos is there already hypostatized, is not only an eternal potency, but an energy before time, which to human thought is equivalent to an anterior eternity. Moreover, in reopening at all these old discussions, no advance will be made upon the fruitless debates of former generations, unless the Scriptural expressions themselves be subjected to the same criticism and analysis as the patristical ones. If the words of St. John’s Gospel, for instance, are to be appealed to as an ultimate authority, creeds will continue to be made to fit some of them and to put a strain upon others. But if it is acknowledged that many expressions in that Gospel, as well as in Justin, are traceable to the school of Philo, then it will not be felt an absolute necessity to frame a theory of divinity in accordance with them, and the whole inquiry will become really free.

• We ought not, however, to omit to direct attention to two extremely interesting and illustrative chapters “On the Artistic Representations of the Trinity,” derived principally from a work of M. Didron,⁶ and

⁶ “Iconographie Chrétienne; Histoire de Jésus.” Par M. Didron, de la Bibliothèque Royale, Secrétaire du Comité Historique des Arts et Monuments. Paris, 1843.

showing that pictorial representations of the Trinity were eight or nine centuries shaping themselves into the forms with which we are acquainted in illuminated missals, and other works of medieval Christian art.

There is a growing desire to bring to light the higher divine truths lying at the root of the various speculative and doctrinal systems, which while they divide Churches, are utterly unsatisfying to their thoughtful members. A deep feeling of the variance between the old religious faiths and the convictions forced upon us by modern discoveries in the physical and moral world, is said to have haunted from youth the author of "Glimpses of the Heaven that lies about us."⁷ The present work exhibits an attempt to bring them into unison, not at all for the purpose of setting Faith and Reason in opposition, nor as if it were a gain to believe less than others do. The Universe is one, and must be in harmony with itself throughout. And in speaking of the Universe as one, God is included in it; for in opposition to the thesis of Comte, that the Theological era is past and the positive era come, the author maintains that, "The era is come when Theology and Positivism are one." They are one, for there is One cause of All; and it is not far to seek. It is a like or rather the same cause with that which we are conscious moves ourselves. Upon the principles of "Parsimony" and of the "Sufficient Reason," we are prohibited from multiplying causes—nay, the tendency of modern observation is to the conclusion that one and the same cause is sufficient, and therefore to be presumed for the phenomena of gravitation, of chemical affinities, of animal and vegetable life, and of the moral and intellectual life of man. But it is a still more striking application of these principles when the author concludes that we are not only to abstain from multiplying unnecessarily secondary causes—we are not justified in presuming causes to be secondary and mediate, when they may be no other than the immediate energies of the One Cause whom we call God, carrying on, ever present, "in the various organisms, the work of his perpetual creation." The author anticipates in the Introduction that such views will be denominated Pantheistic, and maintains that they contain an antidote for Pantheism.

"Pantheism is the conception of the Universe as God. According to it, nature and human minds are all only parts of one MYSTERIOUS ALL, called God, but not thought of as a personal Being, as having thoughts and affections like the Christian God.

"Now instead of saying that the Universe is God, I distinctly say that the Universe is only the *sign and effect* of God,—his word, just as our words are signs and effects of our being. Instead of saying the mind of man is only a part of God, I distinctly say that the very explanation of our existence is that God desires not to multiply *Himself*, but that he craves otherness,—beings not Himself, but only like Himself, sympathizing with Him,—sons and heirs, not members of His own being.

"The conception of God here presented is intensely unpantheistic because

⁷ "Glimpses of the Heaven that lies about us." By T. E. Poynting. London E. T. Whitfield. 1860.

intensely personal. . . . The whole doctrine of the book depends upon the soundness of our attributing to Him sympathies like those which we ourselves possess.

"That only which can be mistaken for Pantheism, is the assertion that the world is the effect of God, not independent of Him, and that it is the effect of His living, ever-present agency; and that again, though the soul has a separate individual existence, its experience is the effect of the constant inspiration of God." (Int. pp. xxi. xxii.)

This doctrine of the ever-present agency of God the author considers to pervade the Biblical Scriptures.

"The whole conception of God, running through the Old Testament, is that of a Being pervading and ruling Physical Nature, clothing Himself with light, sending forth His lightnings, His rain and snow. The conception pervading the New Testament is that of a Spirit pervading souls,—working in them both to will and to do,—incarnating Himself in Christ that He might incarnate Himself in all humanity. I only seek to bring back the Scriptural forms of faith." (*ib.*)

Certainly there is nothing contradictory to Reason in the belief of a personal self-conscious Deity, although his present energy is diffusive through the Universe; it is the point nevertheless of greatest difficulty, if required to be proved as matter of fact, and on which much will probably ever be left to faith—it is the point to which conciliating theologians especially should direct their endeavours; in order, at least, to accumulate inferences and illustrations, if it is not permitted to our faculties to accomplish more. Besides the harmony generally which our author indicates between Scripture and his own system, he deals with great success with some of the special Christian doctrines, as the Trinity and Atonement; for instance, many persons Trinitarian and Unitarian by professed communion, will feel that they could meet upon some such grounds as those suggested pp. 239–250; 258–265. We cannot follow the imaginative part of the work through its details, although it has many beauties, and have not space for criticising some parts which appear to us insufficiently guarded against objection: thus Chapters vi. vii. of Part I. by no means adequately deal with the difficulties which will occur to the general reader, from the doctrine that the ordinary working of men's minds, and even the passions and impulses of his lower animal nature, are the very outflowing of the *Holy Spirit*. That part of the discussion would require a careful treatise to itself. The book is full of material for thought to the religious and philosophical reader.

The untimely death of Theodore Parker,³ although for some time anticipated, awakened notwithstanding the deepest emotion among his admirers. It is an event in which, without exaggeration, the world of civilized religion has a concern. There is not here an opportunity of surveying at large Parker's life, nor of appreciating his exact position

³ "Tributes to Theodore Parker, comprising the Exercises at the Music Hall, on Sunday, June 17, 1860. With the proceedings of the New England Anti-Slavery Convention, at the Melodeon, May 31, and the Resolutions of the Fraternity and the Twenty-eighth Congregational Society. Boston: Published by the Fraternity. 1860.

in the past to the Unitarian and other Christian bodies. But his decease is most to be lamented, happening when it did, in relation to the future. He had hitherto been engaged upon the most invidious part of his work. He had been employed mainly in destroying creeds and in denouncing hypocrisies—necessarily he had made many enemies in doing so. His mode of proceeding was often of the roughest. Great prophets have frequently been very uncourtly in their utterances. Inspired men speak of things not in conventional language, because they see and feel them as they really are—and as the moderns of the West make great but due allowance for the hyperboles of Hebrew prophets, so should we calmer English be content to subtract somewhat, tacitly and with charity, from exaggerations natural to the more restless American. Parker had been subject to a quasi-persecution, but was too strong to be put down: it was natural there should be some acrimony in his tone at times towards those who, while making great professions of freedom, would not allow freedom to him; but he was not unjust even to their merits.

“Once,” he says, “it seemed as if these two sects (the Unitarians and Universalists) would make a revolution in the Church’s notion of God; but alas! they both accept the ecclesiastical method of theology, and when they appeal to the miraculous and infallible Bible in support of their more reasonable and religious notion of God, they are always defeated and drawn back toward the old Church, with its belief of a ferocious Deity; this explains the condition and character of these two valuable sects. Accordingly little good has come from their movement, once so hopeful. They would change Measures and Doctrines, but they would not alter the principle which controls the measure, nor the method whereby the doctrines are made; and so these sects leaven only a little of the whole lump; they do not create that great fermentation which is necessary to make the whole Church take a new form.” (Conference of Progressive Thinkers, &c. p. 62.)

But what was chiefly to be regretted in Parker, which has diminished his influence and raised immense prejudices against him, especially in this country, is the vehemence with which he pursues the conception of a wrathful God which belonged to the earlier Hebrews, which emerges even in the New Testament, and which colours the current of Christian theology. St. Paul tells us, that “an idol is nothing in the world”—we ought not therefore to be *angry* with an idol or idolatrous thing—with an inadequate, erroneous, or superstitious theological conception. He would very ill exhibit his purer theism, who should insult the misshapen monstrosities which are worshipped by our Indian fellow-subjects—he would be a very ill-advised controversialist, who should manifest his Protestantism by spitting upon a Romish image of the Virgin Mary with its gaudy petticoat and tinsel crown. Some years since we recollect seeing in a bookseller’s window in Fleet-street, a print representing Jehovah as a grotesque and somewhat hideous figure, of which the details were taken from the anthropomorphic descriptions of the Old Testament. This was offensive to Christians, still more so to Jews; and a Jewish gentleman in his indignation ran his umbrella through the window at which it was exposed. The Jew had to make compensation to the bookseller for the damage he had

caused, but the moral offence and outrage upon decency was certainly upon the side of the shopkeeper. So, what can be in worse taste than the reference of which Parker was so fond that it occurs in three out of four sermons printed in the "Conference," &c., to Jehovah's^d "eating veal with Abraham?" The apostle could extract from the legend of the plain of Mamre the moral lesson of entertaining strangers. We can sympathize, in any other record, with the feelings of men in a primitive state—when they did not live in streets, nor were numbered and lettered—and when the stranger coming, none knew whence, to the tent door, in the cool of the day, might be a red-handed homicide fleeing from the avenger of blood—or a god come down in the likeness of men—we are warmed with the story of the Arcadian, who kept open house for all men because once he had entertained unconsciously the Dioscuri—why should we behold nothing in the tale of Abraham in the tent of Mamre but a Jehovah eating veal? We may be sure that vast numbers of Scripture readers make far greater allowance for the Hebrew anthropomorphisms than Parker gave them credit for—and form their conceptions of the Divine Being upon the more elevated expressions of the Prophets, rather than upon the barbarous ones of the Pentateuch. And there are not wanting even in communions where we might least have expected to find them, "leaders of the people by their understanding, and by their knowledge and understanding meet for the people," anxious to lead them from the Pentateuchism which has been handed down from Puritanical times, to a purer theology and a more practical religion. These—though they may be less ruthless in the handling of their material—can distinguish as well as Parker between the very varied elements of which the Bible is made up. At the same time it would be a libel upon Parker's memory to represent that his object was to rob poor humanity of the Bible. What portions he considered as the pure wheat of the Scriptures may be judged of from the selections made by him several months before his death for a chant from Ps. cxxxix., and the following passages:—Micah vi. 8; Matth. xxii. 37—40; John iv. 23, 24; 1 John iii. 18—20; iv. 7, 12, 16, 18; Ps. xxiii.; Matth. xxv. 34—40; Matth. v. 3—12.

We cannot now speak of Parker's doctrine of Immanence as contrasted with the conception of an extra-mundane Deity, but will merely observe that it is one with which the progress of science—better than any controversy—is daily rendering men more and more familiar. But, as said Ralph Waldo Emerson, "his commanding merit as a reformer is this, that he insisted beyond all men in pulpits—I cannot think of one rival—that the essence of Christianity is its practical morals; it is there for use, or it is nothing." (*Tributes, &c.*, p. 17.) And it is very interesting to be able to trace in Parker the early development of conscience. The degree in which conscience is due to education and external authority, the degree in which it is innate as a regulating

^d "Conference of Progressive Thinkers. Broad cast upon the waters by Flowers of Thought, for the Church of the Future. With five Sermons by Theodore Parker." London: Geo. Manwaring. 1860.

faculty, vary in different men. Conscience is fourfold—a quaternity in unity—if we may be permitted to parody a well-known doctrine; it is (1) hortatory to, and (2) approving of good; it is (3) restraining from, and (4) condemnatory of evil. Conscience is most familiar to us in the fourth of these functions—as remorse. The energies of Parker's mature life were prompted by it in its first form—but it manifested itself as the restraining conscience—the Socratic *demon* at a very early age.

"The very last page those busy fingers ever wrote," says Wendell Phillips, "tells the child's story, than which he says 'no event in my life has made so deep and lasting an impression on me. A little boy in petticoats in my fourth year, my father sent me from the field home.' A spotted tortoise, in shallow water, at the foot of a rhodora, caught his sight, and he lifted his stick to strike it, when a voice within said, 'it is wrong.' I stood with lifted stick in wonder at the new emotion, till rhodora and tortoise vanished from my sight. I hastened home, and asked my mother what it was that told me it was wrong. Wiping a tear with her apron, and taking me in her arms, she said, 'some men call it conscience; but I prefer to call it the voice of God in the soul of man. If you listen to it and obey it, then it will speak clearer and clearer, and always guide you right. But if you turn a deaf ear or disobey, then it will fade out, little by little, and leave you in the dark without a guide.'" (Tributes &c. p. 21.)

For those who know but little of Parker's works, it should be added that he was a firm believer in immortal life. "In that conviction he lived, and in it he died," not as though it were a matter of logical demonstration, but of intuitional certainty; and Mr. Perfit¹⁰ in the admirable sketch which he gives of Parker's life and work in his commemorative discourse, argues with great eloquence and force in favour of such a belief, not from the *authority* of Parker, but from the fact of the manifestation of such a man; it is inconceivable, he says, that he should be dead—"he has lain down to rest, to awaken in a new home, amid other beings, as a refreshed man, fit for continuing under other conditions, the battle of life."

The same occasion also called forth from Mr. Barnett,¹¹ another worthy tribute to the memory of a great man. The feature in Parker's character which he especially illustrates is his unsectarianism. His opinions and his mode of acting upon them brought him into a state of isolation, put him off from the advantages, and they are many, of Church communion with any Christian body. In such circumstances most men would have been ready to form a new sect. Parker forbore. He saw the time was not come for a new organization. A Church of the Future cannot be made according to pattern; it must grow up spontaneously out of the tendencies of the future, as Churches have in fact grown up in times past; they have been products and develop-

¹⁰ "A Discourse occasioned by the death of Theodore Parker." Delivered by P. W. Perfit, in South Place Chapel, Finsbury, on Sunday evening, May 27th, 1860. London: Geo. Manwaring. 1860.

¹¹ "The late Theodore Parker." A Discourse delivered in South-place Chapel, Finsbury, on Sunday morning, June 3, 1860. By Henry N. Barnett. Published by request. London: Geo. Manwaring. 1860.

ments, not preordained instrumentalities. We have alluded to the unamiable position occupied by Unitarians towards Parker, but Mr. Barnett's "vindication of him against the chief troublers of his life" runs off too much, for our taste, into invective. The description of an "outcast sect" at p. 18, is very clever, and may be true relatively to the more narrow-minded portion of it, but it is too bitter for the occasion. Parker's real vindication is in his work, and we need not now picture him to ourselves as an Indignant Shade in the realm of Ghosts, with shivering Unitarians fleeing before the point of his avenging spear.

Professor Newman avails himself of the opportunity of a sixth Edition of the "Phases of Faith"¹² being called for, to make a detailed exposure of some of the criticisms which have been passed upon his well-known work—chiefly, that is, of such of them as have been reprinted from time to time in a separate form. This new matter occupies 36 pages of the present volume, and to those who will take the pains to follow it, will show the utter unfairness of that "gibbeting" style of reviewing, which is too much in vogue, especially in reference to theological subjects. Indeed it is a most serious evil attending the development of our periodical literature into organs addressed to special classes of readers, that it has become hopeless to expect really fair reviews of books, when to be really fair would be disagreeable to the supporters of the special organ. The various religious and political sections of the public love to isolate themselves, and to dwell in a surrounding of things flattering to their partial views; thus they combine to shut out fairness, and to demoralize the literary class. The castigation which Mr. Newman administers to his "gibbeting" critics is very complete and richly deserved. The original work is already too popular to need further introduction to the public on our part.

The discussion on Religious Liberty and Church Establishments¹³ referred to below, is carried on in a style fitted for the columns of a third rate country newspaper. Whether the author is likely to be a capable expounder of Locke, or a lucid critic of Gladstone and Martineau, may be judged of from a specimen of his theology, which he allows to emerge in the winding up of his lucubrations. Our readers will excuse us for extracting this rather curious specimen of the bombast of the Tabernacle. Alliance between Church and State, we learn, had a much darker origin than the blackest which is usually assigned to it.

"If the Bible is anything more than a mythical imposture, encroachment on the sovereign prerogative and authority of God began before man existed, to become either the victim or the ally of a soaring ambition. From that dark and fateful hour, when the spirit of rebellious usurpation first raised its head against the rights and rule of sovereign power, the pride and counsel of the

¹² "Phases of Faith; or, Passages from the History of my Creed." By Francis William Newman, formerly Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. Sixth edition. London: Geo. Manwaring. 1860.

¹³ "The Ultimate Principles of Religious Liberty. The Philosophical Argument: with a Review of the Controversy, as conducted on grounds of reason and expediency, in the writings of Locke, Warburton, Eliby, Dik, Wardlaw, Gladstone, Martineau, and Mill." London: Ward and Co., 1860.

demon have never ceased to wage the unequal and presumptuous strife. The impious war-cry of non-allegiance hushed through the realms of government by the sweep of Almighty vengeance, the enemy of heaven and earth has nevertheless not ceased by lure and strategy to prosecute his dark rebellious vow. Baffled and despoiled in the open war of defiance and usurpation, the archangelic foe, still in the inscrutable purpose of the Most High, left in the undiminished might and scope of his spiritual powers, pursues his malignant ends while liberty and resources remain to him. The prince of the powers of the air bides his time till the conscious treachery and infatuation of the priest, or the godless hypocrisy and ambition of the politician, may subserve his purpose. The league between the rulers of this world and the visible framework of the "spiritual kingdom" on earth, discloses to us the master strategy of the common adversary of God and man. Albeit many godly dupes be found upholding the supreme delusion, the original of the "idea" of this alliance is not of Hooker, nor of Coleridge, nor of Gladstone; and the man who, whether by the enginery of philosophical logic or by the invincible weapons of revealed truth, seeks to bring to an end this adulterous connection is the true friend of God, and labours in the holy service of the universal kingship of the Redeemer." p. 198.

The author of this kind of rodomontade derives his history of heaven and earth and the third place, rather from his Milton than his Bible. And free thinkers of different shades of opinion will do well to ponder on the probable consequences to themselves as a minority, and to the cause of truth as they desire to prosecute it, if an open field should be suddenly left by the abolition of the Establishment, in the present stage of popular education and enlightenment, to the development of a rampant Spurgeonism.

Mr. Charles Bray's treatise on the "Education of the Feelings,"¹⁴ is characterised by the plain good sense of its practical advice. He treats the mental constitution according to the distribution current among phrenologists. Whether or not this analysis be capable of ultimate verification, will not affect in any important degree the value of the rules which Mr. Bray lays down for the education of the feelings and affections as they emerge in the young. Little depends even upon the first of the phrenological propositions, which is generally conceded, that *Brain is the organ of mind*; nothing upon the second, that *the Brain is a congeries of organs which can be locally identified corresponding with specific mental faculties*, which as yet is generally considered unproven. We only remark this—not to detract from the merits of Mr. Bray's work which are really great—but to guard against any inference, that the usefulness of the book lends any real support to the phrenological theory in its details.

"The Scottish Reformation,"¹⁵ will be received by many Presbyterians of the north as an elegant memorial of their celebration this year of the tricentenary of that event. The sketch is divided into three scenes or periods—the Hamilton period from 1525—1543; the

¹⁴ "The Education of the Feelings or Affections." By Charles Bray. Third Edition. London: Longmans. 1860.

¹⁵ "The Scottish Reformation: A Historical Sketch." By Peter Lorimer, D.D., Professor of Theology, English Presbyterian College, London; author of "Patrick Hamilton." With twenty-five Illustrations of Scottish Reformation localities. By Birket Foster. London and Glasgow: Richard Griffin and Co. 1869.

Wishart period, 1543—1554; the Knox period, 1555—1560. Of these the second supplies the most interesting material to the present volume. Wishart's influence indeed left permanent effects in Scotland. He had imbibed in Switzerland the principles of Zuingle, as distinguished from those of Luther—and the simplicity of the doctrine of the Scotch Church relative to the sacraments, together with the nakedness of their ritual, are traceable to their Zuinglian source. Knox followed Wishart—as Calvin did Zuingle. Dr. Lorimer rectifies the reading of a document relative to a recantation of Wishart's at Bristol, a point of some interest; and he finds himself in antagonism with Mr. Cunningham, whose impartial history we noticed in our last number, as to the balance of historical presumption for the complicity of Wishart in the assassination of Cardinal Beaton. Dr. Lorimer is unnecessarily "indignant" at the supposition that Wishart may not have been so far in advance of the times in which he lived as to render it morally impossible he should have been cognisant of the conspiracy. Indeed he is inconsistent in maintaining against Mr. Cunningham that the "strong presumption is all the other way" (p. 131), and yet in explaining (p. 156) that "the chief actors in the Reformation held the principle, that when it had become hopeless to expect deliverance from public oppressors by the arm of public justice, it was lawful for private individuals to remove them as the enemies of mankind." Wishart, one of these chief actors, no doubt held that principle; whether there is proof that he applied it is an unsettled question—but historians ought to be allowed to give their opinion as to the balance of the evidence, without being exposed to invidious remarks on the part of their co-religionists. Some allowance must however be made for the disposition in a commemorative work like the present to admit of nothing which shall diminish the glories of the chief heroes of the Kirk.

Mr. "Cayley's"¹⁶ new metrical version of the Psalms is extremely faithful as far as we have been able to verify it, and unvitiated by paraphrase. We cannot, however, speak of the versification as satisfying the English ear. The notes which are added deserve the highest praise. Modestly put forward they contain in clear and concise language the results of the critical observations upon the Psalms by well-known Hebraists, as Rosenmüller, Gesenius, De Wette, &c.

In not bad verses, Mr. Templeton¹⁷ exemplifies what ought to form the substantial parts of a really Christian worship—freely sketching the essentials of the Christian doctrine and of the Christian practice. It is a little book worth reading.

We suppose the purpose of Dr. Dunlop's "Vestiges of the Spirit-History of Man,"¹⁸ to be, to trace from their earliest indications the

¹⁶ "The Psalms in Metre." By C. B. Cayley, B.A. Translator of "Dante's Divine Comedy." Author of "Psyche's Interludes." London: Longmans. 1860.

¹⁷ "Divine Service." By Robert Rodger Templeton. Ayr. London: Mac Millan. 1860.

¹⁸ "Vestiges of the Spirit-History of Man." By S. F. Dunlop, Member of the American Oriental Society, New Haven. New York. 1858.

progress of the religions of the world—the evidence bearing on the subject being histories, traditions, forms and objects of worship, names of deities, and other monuments of language. We might possibly do some injustice to the author if we ventured to make any extended observations upon his work, which is addressed to those who take pleasure in antiquarian, etymological and mythical researches.

We are most glad to perceive that Dr. Whewell's first volume of the Socratic Dialogues¹⁹ has been so well received as to encourage the learned translator to proceed with his popular design. The group which he presents in this second selection represents Socrates contending with the Sophists; and upon a misunderstanding of the attitude in which he is exhibited towards them in these dialogues, as well as upon the deteriorated signification of the word in later Greek authors, was founded the current misapprehension concerning them so ably dissipated by Mr. Grote. Mr. Grote's conclusions respecting the Sophists have been subject to a little modification, but very little, and Dr. Whewell gives in his adhesion to them. It is certainly evident from a perusal of the dialogues entitled Gorgias and Protagoras that Plato does not intend to subject those teachers personally to any discredit. And it must be owned that arguments and objections are frequently put into the mouth of Socrates, as *sophistical*, in the bad sense of the word, as are any which are advanced by these professional Sophists. But there was a real antagonism between Plato and the Sophists, or Professors, as we should call them, upon several points. 1. The philosopher was still entangled as well as the Sophist in the ambiguities of language—but he was more earnest than the Sophist in the endeavour to unfold the contents of thoughts by means of a pure dialectic, if such could be discovered. 2. He esteemed it degrading on the part of the Sophist to take money for the same kind of services as those which he himself rendered to his disciples gratuitously. 3. The philosopher, Plato, and, perhaps Socrates himself, differed on an essential point from the Sophist who undertook to *teach* virtue. For according to Plato the good was only capable of being perceived immediately, and the office of the teacher could be only to elicit, unfold, or awaken the idea of good laid up in the soul of the disciple in a higher sphere and before it was enveloped in the body. The teacher cannot communicate any idea which is not already virtually present in the mind of the disciple, and his excellency is shown by skill in finding access to the reason, within which are coiled up the innate truths. To question and be questioned is the best method for quickening these intuitions—set discourses like those of the Sophists are of little value, and written compositions worthless.

"It is like painting a picture of a man. The picture looks alive; but if you speak to it, it preserves an impenetrable silence. It is the same with written compositions. You might think from what they say that they had some sense; but if any one who wants to get at their sense asks them anything, they still

¹⁹ "The Platonic Dialogues for English Readers." By William Whewell, D.D. Vol. II. Anti-sophist Dialogues. Cambridge and London: MacMillan and Co. 1860.

say the same thing over and over again. And when anything is once written, it goes on circulating round and round among those who want to hear it, and among those who have nothing to do with it, just the same. And if it is misunderstood or attacked, it must always run back for help to its father the author, it cannot help or defend itself."—p. 294.

The reprint in a separate form of Mr. Mansel's article on "Metaphysics,"²⁰ originally published in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," is very timely in more ways than one. Unencumbered with the specialities of theological controversy this treatise again presents the author to the public in the character which he can best sustain. For a while he had lost the dignity of the philosopher in the heat of polemics; and he was in some danger of his truthfulness suffering in a vain attempt to employ with success a thorough Kantian skepticism, at one and the same time, in the destruction of a transcendental absolutism, and in the vindication of a no less transcendental trinitarianism. Indeed in the introduction to the Essay on Metaphysics, he has entirely cut away any such standing place as he required in the constructive portion of his lectures for the vindication of a doctrinal revelation founded upon a supernatural revelation.

"All such theories are open to two fundamental objections,—they cannot be communicated and they cannot be verified. They cannot be communicated; for the communication must be made by words, and the meaning of those words must be understood; and the understanding is a form of consciousness and subject to the laws of consciousness. They cannot be verified; for, to verify, we must compare the author's experience with our own; and such comparison is again an act of consciousness and subject to its laws."—Int. p. 28.

And on the author's principles the same must be true of the Divine Being which is true of all Being, that "Ontology is but a higher kind of Phenomenology, its object is not a thing in itself, but a thing as we are compelled to conceive it;" and he cannot, as far as we see, escape the conclusion, that in speculative theology as well as in speculative philosophy, "the attempt to give it an absolute character is to substitute negative ideas for positive,—to desert thoughts and to take refuge in words which have no real meaning, save in relation to a different mode of consciousness" from our own. Not only must any object of thought be limited, according to the laws of the thinking subject—but any object of thought, as an *object*, is limited and differenced "as one out of many, as implying the existence of other things besides itself." "The infinite cannot be an object of human consciousness at all"—or rather not its totality—"and it appears to be so only by mistaking the negation of consciousness for consciousness itself." But if the Philosophy of the Absolute is refuted by the consequences to which it leads—conducting, according to Mr. Mansel, either to Pantheism or Atheism (p. 322),—it is strange that he should not perceive the impossibility of founding his Theology upon the Philosophy of

²⁰ "Metaphysics; or the Philosophy of Consciousness, Phenomenal and Real." By Henry Longueville Mansel, B.D., Waynflete Professor of Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy, Tutor and late Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, Hon. LL.D. of the University of Edinburgh. Edinburgh: A. and C. Black. 1860.

the Conditioned. To reconcile an orthodox Theology with such a Philosophy is impossible, for, by the doctrine of limitation—an Infinite Being is a contradiction in terms. But it is unworthy of the philosopher to introduce into a metaphysical treatise this kind of rhetoric about pantheism and atheism; for of course (whether they would be pleased with a particular nickname or not), there are those in our days who would accept the conclusions which Mr. Mansel terms pantheistic or atheistic. Thus, to take an instance far from home, a Vedantin would reject as altogether illusory, the whole argumentation founded upon the testimony of the conditioned consciousness;

“We speak of a man’s self-hood in two distinct senses: in the one case we speak of that self-hood in the strict meaning of the word; but in the other merely by way of adaptation to circumstances. When we speak of the omniscient one being that self-hood, we speak in the strict sense, and without any admixture of metaphor. But when we speak of these twenty-eight external things being that self-hood, we speak under the influence of infirmity, just as when we mistake a rubbing-post on the road-side for a man, or a rope for a snake; in fact we do not speak the strict truth.

“The wise man who clearly perceives that the deity is his own self-hood, and that the thirty-five primitive substances are not so, is freed from the chains of self-consciousness; he is free also from his original infatuation, forasmuch as he knows for certain that the functions of the twenty-eight substances are not his own functions, and that the things which are experienced by those twenty-eight substances are not his own experiences: he is, moreover, free from all retribution, forasmuch as he is delivered from the sinful and meritorious deeds which those twenty-eight substances had accumulated: and therefore he is become a beatified one, free from the world of births and deaths, and such like evils, and is in fact the deity itself.”²¹—(pp. 31-33.)

Sir William Hamilton’s “Lectures on Logic”²² will possess a more permanent value than the corresponding course on metaphysics. They were, like the former course, thrown off for the most part in their general form in one session, but they received many more subsequent accretions, and he was continually adding supplementary papers which were incorporated from time to time in the “Lectures.” These are given by the editors in a valuable appendix, although they are of very various degrees of finish, and not always in perfect consistency. With respect to these papers, the editors have exercised a sound discretion in communicating them as they found them, and without undertaking to determine, in the present work, their relative value. Indeed the material preserved in these volumes will require further handling by competent persons, before it will be available for ordinary students; it forms at present a repertory rather than a text-book. As in the volumes containing the previous course, the pains taken by the editors in veri-

²¹ “The Elements of the Vedantic Philosophy, translated from the Tamil.” By Thomas Foulkes, Church Missionary Society, Madras. Madras: Printed at the press of the S.F.P.C.M., Vepery; London: Williams and Norgate, 1860.

²² “Lectures on Logic.” By Sir William Hamilton, Bart. Edited by the Rev. H. L. Mansel, B.D., LL.D., Waynflete Professor of Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy, Oxford, and John Veitch, M.A., Professor of Logic, Rhetoric, and Metaphysics, St. Andrews. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1860.

fyng, completing, and sometimes rectifying the sources from which Sir William drew, is beyond all praise. In a modified edition, or in a text-book founded upon these volumes, it would not be necessary to indicate the particular authorities upon which a large portion of the lectures are founded. So may well be omitted hereafter the criticisms, unsparing but fully deserved, upon Abp. Whately, who never displayed any power of grappling with abstract subjects, and was "utterly unversed in the literature of logic," as is now universally acknowledged, though it was not so then. Some considerable deduction must also be made, as we think, from the *practical* value which Sir William assigned to his discoveries. We are not detracting from the analytical merit of his doctrine of the quantification of the predicate or of his development of the doctrine of the wholes of extension and comprehension, but are of opinion, that the forms of language will stubbornly refuse to adopt the solecisms which would follow the express quantifying of both terms in a proposition. Nor does the obligation follow from his postulate, "Explicitly to state what has been implicitly thought;" for the predicate in an affirmative proposition remains unquantified expressly, because its quantity has *not* been thought, has not for the purposes of inference as yet been required to be thought; for to say, *All ale is beer, Some ale is bitter drink, Some bitter drink is beer*, it is not requisite to *think*, what is the relative extension of ale and beer; as yet it may not be known that they are not co-extensive.

Now the determination of the quantity of the predicate in affirmative propositions we maintain with the old logicians is extra-logical. And in form, ordinary—that is, non-scientific language, does not require us to make any distinction in the relation of the terms in the propositions, *All equilateral triangles are equiangular* and *all men are mortal*—language makes no distinction, because in the case of these affirmative propositions the law of thought does not determine the extension of the predicates. Moreover, there is no inconsistency, as Sir William holds, in assuming the distribution of the predicate in universal negatives, because in that case the law of thought, of ordinary thought, does require it. Only the mathematician can say, *All equilateral triangles are [all] equiangular*; but if the judgment be negative, it *must* be, *No equilateral triangles are [any] equiangular*. Sir William was quite aware that if the distinction made by the logicians between *material* and *formal* is correct, his rectification is nugatory. And he is hardy enough to say, "Logic has neglected—withheld—in fact openly suppressed, one half of its forms, (the quantification of the predicate universally in affirmatives particularly in negatives), because these forms *though always operative in thought*, "were usually passed over as superfluous in the matter of expression," ii. 291. A like objection lies to his criticism of the usual rules concerning indefinite or indesignate propositions. On the more important development of the doctrines of extension and comprehension, he admits that the distinction was acknowledged by Aristotle, and recognised by him in the two distinct kinds of predication—that of genus or kind, and that of quality or attribution. But he considers that Aristotle lost sight of it and *neglected* to carry it through his syllogistic system. His followers blindly, of course, followed in the

same negligent course. We are much rather disposed to think that neither Aristotle nor his followers attempted to apply the syllogism in its perfect forms to wholes of comprehension, because they found it would not work, and we have very great doubt whether it will be possible to supplement the old logic in that particular for any practical purpose. At the same time nothing can be more ingenious than the elaboration with which Hamilton carried out the exemplification of this famous discovery. The editors of these Lectures have been so good as to add an excellent index, for which they deserve the warmest thanks.

A supplementary volume to the "Collected Works" of Dugald Stewart,²³ containing translations and a complete index, will render this issue perfect in every respect, and adapted for all purposes of the general reader. The author himself had desired such translations to be added, if his works were republished, and had rendered many of the passages himself.

POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, AND TRAVELS.

THE strange indifference which has so long characterized the English public to all that concerns the domestic politics of the United States is now beginning to give way to a more intelligent curiosity, and this is the less surprising on the eve of probable events in the States which must largely affect the interests of our manufacturing classes. The approaching presidential election, and the almost certain return of the Republican candidate, threatens to bring to a crisis that conflict between the North and South which to Americans has so long seemed big with such alarming consequences.

This alarm it seems to us has been purposely aggravated by the Pro-Slavery party, and as a weapon of party tactics is not without its recommendations to those who have made use of it; but we cannot but think that the South has protested too much, that when the final and decisive conflict takes place they will be far from adopting the extreme measures they have been in the habit of holding *in terrorem* over their opponents. When once those opponents have made up their minds to look the danger in the face, the very resolve by which they do so will deprive the danger of half its terrors and their adversaries of all their courage. A more peaceful conclusion of the great controversy between the North and South than either the one or the other anticipates in the heat of dispute, may, we think, be confidently expected.

Mr. Edge has published a small volume with a very aggressive title "Slavery Doomed,"¹ in which a clear account is given of the present

²³ "Translations of the Passages in Foreign Languages contained in the collected works of Dugald Stewart." With general Index. Edinburgh: T. Constable and Co. 1860.

¹ "Slavery Doomed: or the Contest between Free and Slave Labour in the States." By J. M. Edge. London: Smith, Elder and Co. 1860.

state of American politics, and of the prospects of the peculiar institution. He compares the North with the South in area, population, productiveness, trade, education, and religion; he gives a full account of the modes of cultivation in Free and Slave States, pointing out the exhausting character of the methods of agriculture to which slave labour is applied; his review of the events of the last few years, of the Missouri compromise, of the Kansas Nebraska Bill, of the Dred Scott decision, of the effects of Mr. Buchanan's administration, and of the small success which has attended it, are necessary to a proper appreciation of the present position of the parties which divide the country, and will be a welcome assistance to all who wish to watch that political drama on which the curtain is so soon to rise. His confident anticipation of the success of the Republican party is perhaps better founded than his equally confident conclusion that the effect of such a victory of the Anti-Slavery party would suspend, if not altogether destroy, the productiveness of the staple of the South; in the face of a decided defeat the South would probably content themselves with the reflexion that they had fought their cause to the last, and having little to reproach themselves with in the way of omission, would soon come to the conclusion that the inevitable must be endured, that a hopeless continuance of the struggle could lead to no good result; and this is the more probable, as they must be conscious that such constant efforts as have been called for at their hands for the last few years are more exhausting than defeat, and that after such exertions defeat is not only irretrievable but may be accepted without dishonour. If the North pursue their victory with moderation, and offer a golden bridge to their opponents, everything would lead us to suppose that the threatened appeal to arms which has done such service as a menace, will be seen to change character to the disadvantage of those who should resort to it, and that I dare not, will be found to wait upon J, would too closely for it ever to be entered upon as a course of action, the responsibility would stand in too frightful a relation to the positive good that could be hoped for. The only thing to be dreaded for the States is a somewhat close-run election. If the North arouses itself earnestly and resolutely, and gains not only the victory as it certainly can, but an overwhelming one as it certainly ought, most of the anticipated evils will melt away, and America enter upon that career of progress and improvement which it often assumes to have already opened, because it has the well-grounded confidence that it can be so whenever the national will shall so determine.

These remarks are supported by the tone of a pamphlet by Mr. T. W. Hoit,² of St. Louis, who defends the peculiar institution on moral grounds without in any case threatening the North with a disruption of the Union. What he calls the philosophical postulates of American slavery exhibit a curious perversion of morals and philosophy; because "Right holds a just and heaven-derived superiority over wrong," he assumes it to have also a supremacy

² "The Right of Slavery." By T. W. Hoit, of the St. Louis Literary and Philosophical Association. St. Louis: S. Bushnell. 1860.

and with that supremacy a duty of control. Supporting himself by the analogy of those powers which society exercises over its dangerous members, he argues that civilization in like manner is bound to take up arms against barbarism, and rescue the negro from the horrors of cannibalism, fetish worship, and abandonment to the most sensual vices, by subjecting him to the white man, under whose care he may learn at least the primary lessons of progress. It is by no means difficult to show that the condition of a slave on a well-regulated cotton plantation is preferable to his life in Africa, when the grounds of that preference are found in American or European notions of what is desirable; but neither is this argument nor the former one in any proper sense applicable to the case. The first, in offering an apparent justification of slavery sins like most similes in being defective in the most essential point. Society enslaves its dangerous members in the exercise of the first of all rights, that of self-preservation, and that, too, not without full notice being given of its intention; the slavery which it imposes as a punishment seldom extends to the whole term of the criminal's life, and never to his descendants; it is individual, and exists only as a means of education called for by those who are not to be reached by milder methods. It is not even founded on the highest notions of right, but on conventional rules of law which repose on the nature of the State, and on that common consent which indicates the degree of civilization at which the community has arrived.

The falsity of this argument would be immediately seen if it were proposed to render the subjects of one State amenable to the criminal code of another. The jurisdiction of law extends no further than its voice can penetrate. The absurdity of setting forth a moral superiority as a justification of a moral wrong can hardly be surpassed, unless it be by the confusion of ideas which arms morality with the sword of justice. This confusion has lain at the bottom of all the persecutions to which mankind has ever been exposed, and opens the door to a crusade against the very party which relies on arguments drawn from it.

The author's second argument is as little applicable as the first. That a condition of life appears to any one to be advantageously exchanged for another, is no justification to them who would force it upon those who do not enjoy its benefits, nor can any argument be drawn from the fact that the comfort and security of a civilized community offer material advantages to a slave, which after long years of subjection he would not willingly exchange for the lost joys of savagery, for with his freedom he has lost his taste for it. The alternative offered to a free negro is thus between liberty and labour for another; that any negro would choose the latter, not even Mr. Hoit would assert, and few but he would maintain that the black should be forcibly brought to acknowledge that slavery has some compensations for the loss of savage freedom.

This relative comfort is not the proper standard of comparison for the peculiar institution; it is not to be judged by comparisons with African barbarism, but by its effects on civilization in America, where the African justification on which Mr. Hoit relies is becoming day by

day more evanescent; this justification, so inadequate when brought forward to support an active slave trade, loses every shadow of application to a system of slave breeding, and gradually falls with the mixture of races to a point of self-refutation that exposes its enormity to the fullest light. The antipathies of race, so powerful in the North, furnish Mr. Hoit with some telling retorts upon his opponents. The instinctive horror of mixed blood which characterizes the great majority of American abolitionists must give way before any solution of the difficulty can be hoped for in the States. To attribute the political inefficiency of the Mexicans and South Americans to their mixed blood alone is to go far afield for an argument to support an instinctive prejudice.

We intended to have extracted some truly American declamation from Mr. Hoit's pages, but our space will not permit; we can only recommend his essay to any who are curious as to the present tone of the defenders of American slavery, which will be found singularly free from those minatory features which not long since so strongly characterized it. His remarks on the Machiavellian policy of England in carrying out the abolition of slavery in her West Indian colonies might justly call for such a reply as Mr. Everett³ has published to the heavy censures contained in Earl Grey's animadversions on the effect of the overwhelmingly democratic suffrage in the States, but such accusations as Mr. Hoit's have long lost all effect, except for the purposes of party declamation, and are useless even for that end, where passion has not long since set a calm judgment aside. Mr. Everett's reply to Lord Grey is rather an evasion than a refutation of the charges brought forward, and more could not be expected. On the 4th July, 1860, in the City Hall of Boston, the Americans met to hear something very different from a cool inquiry into the causes which obstruct the entry into political life for the majority of the cultivated citizens of the States. Mr. Everett had to tell them of their great exploits, and had no difficulty in drawing a picture which would satisfy the most inordinate self-esteem. Words are never wanting, and least of all to our American, to describe the mighty political panorama which his countrymen have unrolled to an admiring world since 1776. But these things were not denied by Lord Grey, and are by no means incompatible with the qualifications of that greatness on which he insists and which are not refuted by recriminations, the justice of which Mr. Everett's adversary would be the first to acknowledge and deplore.

Although his pamphlet is rather a rejoinder than a defence, Mr. Everett's remarks are on the whole temperate, courteous, and conciliating, if not conclusive of the controversy in hand.

Mr. Leone Levi's volume "On Taxation"⁴ might have been called a handy book on public income and expenditure, had not that title been

³"Speech of the Hon. Edward Everett on American Institutions, in reply to the discussion in the British House of Lords." London: Smith, Elder and Co. 1860.

⁴"On Taxation: how it is Raised and how it is Expended." By Leone Levi, F.S.A., F.S.S. London: Parker and Son. 1860.

somewhat overworn by the multitude of handy books generated by the success of Lord St. Leonards'.

Mr. Levi does not enter upon a discussion of the general question of the principles of taxation, but contents himself with a clear exposition of the prevailing dogmas on which our system is based. The book contains a very rapid critical history of each of our existing taxes, and a similar survey of the present condition of the administration of the national income. In a very compendious, and at the same time very complete form the present financial condition of the country is brought before the reader, each division of the subject is enriched by tabular epitomes of the progress of the particular tax, and, where it is possible, by estimates of the effects of recent changes.

These tables, which occupy but a comparatively small space, are the result of great labour and research, and, in such cases as we have verified, show themselves to be remarkably correct. As a supplement to theoretical books on its subject this volume has the greatest possible value; its exposition is remarkably clear; it is disencumbered of all controversial impediments, and can be confidently recommended as a very convenient arcanum of most of the facts necessary to be known on the large subject of which it treats.

In spite of the great increase of the demands made of late years by each succeeding Government, Mr. Levi shows that even should our present vast expenditure prove to be not merely an occasional demand, but an indication of a permanent increase in the cost of governing the country, we should still have no cause for alarm, as the resources of the nation have expanded in a proportion which greatly exceeds our increased expenditure for public purposes.

In a very valuable chapter on the distribution of taxation he traces the incidence of customs, excise, taxes, and poor rates on the different classes of society, and arrives at a very gratifying result as to the general justice of the demands made on the upper, middle, and working classes. Mr. Levi is far from an utopist, and while constantly pointing out the direction of possible improvement, is equally far from joining in an ignorant clamour against a system which, when shown in its detail with that truth and completeness which his book displays goes far to answer, and by its own evidence to confute, much popular declamation and partial and irrelevant criticism.

Two supplementary divisions contain a history and account of the National Debt, and a detailed statement of the mode in which the expenditure of the supplies is controlled by the Exchequer and the Paymaster-General.

"A Few Questions and Answers on the Science of Exchanges"⁵ is an attempt, and we cannot say a happy one, to display the results of political economy in a catechetical form. There are few subjects so difficult to treat in the dogmatic manner this mode requires. The definitions of economical terms are far from being sufficiently familiar to the public at large to allow of their being brought forward without

⁵ "A Few Questions and Answers on the Science of Exchanges." By an M.A., of Trinity College, Oxford. - London: Ridgway. 1860.

their usual apparatus of argument, and we cannot think that the author's efforts at aphoristical conciseness are sufficiently successful to dispense with it. There is hardly any topic that is not dismissed in half-a-dozen lines, and a curious effect is produced on the mind by finding the conditions of production and the propriety of the Bank of England's refusal to rediscount for the bill brokers discussed within a few pages of each other. The inappropriateness of this method of treating the subject may be seen by the necessity it involves of such questions as the following. What must we remember in the study of political economy? What may be considered an axiom of the financialist? To such questions as these there may be many answers, and their only use is to furnish a fresh point of departure for the author.

We have not space to dispute whether labour ought to be called capital, or whether the gold discoveries in California and Australia have been of advantage to mankind, but the answer to the question, "If the value of gold is perceptibly lowered in the course of a few years, what will be necessary in this country?" is founded on such a confusion between price and value that it ought not to pass unnoticed, and the more so as the confusion in question is very general.

The author replies—

"The standard price of 22 carat gold must then be altered, for if we were to go on giving 3*l.* 17*s.* 10½*d.* per ounce for gold that was in reality worth perhaps 3*l.* 10*s.* per ounce, all the gold in the world would flow into Great Britain; we could not help altering the price of standard gold to what other civilized nations were giving for it in the course of business."

The misconception embodied in this answer turns upon the term "the price of gold," an expression that has misled many besides the author of this pamphlet. In this country gold expresses the price of all things, but has none itself. In countries which have a double standard, gold has a price expressed by its relation to the other legal tender, but in England, while measuring all things, it has itself no measure. The mint coins 3*l.* 17*s.* 10½*d.* from every ounce of standard gold that is deposited with it for the purpose, and this is called the mint price of gold, but this is only a name for an ounce of gold *in coin*, and can be accommodated to no definition of price.

An ounce of gold is divided into 3*l.* 17*s.* 10½*d.* in the same way that a foot is divided into twelve inches to facilitate its use as a measure. This division by no means affects the uses of gold as an equivalent, and if from the abundant recent production of the metal its exchangeable value should be lowered, as there can be but little doubt will be the case, its decreased power of purchase, however it may alter its relations to everything else, cannot in any way touch the question of how many coins shall be made out of any definite quantity of the metal.

The fact that 3*l.* 17*s.* 10½*d.* is the English monetary equivalent for an ounce of standard gold never attracted a single ounce to our shores, and never can, and we shall continue to give for it "what other civilized nations are giving for it in the course of business" in a far simpler manner than by an alteration of what the author calls the price of standard gold, which could have no effect at all. The value of gold is determined like the value of any thing else, by the amount of

labour necessary for its production, and as for many years this was found to be a very constant quantity, gold offered great advantages as a medium of exchange or measure for other things whose relation to it came to be called their price—price being simply an equivalent in money. Any alteration in the conditions of the production of the precious metals must alter their value in relation to all other things, but cannot make any change in the money value of money. To suppose otherwise is to fall back on the political economy of Philippe Bel and Henry VIII., a consummation hardly to be desired either by English or French economists.

The recent death of Mr. Whitty in Australia will cause many to return to the perusal of the remarkable series of political portraits, which first appeared from his hand in the "Leader." Of late years there has perhaps nowhere appeared so mordant a satire as his "Governing Classes of Great Britain."⁶ The sentiments of the rat outside the meal tub have seldom found a more energetic expression; so acute a critical understanding has not for a long time devoted itself to political literature.

The critical bias is, however, so overwhelming, the resort to persiflage so constant, and the occasional mystifications carried out with such perfect gravity and apparent good faith, that the clever author found no opening for the use of abilities so fully displayed; he shows himself too openly the Bohemian free lance, he takes a place not only external to the governing classes he tilts against, but also to the state of society among his contemporaries, who came to look upon him as an eccentric meteor, and perhaps a little as a *mauvais sujet*.

The remarkable ability of his novel was in like manner deprived of its ready recognition by the incoherent morality of the tale. It was obscurely felt that if moral praise and blame are to be so distributed all society must dissolve, that some fixed rules are absolutely necessary, and that where the best are not to be had, those existing must be put up with, until they are gradually amended. Society cannot exist in a void of principles, and those which are at present on the stage must be recognised as filling their parts, and not hooted off by an universal cynicism. England will not submit—and it is one of the greatest proofs of her vitality—to a *tabula rasa*. Our organization is too complex to submit to an entire reconstruction without danger to itself, and at the same time too strong not to insist on time being given for the assimilation of any new elements, that it may be fully seen whether they conduce to its well-being or must be cast out from the system as noxious or at least unseasonable.

Mr. Whitty in his short preface takes credit to himself for furnishing a new permanent phrase to political literature and parliamentary debate, but although the origination of the phrase "the governing classes" may belong to him, the idea itself is certainly to be referred to Mr. Disraeli, whose description of the English system as a Venetian oligarchy has put weapons into the hands of both friends and foes. Mr. Disraeli

⁶ "The Governing Classes of Great Britain. Political Portraits." By E. M. Whitty. London: H. Lea. 1859.

is Mr. Whitty's prototype. "What do yer stand on?" asked a Shrewsbury voter of Mr. Disraeli at the hustings. "On my head," was the witty reply. This attitude requires a constant exertion, to which the Tory leader's powers are still equal. The political pamphleteer succumbed under the effort.

The mania for remodelling the map of Europe has crossed the Channel, and appears with amusingly different symptoms in the books of Mr. Partridge, and in that of an ex-Cabinet Minister. "Is it Peace, Jehu?"⁷ is a remarkably clear review of the career of Napoleon III. since his election to the Chamber of Deputies. The silent preparation and sudden execution of the plans which have secured each step of that wonderful advance, which has changed a discredited adventurer into the foremost man of Europe, are traced with that minute attention to dates and contemporary detail which are necessary to set them in their full light. The author cannot be called a gallophobist, but he looks upon the attitude of Napoleon III. as so threatening, and considers his means of attack so overwhelming, that he proposes, as the only way by which French domination in the Mediterranean can be avoided, to hand Constantinople over to the Russians.

He will find few of his countrymen, if indeed he be an ex-member of any *English* cabinet, prepared for so signal a reversal of the policy of the last few years. In his opinion "there is only a triple choice—abandon the Mediterranean to France, and accept a passage through it to India, as a grace and favour." Risk a greater war than the world has ever yet known. A full and entire understanding and compact between Great Britain, France, and Russia, for a preconcerted and pre-arranged partition of Turkey based on a possession of Constantinople by Russia."

It seems to him that the destruction of the Turkish fleets and that of Russia in the Black Sea have destroyed the equilibrium of maritime power in the Mediterranean, and that England's only resource is to bring the two great military powers face to face in the South of Europe, and thus give ease and comparative security to the continent, by putting all continental questions aside by the overwhelming magnitude of the interests involved in an Eastern settlement, which is substantially that proposed by the Emperor Nicholas. It is hardly likely that the fears aroused by the increasing power of Louis Napoleon will blind us to those dangers which induced England to enter on that alliance with him, by means of which he was first enabled to make sure advances to it. A convention by which Russia should be placed in Constantinople, France in Asia Minor, and England in Syria and Egypt, partakes too much of a forcible partition to meet with much acceptance here, and the more so as the promises of peace it holds out are by no means so reassuring as the author would have us believe.

A complete antidote to any such views as these will be found in the books of Mr. Partridge, who agrees with the ex-minister that it will be in the long run impossible to prevent France absorbing her natural

⁷ "Is it Peace, Jehu? or Bonapartism." By an English Cabinet Minister. London: T. Caterby, 1860.

boundaries, and who never speaks of Napoleon except as the active hand of France, and always treats him, as his uncle has been so frequently treated, as the Inheritor of the Revolution, and the representative of the free movement among the nations of Europe, the only real antagonist to which he finds in the constant and unremitting efforts of Russia to expand towards the West. These efforts he looks upon as so big with peril to Europe, that nothing but the reconstruction of Poland in federation with Hungary and the Provinces freed from Austrian dominion, can furnish the West with an adequate barrier against that flood of Russian barbarism with which it is threatened. In this view France must strengthen herself against her ultimate antagonist, Russia, and if England will not assist her in doing so, she will certainly find herself isolated in Europe, and exposed to the common hostilities of both France and Russia, before that great and decisive conflict breaks out between the East and West, to which all things have pointed since Russia acquired a firm footing in Poland. It is somewhat significant that the first of these views depends entirely on an estimate of Louis Napoleon's personal character, that France is looked upon as his means, and that his end is supposed to be the humiliation of England; while in the second, the Emperor's personal qualities are never alluded to, but France is impersonated, and Napoleon is supposed to comply with irresistible national demands.

Mr. Partridge's books are in style the most strangely incoherent that are anywhere to be met with; they abound in repetitions, and vehement denunciations of his own country, that will considerably lessen his circle of readers, and consequently diminish that influence he so ardently desires to exercise.

Mr. Francillon's "*Lectures on English Law*,"¹⁰ which were written to assist the studies of two students in whom he feels an interest, will, we have no doubt, perform the same good office for many more. They are written with remarkable clearness, and are so free from unnecessary technical detail, that we know of no manual which could so advantageously be put into the hands of young men who desire to have some general notions of the nature of our legislation without encountering the difficulties of more professed law books. Mr. Francillon starts with an account of the English common law, and keeps constantly before his readers the origin, in local customs and trade usages, of the greater part of our statute law. The prospect that this origin of our enactments may be lost sight of in the multitude of separate acts which, by defining, limit and destroy these customs and usages as such, renders this mode of treatment peculiarly judicious. From the multitude of topics touched upon, the book partakes greatly of the character of a summary, but for the same reason its value as a

* "*The Obstructives and the Man; or the Forces and the Future of Europe.*" London: E. Stanford. 1856.

* "*Coalitions and Frontiers in 1860-61.*" By J. Partridge, author of "*The Obstructives and the Man.*" London: E. Stanford. 1860.

¹⁰ "*Lectures, Elementary and Familiar, on English Law.*" By James Francillon, Esq., County Court Judge. First Series. London: Butterworth. 1860.

book of reference is increased. Country gentlemen and county magistrates could hardly find a more convenient book.

Another book, published by the same house, Mr. Smith's "History of Education for the English Bar,"¹¹ addresses a more professional class of readers, but is well worth the attention of laymen as a rapid survey of the modes of study which have been prevalent among lawyers. In no profession has the individual student been hitherto so much left to his own resources, and perhaps this may be considered as the natural consequence of an unsystematized body of laws; a connected course of legal study almost implies a codified body of law, and the more we approach the one, the more the other becomes attainable; indeed, modern improvements in law progress side by side with improved means for its study. Mr. Smith gives a rapid survey of the ancient practices of the Inns of Court in the training of their junior members, and some general remarks on self-education for the Bar; he collects together what is known of the method of study followed by the most celebrated lawyers; the general result to be drawn from which is the very natural one, that hard work on whatever system is the absolute requisite for success in the law as in every other profession. Nothing can be more dissimilar than the accounts given by Romilly and Brougham of their modes of study, but that they both earned in the fullest sense their great reputations, is the clear result of the insight they give us into the laborious foundation they laid for it.

In 1852 the four Inns of Court determined upon joining in an uniform system of education, and resolved that "in order to be eligible for a call to the Bar, students were in future *either* to attend for one whole year the lectures of two of the readers, *or* to pass a public examination satisfactorily."

The readers appointed by the courts were on Jurisprudence and Civil Law, the Law of Real Property and Common Law, and on Constitutional Law and Legal History. In 1851, a commission of inquiry, comprehending some of the chief lawyers of the day, reported on the working of the system; in sum, to the effect that it was desirable the Inns of Court should unite to form a Legal University, the senate of which should grant certificates of honours, and that examination in certain subjects should be absolutely necessary as a condition to a call to the Bar. The separate Inns have also instituted inquiries, and their committees agree with the commissioners in the desirability of the course of study recommended by them, and also with the opinion that examination should determine a certain ascertained qualification before calling to the Bar. To the project of a new Legal University they do not give their assent.

The present position of the controversy shows how great an advance has been made from the old facile methods of qualifying for the legal profession, by eating a certain number of dinners, a much more agreeable, though not more adequate, test than that to which, till this last

¹¹ "A History of Education for the English Bar, with Suggestions as to Subjects and Methods of Study." By Philip A. Smith. London: Butterworth. 1860.

year, the Lord Mayor submitted himself, when he chopped wood and counted nails to show himself fit to discharge the duties of chief magistrate of the City of London.

Mr. White¹² may now be looked upon as a professional tourist, for this is the sixth of his perambulations to the account of which he has invited the public. As might be expected, he shows himself an experienced hand both in walking and talking about his walk; he is perhaps a little prosy and addicted to bursts of enthusiasm at the sight of some of the commonest objects of the country; he has a true cockney's power of discovering an idyl in the prospect of two rustics under a hedge, and he is always overcome at the sight of an old thatch with a house-leek growing on it. At the sight of a goodly prospect of woodlands, parks, hamlet and hall, he tells us his admiration found voice in a song of thanksgiving, and that he had to take out his flageolet and play the *Heavens are telling*, sitting in the shadow of a hedge, before he could leave the hill-top. This emotional readiness, though of a mild description, is somewhat irritating to his readers and constantly keeps them from the matter in hand. Mr. White always takes care to be well informed of the local history and traditions of the places he visits, and fills his landscape with a disorderly crew of its old inhabitants after the manner of the best guide-books; this is one of the greatest recommendations of "All Round the Wrekin," and few should visit Shropshire without this volume, which only wants a map or two to be a most useful itinerary of the county and its neighbourhood. If it were not for the monotony produced by Mr. White's inability to leave a single mile, we may say a single step, of his way undescribed, this would be an excellent descriptive book; but the abundance of trifling remarks which occur naturally enough to any one walking through a rural district, however they may lighten the way of the traveller, have a very different effect upon any one who takes up a book hoping to find a characteristic account of the country described; the information is there, but it is buried so deep in amiable twaddle that we have hardly endurance to surmount the small hindrances of the search for it. The accounts of the hardware-works at Birmingham, and of the glass blowing and casting at Smethwick are pleasingly done, and abound in edifying stories of the good effects of evening schools and temperance societies. The benovolent eagerness with which Mr. White seizes upon anything of the kind, we are afraid gives a too generally hopeful tone to his account of the Birmingham operatives. He is as ready to welcome among them the first appearances of a social millennium of savings banks and evening classes as he is to recognise an arcadian simplicity among the country cottagers who gave him a cup of water on a scorching day. But after all, we are complaining only of the always human too much, and it is well for any one when the objections made to him are drawn from his virtuous and benovolent sympathies.

To those of our readers who are likely to visit the Isle of Wight, we

¹² "All Round the Wrekin." By Walter White, Author of "A Londoner's Walk to the Land's End," &c. London: Chapman and Hall. 1860.

strongly commend a new and admirable guide-book by the Rev. Edmund Venables.¹³ The author states in his preface that "Every place described has been visited, many repeatedly;" and that the object of the work is "to set before the minds of strangers at a distance or tourists through the island, a true representation of its varied scenery, painted neither in too vivid nor too faint lines." In respect to one side of the island we can testify to the faithfulness with which this object has been accomplished. The remarks on *Blackgang Chine*—"one of the great lions of the Isle of Wight, which every body sees, and with which almost everybody is disappointed"—are a good sample of the general accuracy and common sense which distinguish the whole book. Especial care seems to have been taken with the scientific part of the work, which extends to 120 pages, and which presents for "the first time any account of the various departments of natural history and botany in an Island Guide." The several divisions of this section have been contributed by different naturalists, their names being appended to their respective contributions. A copious index closes the volume, to which is added a large and excellent map. We feel assured that the extensive and exact knowledge displayed throughout Mr. Venables' work, its excellent arrangement, truthful descriptions of scenery, judicious directions to visitors, and above all its great value as a manual of the geology, flora, and fauna of the island, will cause it to be generally recognised and used as the best book on the subject to which it refers.

Mr. Weld's excursion to Caithness and Sutherland¹⁴ is an account of a very pleasant vacation ramble—a more cheerful and intelligent guide to those counties could not be found. At Brawl Castle, near Thurso, he joined a party of friends in August, 1859, and gives us a very good account of the sport they met with, and of the moors where they met it. The fishing, too, in the river Thurso is usually excellent, and Mr. Weld, who we fancy is fonder of the rod than the gun, enters very fully into the state of the salmon fisheries, and upon the vexed question between the owners of the mouths of the rivers and the landlords of the upper banks, and takes a sportsman's view of stakes and standing-nets, which have of late so largely interfered with the angler's success. His description of the herring fishery at Wick, which was at its height when he passed through the town, is very well worth reading; it is very full and graphic, leaving the reader but little to desire, unless it be an opportunity of visiting the place in August. The importance of the trade for the inhabitants can hardly be exaggerated; the average take exceeds 13 millions, and gives constant employment to 2500 women during the few weeks it lasts in merely gutting the fish. After three weeks' stay at Brawl Castle, Mr. Weld

¹³ "A Guide to the Isle of Wight, its approaches and places of resort, with numerous walks, drives, and excursions, and a general synopsis of its topography, agriculture, products and manufactures, local affairs—civil and religious—antiquities, architecture, history, geology, zoology, and botany." By the Rev. Edmund Venables, M.A., and eminent Local Naturalists. London: E. Stanford. 1866.

¹⁴ "Two Months in the Highlands, Arcadia, and Skye." By C. R. Weld, Author of Vacations in Ireland, &c. London: Longmans and Co. 1860.

started in light marching order on a journey to the Orkneys. A member of the Alpine Club, an experienced cragsman, a competent geologist and botanist, he makes his readers share, as fully as possible, in the exhilarating effects of his open-air enjoyments. On the way to Kirkwall he passed the stones of Brogar, one of the most perfect druidical temples in the kingdom, of which he gives us, in a vignette, an excellent sketch, with accounts of the expiring remains of Scandinavian superstition. Before long, it seems that names and terminations of names will be all that will be left of those old sea wanderers who so long bore rule in these islands. St. Magnus' Cathedral and Earl Patrick's Castle are the only architectural features of the place, but both are highly peculiar, and have full justice done to them by their visitor. After leaving the Islands, he returned to Thurso, and started on a rambled round the coast of Sutherland, gathering local traditions and picturesque superstitions as he went.

At Durin he parted with one of his Thurso friends who had accompanied him so far, and pursued his journey alone, with the Duke of Sutherland's excellent survey of his county as guide, falling into pleasant talk with any one on the road, amongst others with a "Man," viz., one of a sect who appropriate the title, calling themselves "the men."

The peculiar feature of this sect is, the doctrine of "self-election;" they repudiate all discipline, and hold all theological learning in utter contempt, and the language of the most ignorant "man," if he asserts that he speaks by Divine inspiration, passes for gospel truth among their followers. There are some amusing extracts from the cursing testament of one of these saints that he had prepared against his dying day, which we should like to quote did our space permit; but it must suffice to say, that he lifts up his voice and bears a dying testimony against the world at large, particularizing the stones of offence in his immediate neighbourhood with a ludicrous minuteness. They go about the country in a peculiar costume, the chief feature of which is a large cloak, which they look upon as apostolical, and a white handkerchief or cap under their hat, the cleanliness of which is, strange to say, accepted as a measure of their godliness.

After the completion of his tour in Sutherland, and the successful pursuit of a lost portmanteau, he started, by way of Oban, for the Isle of Skye, of whose highest hills, the Cucullins, he gives a very good account. In no place, he says, can the glacial action on the face of rocky hills be so well observed, and few hills, in his opinion, offer such alluring temptation to the professed climber.

He constantly crosses Dr. Johnson's path in his celebrated tour to the Hebrides, and it is surprising how fresh and pertinent the Doctor's remarks appear, when they occur to Mr. Weld's remembrance; indeed, our traveller has a happy faculty of calling to mind the right thing in the right place, and an equally happy talent for seizing on the characteristic features of all that lies around him, whether it be scenery and architecture, dogs, game, and fish, or men, manners, and things in general.

The *Life and Travels of Humboldt*,¹⁵ published by Blackwood, is a well-executed compilation from the works of the great naturalist. Such epitomes, however, of a life's labour are not very useful. The great merits of the "Ansichten der Natur" of the "Essai Politique sur le Royaume de nouvelle Espagne," do not consist so much in a result that can be disposed of in a summary manner as in the richness and value of the details; and these no abridgment can possibly give. The rapid passage from place to place, the necessity of at least mentioning Humboldt's presence in the various localities he visited, give a hasty appearance to travels which were of a very different character. A single volume, and that a small one like this, cannot aspire to be more than an index to the works of which it gives account, and of necessity partakes more or less of the baldness of a catalogue.

The biographical connexions by which the compiler has brought the different parts of his book together are disagreeably infected by a tone of sentimental affectionateness. Humboldt's native place is always called "dear old Tegel;" and any death in his family is announced by saying "there was another grave at Tegel." His brother's wife is never simply Madame Humboldt, but always "the Frau Caroline," and usually with some semi-caressing addition. This domestic tone is neither in good taste nor appropriate in a history of the results of a life of scientific investigation.

Mr. Murray has published Capt. McClintock's *Journal*,¹⁶ kept during his adventurous journey in the little steamer which first brought home to us the news of the sad fate of Sir John Franklin and his companions. The main features of this voyage have been for some time since familiar to every one; for who has not felt some share of that anxious curiosity which has despatched so many expeditions to these dangerous seas and inhospitable shores; but the full detail of difficulty overcome, of hardships endured, and of that quiet and resolute courage which is furnished by this complete account, must give every fellow-countryman of the gallant adventurers reason to be proud of their common blood.

No notion can be formed of the rare qualities and patient courage requisite for the successful conduct of an Arctic Expedition, except from the daily accounts kept of those who have returned. The intense strain upon the mind of the commander during the spring and autumn, while settling down into winter quarters, or scaping from them with the returning summer (for the intervening seasons leave but little space in which to display themselves) can only be adequately understood when we have acquired some notions of the physical appearance of those strange and desolate seas.

Captain May, who sailed in the *Fox* as a volunteer, after having supported the enterprise by the most liberal contributions, has enriched

¹⁵ "The Life and Travels of Alexander von Humboldt, with an Account of his Scientific Fellow-Labourers and Contemporaries." London: J. Blackwood and Co.

¹⁶ "The Voyage of the 'Fox' in the Arctic Seas; a Narrative of the Discovery of the Fate of Sir John Franklin and his Companions." By Captain McClintock, R.N., LL.D. London: J. Murray. 1860.

the volume by many most excellent drawings; and if there is no exaggeration in the heaving of the water in that picture of the *Fox* steaming out of the Rolling Pack, which fronts the title-page, he has given the uninstructed, at one glance, that notion of danger and enormous responsibility which we have just said could only be partly realized by the perusal of the daily accounts of the elements of which it is made up. Captain McClintock's volume is enriched by abundant maps of the intricate geography of the seas he had to search, and by a fully laid down chart of his own discoveries, which, apart from the peculiar object of his voyage, consist in the accurate survey of 800 miles of new coast, proving, as Sir Roderick Murchison says in the preface, "that the strait named by Kenedy, in an earlier expedition of Lady Franklin, after his companion, the brave Lieutenant Bellot, and which has hitherto been regarded only as an impassable frozen channel, or ignored as a channel at all, is a navigable strait, the south shore of which is thus seen to be the northernmost land of the continent of America. McClintock has also laid down the hitherto unknown coast line of Boothia, southwards from Bellot's Strait to the magnetic pole, has delineated the whole of King William Island, and opened a new and capacious, though ice-choked channel, suspected before, but not proved, to exist, extending from Victoria Strait, in a north-west direction, to Melville or Parry Sound." Perhaps nothing can give a more adequate idea of the uncertainty attending the navigation of these seas than the fact that the whole of the active investigations of Captain McClintock were confined to the second year, he having been caught in the ice in the northern part of Baffin's Bay, in an attempt to sail round the upper edge of the central pack ice. Thus enclosed, he drifted down the whole length of the western shore of Greenland, a distance of 1385 miles, having been beset 250 days, the first ten months being thus utterly lost for the purpose of his voyage. But the tedious and disappointing first winter was fully recompensed by the triumphant success which attended his efforts in the following one.

After a fresh passage up Baffin's Bay, he sailed through Lancaster Sound and Barrow's Strait to Beechey Island, where he set up a tablet to the memory of Franklin and his companions, that being the place at which they were last heard of, and thence to Peel Sound, but returned to proceed by Prince Regent's Inlet to Brentford Bay and Bellot's Strait, where he passed his second winter, during which he travelled down the west coast of Boothia Felix, and passing over to King William Island, sent Lieutenant Hobson round by its western shores, taking the eastern for himself. After accomplishing the circuit of the island, Captain McClintock found that Lieutenant Hobson had been obliged by sickness to return to the ships, but not before he had left an account under a cairn of his success in discovering the melancholy traces of the lost expedition, upon which traces McClintock of course immediately came. The accounts gathered from the Esquimaux, of two ships stranded on their shores long years ago, of the white men walking till they dropped down dead, probable as they were, could hardly have prepared McClintock for the sad spectacle of the bones of some

of their number whitening on the ground. The abandoned boat, the stores untouched, which would have been wealth to any number of the natives, sufficiently proved that here indeed was an absolute trace of the sad fate of the companions of Franklin. The paper found by Lieutenant Hobson showed that they had left their ships after two years' imprisonment in the ice, when it is known that their provisions would not have justified their passing another winter in the ships; and the notice of their intention to proceed to the Great Fish River determines the course they must have pursued, which could have been no other than over the very ground traversed by Captain McClintock; and yet beyond this point no further trace of a party of 105 men, nor any of the ships they had abandoned!

Captain McClintock explains this fact, which at first sight appears so strange, by the probability that they would travel on the sea ice rather than on the land, on account of its greater practicability, and that any trace of their passage would be lost with the melting of the road they had travelled on during the succeeding summer months. One of the ships is reported by the Esquimaux to have sunk, and all trace of the other has disappeared, probably in much such a manner as the vestiges of her crew have been also lost. Sir John Franklin died on board, ten months before the ships were abandoned, in April, 1848, having virtually discovered that approach to Dease's Strait which completes one North-Western Passage, and that passage, too, which he had ever considered as the most likely to exist.

These mysterious seas have now yielded up all their secrets. Very few miles of their inhospitable shores remain unexplored, and those few occur in such directions that they can be laid down with sufficient certainty. All the great features of the Arctic Archipelago are known, a passage through its narrow seas is proved possible; all reasonable curiosity is now satisfied, for it can hardly be said that there remains any scientific question to be answered the reply to which could be weighed for one instant against the perilous quest it calls for. Let our Arctic sailors and our Indian soldiers speak for England, but let us neither tempt a new revolt or again defy the mighty powers of the frozen north.

It is not long since history concerned itself with the affairs of monarchs only; and perhaps, not long hence, it will have come round to the opposite extreme, and concern itself exclusively with the fate and fortunes of those multitudes who were once thought too insignificant to be noticed. "The History of the Labouring Classes in France,"¹⁷ just published by M. Du Cellier, is one of the symptoms of a change in popular notions of what constitutes history, for which we have to thank that great school of historical inquiry for which France has, during the last generation, been so justly celebrated. The old monarchical histories have long since given way before the political, and these are now receding before the social ones; as national

¹⁷ "Histoire des Classes Laborieuses en France, depuis la Conquête de la Gaule par Jules César jusqu'à nos jours." Par M. F. Du Cellier. Paris: Didier and Co. London: Williams and Norgate.

life and political self-consciousness gradually penetrated the lower strata of the social body, the natural desire to inquire into the history of our forefathers is coloured by the hope of finding that they at some time enjoyed what we aspire to for our children. In the search for the golden age we come upon the history of progress, and are rewarded like the husbandman's sons, not by the discovery of the gold supposed to have been buried in their father's field, but by the increased fertility of the field itself; by gold, indeed, but with an image and superscription that we dreamed not of. The changes from the possession in common by the Gaulish clan (in some respects similar to the system in North Africa, and some parts of India, at the present day), which were gradually introduced by the Roman conquest and laws, by the Franks, by Charlemagne's great organization, so soon to give place to the feudal system, are traced with careful judgment; the condition of society which favoured, or rather called for this last *régime*, is drawn with a fulness which we have nowhere else seen. The effects of the Crusades, and the opportunities offered by them for the organization of a middle class, with whose history that of the labouring classes may be said to agree, until the laws of Henry II. in favour of the public charities struck at the root of the system of guilds, by enacting that any one who had for six years continuously taught his trade to the children of the Hospital of the Trinity, should have all the legal privileges of a passed master, are treated with fulness and discrimination. A new light is thrown by the author on the part taken by the labouring classes in the celebrated defence of Paris against Henry IV. He attributes their self-devotion rather to sectarian fanaticism than to the influence of those communistic ideas which have, in later years, exercised so great an influence over them. In this particular he forsakes a view very popular in France, and, in our opinion, he has very good grounds for doing so.

The chief events of the seventeenth century affecting the labouring classes are the efforts of Colbert for their relief, frustrated both by their own prejudices and those of the Bourgeoisie. The revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and the expatriation of the most flourishing branches of the national industry, which had been chiefly carried on by the Calvinists, who, in liberating themselves from the established theological dogmas, had also freed themselves from the aristocratical prejudices against commerce, which had hitherto identified it with the occupations of the populace as unworthy of an educated man, inflicted the heaviest blow on the interests of the labouring classes which they ever received in France.

The industrial and agricultural condition of the country in the following century has been often described, and is familiar to Englishmen from the pictures drawn of it by Arthur Young. The efforts of Turgot, characterized by the uncompromising energy of a conscientious theorist, were frustrated by prejudices that he would not manage, and had not time to overcome.

The influence of the Revolution, the Republic, the Empire, and Restoration, the Monarchy of 1830, the Revolution of 1848, and re-establishment of the Empire, on the condition of the working-classes, is

investigated with great care by M. Du Cellier, who confines himself to the history of the progress made by them, and does not allow himself to be called aside to discuss the numerous social theories which have flourished in such abundance during these last periods. His book may be recommended as a calm inquiry into a subject that is generally treated in a spirit of the most exaggerated artisanship.

SCIENCE.

WE have long been of opinion that the time is fully come for a reform in the teaching of Elementary Physics; the general doctrine of the Correlation of Forces being now so firmly established, as to afford a secure basis for the fundamental propositions of each of the departments that are usually treated as if they had little or nothing in common with the rest. Although the old notion of "imponderable forms of matter" still finds a place in too many of our text-books, and discussions about the singleness or duality of the "electric fluid" occasionally present themselves as relics of a now antiquated mode of thought, every one who is interested in the progress of truth must desire that such errors should be cleared away as speedily as possible, and that the public mind should be familiarized with the simpler as well as more philosophical aspect under which the subject is now viewed by thinkers of the highest class. For here, as elsewhere, the highest forms of knowledge, instead of being the most abstruse, are really, when properly presented to the mind, those most readily apprehended. And when once the opening mind is thoroughly possessed with the simple conception of *force*, brought home to it by its own experience of effort in producing or checking mechanical motion, and with the fact (which may be readily drawn forth from the results of the most familiar experience) that mechanical force may be made to operate in different ways,—expending itself in the production of heat and electricity, for instance, when motion is retarded by friction,—the extension of the same conception to other cases with which it seems at first to have but little relation, is comparatively easy. We have ourselves been struck, in fact, with the contrast between the facility with which the doctrine of correlation is accepted and comprehended by those who have nothing to unlearn, and the difficulty with which it finds its way into the understandings of such as are possessed with the notions respecting "latent heat," "resinous and vitreous electricity," and the like, to which they cling with all the tenacity of early habit. With these views we cordially welcomed the announcement that the Juvenile Course which Professor Faraday so wisely and so kindly delivers during every Christmas vacation at the Royal Institution, would on the last occasion treat of the Physical and Chemical Forces generally, and of their relations to each other;¹ and although (as every one who has heard him

¹ "A Course of Six Lectures on the Various Forces of Matter, and their Relations to each other." By Michael Faraday, D.C.L., F.R.S., Fullerian Professor of Chemistry, Royal Institution. Edited by William Crookes, F.C.S. With numerous illustrations. London, 1860. Fcap. 8vo, pp. 179.

lecture well knows) it is impossible to transfer to paper the indescribable charm of the manner of his exposition, yet a verbatim report of the matter, as taken down by a skilful short-hand writer, and corrected by the lecturer himself, with copious wood-cut illustrations of the apparatus and (so far as may be) of the experimental phenomena, afford a substitute of no mean value; and not only many a lad, but many children of a larger growth, will read the little volume before us with feelings of far greater interest than they would experience in the perusal of a more formal treatise. To many of those who may be already familiar with the facts brought under their notice, the mode in which they are brought to bear on each other, and the relations developed between them, will be altogether new; and even such as are well acquainted with both facts and doctrines may draw from Professor Faraday's admirable exposition of them a valuable lesson in the art of teaching. To him no fact is too trivial, no illustration too trite, if only it is appropriate. He presumes upon no previous knowledge, but only upon a general foundation of common sense. And he shows the humility which distinguishes the real philosopher, in thus bringing a mind of such vast acquirements and comprehensive range down to that common level on which alone it can make itself understood by the limited capacity of the child.

A large and handsome volume lies before us, entirely devoted to the subject of Water in its various relations, which are discussed as only Germans can discuss such a subject.² The following list of the headings of its principal subdivisions will convey an idea of its general scope:—1. Of Water in its Chemical and Physical properties. 2. Of Water as a constituent of the Atmosphere. 3. Of Water as a Regulator of Climate. 4. Of Water in its Earth-fashioning power. 5. Of the Sea and the Great Waters of Continents. 6. Of Water as Nourisher. 7. Of Water as the Habitation of Plants and Animals. 8. Of Water as Medium of Communication, and as Assistant in the Arts. 9. Of Water as a Poetical Element.—The Earth-fashioning power of Water is treated with peculiar completeness; a large body of information and many admirable illustrations from recent sources being incorporated with matter already familiar to such as have attended to that subject. The closing topic, as might be expected from what has gone before, is handled in a manner that will scarcely satisfy the ideal conceptions of the poet or the artist; the predominance of the scientific mode of thought being apparent throughout.

Those who are interested in observing the curious results of misdirected ingenuity, will find a notable example in a work which has lately reached us from the United States;³ the author of which, starting with the idea that the proportion of the polar and equatorial diameters of the earth, and the distribution of land and water on its surface,

² "Das Wasser, Eine Darstellung für gebildete Leser und Leserinnen." Von E. A. Rossmäslar. Zweite vermehrte Ausgabe, mit 9 Lithographien und 47 Illustrationen in Holzschnitt. Leipzig, 1860. 8vo, pp. 526.

³ "Studies of the Earth." An Essay on the Figure and Surface-Divisions of the Earth, its Geological and Meteorological Phenomena, and its Astronomical Elements. By Samuel Elliott Quee, Washington, D.C. Washington, 1860. 4to, pp. 98.

must have been governed by the influence of solar and lunar attraction, has essayed to discover numerical relations between the former set of quantities and various solar and lunar elements which have been ascertained by astronomical observation. Having determined these ratios to his own satisfaction, he then applies them in the reverse order to the reproduction of these elements from terrestrial data; and whilst he has only been working a sum in arithmetic, he thinks he has been making a great discovery, which we shall allow him to express in his own words:—"Therefore by the use of the distance of the moon as co-efficient, both the distance of the earth from the sun in sun-diameters, and the value of the diameter of the sun, have been calculated from the earth's divisions and surface-structure; and the former, the distance of the earth from the sun, can be calculated from the structure of the earth alone."

The "Genesis of the Earth and of Man"⁴ is a little book that is chiefly noteworthy as showing a disposition on the part of some, even of those who hold themselves bound by the letter of Scripture, to accept the conclusions of science, and to accommodate their theological views to its teachings. The author is evidently a man of considerable acquaintance with Semitic literature; and he brings this to bear upon the interpretation of the book of Genesis, in a manner that will startle those who have been accustomed only to the received notions as to its historical import. His greatest heresy is that Adam is not the progenitor of the human race generally, but only of that family of mankind to which the Jewish nation belongs; and that even in Adam's time the earth was extensively peopled with human beings, whose descendants constitute the great bulk of the existing races. He affirmed this doctrine in his previous edition, as fairly deducible from the Biblical narrative; and he now strengthens it by those various external evidences of the antiquity of man which have recently attracted so much interest. The Biblical account of the Creation he supposes to have been derived from a vision by which the history was revealed to Adam; and he admits, after Hugh Miller, a considerable latitude in the interpretation of it, whilst endeavouring to bring it into general accordance with the facts of Geology. The Editor of the book does not seem altogether easy at the latitudinarianism of his *protégé*; and it is rather amusing to find him prefacing it with such a warning as this:—"An opinion has lately sprung up, that, in reading the Bible, we are to inquire what each writer 'meant.' This is in direct contradiction to the express teaching of the Bible itself, and leads to error instead of truth;"—the whole aim of the author being honestly to determine what the writer of Genesis "meant."

The lovers of those somewhat inanimate beauties, the Sea-Anemones, have received from one of their most enthusiastic admirers, Mr. Gosse, a series of portraits, with descriptions of their charms, by which it may

⁴ "The Genesis of the Earth and of Man; or, the History of Creation, and the Antiquity and Races of Mankind, considered on Biblical and other Grounds." Edited by Reginald Stuart Poole, M.R.S.L., &c., of the British Museum. Second edition, revised and enlarged. London, 1860. Fcap. 8vo.

be anticipated that they will in future be easily recognised and named.⁵ Previously to the time when Mr. G. commenced the study of Marine Zoology, it does not appear that more than thirty British species were known, and of these several were doubtful. He considers that at least seventy "good" species may now be distinguished, and of these he claims to have himself added no fewer than thirty-four to the British Fauna. It is, of course, not impossible that some of these may prove to be mere varieties; for, as certain well-known types of this group have been ascertained to present a considerable range of variation both as to form and colouring, it cannot be thought unlikely that the differences between other forms which are at present supposed to be specifically distinct, should hereafter be found, as our acquaintance with them increases, to depend on a like variability on the part of types which have as yet been very imperfectly studied. Mr. Gosse is not unmindful, however, of this source of fallacy; and has wisely taken pains to show, both by admirable pictorial delineations, and by careful descriptions, what are the characters of the best marked varieties, as well as of what he considers to be true species. He has aimed to make his diagnoses as brief as is consistent with clearness; seizing on such characters, in each case, as are truly distinctive and discriminative; and enumerating these in a regular and definite order, so that the student may readily compare species with species, or genus with genus, in their several parts or organs. In this portion of his work we think that he has generally succeeded well; as he has also in his introductory chapter, which contains a general account of the structure and physiology of the Actinozoa, and which may be studied with advantage even by such as think themselves already well-informed on those points. But his arrangement of species into genera and families is that of a naturalist who dwells too much on the minor peculiarities of the objects of his special study, and who is thus led to erect them into characters of undue importance. If distinctions of such trivial value as those by which he separates the families of *Sagartiadae*, *Antheadae*, and *Bunodedae*, from that of *Actiniadae*, were to be admitted elsewhere, half the genera in the Animal Kingdom would at once be raised to the rank of families, to the subversal of all our existing notions of classification, and, as we cannot but believe, to the great detriment of systematic science. So, of the list of new genera, among which Mr. Gosse has distributed his largely augmented list of species, it is clear to us that the greater part of them are only entitled to rank as subgenera, if they should be admitted to possess any other value than that which attaches to convenient groupings of species that are obviously very closely allied. By those who desire to make a special study of this tribe, Mr. Gosse's classification will doubtless be found very convenient; the doubts to which we have given expression are such as will probably occur to scientific zoologists alone.

⁵ "Actinologia Britannica. A History of the British Sea Anemones and Corals." With coloured Figures of the Species, and Principal Varieties. By Philip Henry Gosse, F.R.S. London, 1860. 8vo, pp. 362. With 12 lithographic plates, printed in colours.

Von Hessling's elaborate work on the Pearl-mussel⁶ does not treat (as the ordinary reader might suppose) of the animal which yields the pearls most prized for the adornment of the fair sex; this last being the Pearl-oyster, or technically the *Avicula Margaritacea*, of tropical seas, whilst the Pearl-mussel is a fresh-water mollusk, belonging to the genus *Anodon*, which is distributed extensively through the rivers and lakes of Europe, as the allied genus *Unio* is through those of North America. The anatomy and physiology of these genera, the structure of their shells, and of the pearly excrescences frequently put forth from their internal layers, their geographical distribution, and the question how far the supply of pearls which they afford can be increased and improved by artificial means, are discussed with great minuteness; though some of the more difficult problems which still remain to be solved in the anatomy of Bivalve Mollusks are passed by without adequate notice.

The popular literature of Marine Zoology has received an interesting addition from Mr. Harper,⁷ who writes with the enthusiasm of thorough enjoyment respecting the doings of his pet crabs, fish, and anemones, as witnessed in his *vivaria*, and displays no inconsiderable powers of observation and description in the record of them, not being free, however, from the very common error of attributing *human* motives to the actions of creatures which the scientific physiologist must believe to be governed by very different impulses. Mr. Harper is a strenuous advocate of the mechanical theory of the boring of the *Pholas*, in favour of which he gives very important testimony from his own observations, having kept specimens for a considerable time in confinement, until they bored completely through the rock in which they were imbedded, so as to allow their operations to be watched from either end of their burrow. He is convinced that the rasping action of the shell affords the principal means by which the excavation is effected, but that the foot also renders important assistance, being planted firmly at the bottom of the burrow, and thus acting as a secure fulcrum. The author's views on this subject have been already communicated in two letters to the *Athenæum* (Jan. 26 and Feb. 28, 1859). We regret not to be able to speak so well of Mr. Harper's illustrations as of his text. Though artistically drawn, they are injured by being printed in a uniform violet tint, having no relation to the colour of the objects they represent, and would have been much more true if they had been printed in ordinary black.

Mr. Cornwall Simeon's little volume of "Stray Notes" belongs to a class which we are always glad to welcome as indicative of a genial love of nature on the part of the writer, and as tending to foster it on the part of the reader.⁸ He is an enthusiast in piscatorial pursuits,

⁶ "Die Perlmuscheln und ihre Perlen; Naturwissenschaftlich und Geschichtlich, mit Berücksichtigung der Perlengewässer Bayerns." (Geschrieben von Theodor von Hessling. Mit acht Tafeln und einer Karte. Leipzig, 1859. 8vo, pp. 376.

⁷ "Glimpses of Ocean Life; or, Rock Pools and the Lessons they teach." By John Harper, F.R.S.S.A. With numerous illustrations by the Author. London, 1860. Fcap. 8vo, pp. 379.

⁸ "Stray Notes on Fishing and Natural History." By Cornwall Simeon. Cambridge, 1860. Fcap. 8vo, pp. 263.

and magnifies (perhaps a little unduly) their superiority either to hunting or shooting, in the degree in which they bring their votary under the refining influence of beautiful scenery, and into contact with the innocence and cheerfulness of the animated creation. It would, perhaps, be as true to say, that fishing is chosen as a relaxation by such as have a preference for this kind of quiet intercourse with nature, over those more active sports which derive much of their zest from physical exertion and social rivalry. The first part of Mr. Simeon's little book is exclusively addressed to anglers; and on this we do not presume to comment. Of the second part, which is made up of the various observations noted by the author chiefly during his piscatory excursions, it will be enough to say that these may be read with pleasure by any one who is interested in the study of Natural History, whether as an amateur or as a man of science.

Mr. Tyas's "Wild Flowers of England," of which a new and enlarged edition is before us,⁹ is essentially a *pretty* book, made up of showy pictures, gossip, scraps of poetry, and such small modicum of scientific information as the Incumbent of Kingsley thinks capable of being digested by the fair readers whom he seems to have specially in his contemplation. We could tell him of a brother-clergyman by whom "the wild flowers of England" are made a subject of educational discipline of no mean value to the children of his village school; who are led by his method to the cultivation of the powers of keen observation, accurate discrimination, and intelligent reasoning; who shrink from no difficulties in the shape of hard words, but are helped to master whatever are really worth their learning; and who thus acquire an interest in the subject, that remains with them in after years and gives a healthful direction to their thoughts and feelings, whilst they have been undergoing a mental training that prepares them for the use of their faculties in any subsequent walk of life. Of these two methods of teaching Botany, we much prefer Prof. Henslow's to Mr. Tyas's.

Although microscopic inquiry is nowhere carried on with more activity than it is in Germany, there is not in that country, as with us, a special periodical devoted to that department of investigation. Dr. Reinicke, however, proposes to issue, from time to time, a *brochure* containing memoirs and shorter notices by himself and others, on various topics interesting to the microscopist; and the part before us¹⁰ (which is the second that has appeared) contains an elaborate essay on the movement of the *Oscillatoria*, especially the *Spirulina*,—a shorter and thoroughly practical paper on the mode of making thin sections of teeth, bone, shell, and other hard bodies, in which art English object-preparers have hitherto taken the lead,—and a number of brief contributions by various hands on divers subjects. We learn from the advertisement on the cover, that the first part, which we have

⁹ "The Wild Flowers of England; or, Favourite Field Flowers Popularly Described." By the Rev. Robert Tyas, M. A., F. R. S., Incumbent of Kingsley, Cheshire. With 24 coloured groups of Flowers, by James Andrews, F. R. S. Large paper edition, revised. London, 1860. Post 8vo, pp. 1860.

¹⁰ "Beitraege zur Nerven Mikroskopie." Von Friedrich Reinicke, Lehrer der Naturwissenschaften am königl. Schullehrer-Seminar zu Dresden. Zweites Heft. Mit Eingedrucktten Holzschnitten. Dresden, 1860. 8vo, pp. 80.

not seen, was chiefly devoted to a discussion of the value of the *Pleurosigma angulatum* as a test-object. We shall look forward with interest to the continued appearance of this publication.

Notwithstanding the number of works upon the Microscopic Anatomy of the Human Body which have appeared on the Continent, no other original treatise on the subject has been published in this country, than that of Dr. Hassall, which has never acquired the estimation of competent judges; and those who desired more minute information upon histological details than that which is afforded in the admirable summary given by Dr. Sharpey in his edition of "Quain's Anatomy," or in the "Physiological Anatomy" of Messrs. Todd and Bowman, have been obliged to have recourse to books in other languages, unless fortunate enough to have access to the translation of the first edition of "Professor Kölliker's Handbook," which was executed some years ago for the Sydenham Society by Messrs. Busk and Huxley. The subsequent progress of scientific inquiry had left that edition far behind; a second edition of the work had appeared in Germany; a French translation had been issued; when, in accordance with suggestions made to him in several quarters, Professor Kölliker made arrangements three or four years ago for the reproduction of his work¹¹ in this country. Its progress through the press has been delayed by various circumstances; but this delay has enabled the author to introduce so much new matter, that the translation, though made from the second German edition, virtually represents the third which has recently appeared in its original language. It has been executed and revised with great care, so that the work generally reads as if it had been written in our own vernacular; and the admirable series of illustrations on wood, chiefly taken from the author's own drawings, have been re-engraved and very carefully printed; so that the British student of Histology now possesses a very full and at the same time compendious view of the subject, as set forth by one of the highest authorities in this department of science. Such a work must carry with it its own recommendation; Professor Kölliker's reputation as a Microscopic observer, not merely in the various departments of Human Anatomy, but in the far wider field that is afforded by the structure of the lower animals, being second to that of no other; and his style of description being clear and concise, strikingly contrasting with the verbosity of many German authors. In regard to the greater portion of the subjects embraced in this treatise, the information given is based on the results of the author's personal investigations; and it would have been impossible, without a very large addition to its bulk, to have made it include full references to the labours of others. References of this kind, however, are given in the case of several of the more recent and more important memoirs and treatises upon questions which must still be regarded as *sub judice*; and such as desire to enter more fully into such questions will be thus guided to a knowledge of the teachings of other histologists in regard

¹¹ "A Manual of Human Microscopic Anatomy." By A. Kölliker, Professor of Anatomy and Physiology in the University of Würzburg. With 249 illustrations. London, 1860. 8vo, pp. 633.

to them. It is perhaps well that we should warn our readers that the "Manual" of Professor Külliker corresponds in size rather to the German "Handbuch" than to what we have come to recognise as the typical form designated by that term.

It always gives us pleasure to notice a new edition of a really good book, when the author does not content himself with a few trivial additions and corrections, but takes adequate pains to place his work *au courant* with the advance of the subject on which it treats, and does not shrink from the trouble of thoroughly renovating the whole fabric, by parting with everything which had become effete, and replacing it with new and sound materials. It is because he has thus conscientiously discharged his duty, that Dr. Druitt has obtained a success for his "Manual of Surgery"¹² which we do not remember any other author of such a text-book to have reached. We find in the volume before us as many as thirty new wood-engravings, and a large amount of new matter relating alike to the general doctrines and to the minutest details of surgery; and yet the bulk of this edition is not augmented by more than thirty-two pages,—a result which speaks strongly of the care with which the author must have carried on the process of elimination as well as that of new formation.

Of Dr. Latham's two volumes on "Descriptive Ethnology"¹³ we need only say that they are indispensable to every one who desires to keep pace with the progress of inquiry in this department of science. Dr. Latham does not in this work attempt to draw any general conclusions; but records the results of elaborate investigations, linguistic, physiological, and historical, into the phenomena presented by the existing distribution of a number of tribes of the Old World, which up to this point have been very imperfectly studied.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

M. AMÉDÉE THIERRY, the brother of the distinguished historian, and himself an author of some reputation, has, in his "Récits de l'Histoire Romaine,"¹ given us a detailed account of the closing fortunes of the Western Empire. In a work which indicates diligence and research, he has described, in vigorous and lucid language, the fall of imperial Rome and the extinction of Italian independence.

¹² "The Surgeon's Vade Mecum: a Manual of Modern Surgery." By Robert Druitt, Licentiate of the Royal College of Physicians, London. Eighth Edition, much improved, and illustrated by 328 wood-engravings. London: 1859. 8vo, pp. 791.

¹³ "Descriptive Ethnology." By R. G. Latham, M.A., M.D., F.R.S., late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Two vols. 8vo. London, 1859. First Volume, Eastern and Northern Asia; Europe; pp. 516. Second Volume, Europe, Africa, India; pp. 506.

¹ "Récits de l'Histoire Romaine au Vme Siècle. Derniers temps de l'Empire d'Occident." Par M. Amédée Thierry, Membre de l'Institut. Paris: Didier et Cie. London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate. 1860.

Limiting himself to the period, little more than a quarter of a century, which commenced with the investiture of the Greek Emperor Anthemius, A.D. 467, and terminated with the arrival of the Ostrogoth king Theodoric, A.D. 493, M. Thierry has furnished a complete narrative of the events that fall within it, from the voyage of the poet Sidonius Apollinaris, afterwards prefect of Rome, to the death of Odoacer, the nominal representative of the Emperors of the East. From the marriage of Ricimer to the daughter of Anthemius, and the prefecture of Sidonius, in the first and second chapters, he passes, in the third chapter, to the expedition against Genseric. In the fourth we have the fall of Anthemius; in the fifth a sketch of the miserable and anarchical provinces on the Danube, and of the remedies provided, by the reforming apostle Severinus, whose death, with Odoacer's invasion of Norica, forms the subject of the ninth chapter. The emigration of the Ostrogoths from Pannonia; the administration of Nepos and Odoacer's regal patriciate; the distribution of a third of the conquered territory to the soldiers, and the quarrel between the bishop of Rome and the patriarch of Constantinople, are the topics of the sixth, seventh, and eighth chapters, while the growing fortunes of Theodoric, the war of the Ostrogoths in Macedonia, Thessaly, and Epirus, their march over the Alps, the siege of Constantinople, Zeno's cession of Italy, the overthrow and death of Odoacer, and the assumption of kingly power by Theodoric, are related in the three concluding chapters. In this chaotic period, which M. Thierry has undertaken to revive for us, we witness that signal catastrophe which separates the ancient from the modern world; the dislocation of all the governing elements of the Empire; the antagonism of the East and West; the attempts of the provinces to realize their independence; the creation of a half-barbarous, half-Roman sovereignty out of the wreck of the old dominion; the contest between material force and intelligence, raging throughout the world, but concentrating itself and triumphing in Rome; a conquering Christianity, a military episcopacy; and the strange phenomenon of an absolute theocracy, under Severinus, at once the protector of the Romans and the adviser and friend of the Barbarians. In his historical estimate, M. A. Thierry endeavours to be rigorously just: Thus, without any rhetorical preference for the Lower Empire, he considers that it is entitled to the gratitude of mankind, for the double service which it has rendered in the extension of Christian law, and its resistance to the encroachments of Asiatic barbarism. Similarly he distinguishes between the *uncrowned* Theodoric, cruel, savage, deceitful; and Theodoric the *crowned* king of Italy, who was unquestionably worthy of the name of Great!

Suddenly passing from the overthrow of the Roman Empire to the break up of Catholicism in England, and looking over the fifth and sixth volumes of Mr. Froude's almost classical History of Tudor England,² we find the second act of the great religious revolution about

² "History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth." By James Anthony Froude, M.A. Late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Vols. V. VI. London: John W. Parker and Son, West Strand. 1860.

to commence. The sixteen executors to whom Henry had confided the government of the country, during the minority of Edward VI., determining that one of their number should be invested with political supremacy, were induced to select the Earl of Hertford, the king's uncle, as their superior. The Protectorate of Hertford, better known as Duke of Somerset, lasted for five years. Somerset was not a successful ruler. The fatuous invasion of Scotland, to compel the marriage of Mary Stuart with the young Tudor, resulted in the alienation of that kingdom. The loss of the Imperial alliance, the exhaustion of the public revenues, the rebellion at home, which was suppressed at the cost of ten thousand lives, and "the wild doings," the trial and execution of the Protector's brother, the turbulent Lord Seymour of Sudleye, were among the many disasters that characterized the Protector's infelicitous administration. Somerset, Mr. Froude tells us, was popular with the multitude, for he was the defender of the poor against the strong. He was a man, the very multitude of whose good intentions betrayed him. Attempting a giant's work, with a woman's strength, he failed, and in his failures was passionate and unmanageable. The hero of the hour, however, Somerset contrived to work his will in Church and State, while that hour lasted. The Reformation continued to advance. From Lutheran England changed to Geneva. The clergy were refused a voice in ecclesiastical legislation; the *congé d'élire* was abolished in the election of the bishops; the residuary property of Church corporations was placed in the hands of the Crown; the repeal of all positive laws enforcing celibacy was carried; images were put away, windows broken, and walls whitewashed; a Book of Homilies was issued; and an Act of Uniformity passed. Parallel to the religious reformation important social changes were being silently worked out. The amalgamation of farms, the enclosure of common lands, the diminution of employment, the depreciation of the currency, the attempted enforcement by the governing powers of an unjust tariff, the destruction of hospitals, schools, and almshouses, the frightful official rapacity, the fraudulent appropriation by the Lords of the Council of valuable estates, give a dark distinction to the degenerate Reform movement in the reign of the Sixth Edward. The latent anarchy of the English people early broke out into overt insurrection. At first Somerset openly favoured the insubordinate demonstrations of the populace. Persuaded, says Mr. Froude, that the masses sympathized with the changes which he was introducing, and mistaking acquiescence in the Papal separation for approval of innovations in belief, he conceived a religious revolt to be impossible. At Whitsuntide, 1549, the first Prayer Book was to come into use, and the Mass was to be prohibited by law. In the West the people inclined to Catholicism, in the East to Anabaptism. In Cornwall and Devonshire the insurrection wore a religious character. The blazing "Barns of Crediton" became a fiery watchword with the stout-hearted western men, who fell in the summer-gloaming fighting for their hearths and altars. In the Eastern counties, on the other hand, the insurrection assumed a social aspect. In his vivid and discriminating narrative of this double rising, Mr. Froude admirably describes the nature and pro-

gress of the popular rebellion. We regret that we have not space to quote from these pages of pure English undefiled, some of the passages, which tell us "how the Carews rode fretfully up and down the river banks, probing the mud with their lances to find footing for their horses," or which describe the rising under Kit the tanner of Wymondham, when sixteen thousand men encamped on the north of Norwich, in turf huts roofed with boughs, and tell us how the offending country gentlemen were brought up for trial under the old oak-tree. Passing rapidly over these events we find the speculative theology of Protestantism usurping the action of a practical piety, and the Reformation degenerating into insupportable tyranny. The Lord Protector, now grown more tolerant, took part with the Princess Mary against the Lords of the Council. Before his plans for the re-conquest of power were matured, he was betrayed by Palmer; and accused, whether falsely or not, by Warwick or Northumberland, was found guilty of felony, and executed. to the deep grief of the people, by whom he was passionately beloved, on 22nd January, 1552.

Without his rival's title of Protector, Northumberland succeeded to his rival's power. During the last illness of the amiable and pious but, perhaps, primly precocious Boy-king, this ambitious and selfish man determined to change the Succession, in direct contravention of the will of Henry VIII., and of a Parliamentary enactment. Craumer suffered himself to be drawn into the rebellion, and Lady Jane Grey, whose story is retold so touchingly and beautifully by the present narrator, became the sacrifice to a faction of able and dangerous men whose interest committed them to the Reformation; men who had divided among them the forfeited estates of the Percies, the Howards, &c., and who to prevent reaction would have supported any men or any measures. The standard of rebellion was raised. Indignant England rallied round the House of the Catholic Mary. With the execution and defection from the Protestant cause of Northumberland, Palmer, and Gates, the ultra-faction among the Reformers became powerless; and "the central multitude, whose belief was undefined, yielded to the apparent sentence of Heaven upon a cause weakened by unsuccessful treason, and disavowed in his death by its champion." England's reconciliation with Rome was now soon brought about, under the auspices of Cardinal Pole and Queen Mary. Mr. Froude speaks very feelingly and we think truly of the poor Queen, with the blood-swathed name. He describes her life, up to the time of her accession, as blameless, and even noble; he portrays her wandering about the palace galleries, writing tear-blotted letters to her coarse-minded and profligate husband; with that brilliant vision of a Saviour Child lost in the waking reality of disease and madness. The responsibility of lighting up the fires of Smithfield rests not principally with her, contends our historian, but with Cardinal Pole, a man not naturally cruel, but one who thought he did God service by the violent repression of heresy. Exonerating Gardiner (who was now dead), Bonner, Philip, Mary, Charles V., and his ministers, from the charge of actively promoting the later persecutions of this reign, Mr. Froude argues that the chief blame lies with Pole, under the shadow of whose own

cathedral were witnessed the most frightful scenes of all that frightful period; who issued the first edict for the Episcopal Inquisition; who declared that there could not be a work of greater cruelty against the Commonwealth than to nourish or favour heretics; who spoke of the martyrs as worse than murderers or the blackest traitors, as brambles and briars that had been and still would be cast into the fire; and whom Archbishop Parker, "who knew Pole and his doings well," called *Carnifex et flagellum Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*. In the absence of any acquitting testimony we incline to think Mr. Froude's reasoning goes far to establish for Cardinal Pole not an exclusive monopoly, but a bad pre-eminence of persecuting zeal. Yet, be it remembered, that even Cranmer, the mild and gentle, not only shared with Pole the conviction that error of belief is the greatest of crimes, but actually claimed the privilege of sending obstinate heretics to the stake.

We cannot now go more minutely into the sad but often splendid narrative of the Twelve Years which Mr. Froude has undertaken to describe. In general we are able to accord with the view of English history which he opens out to us in this portion of his work; we are not violently startled by the assertion of the primary paradox which has been considered the crowning defect of the earlier volumes; and in the estimate which he presents of the great actors in the historical drama of Gardiner, Cranmer, Edward, Mary, and others, we think we discern indications of a noble anxiety to be scrupulously and generously fair. Mr. Froude's simple, unaffected English, the tender humanity of his thoughts, the quiet, sustained beauty of his style and narrative, and the subdued, harmonious colouring of his composition, leave us little to desire in a merely literary point of view. If, with the grace, refinement, and penetration of poetic genius, Mr. Froude had united the comprehensive grasp and analytic power which are the attributes of pure philosophical intellect; if he had kept clear of the embarrassments of theoretic prepossession; if his expression were somewhat warmer and his narrative somewhat more rapid and intense, his History of Tudor England would bid fair to be as popular and authoritative as it is refined, ingenious, and even original.

Mr. Massey's third instalment of English History³ describes the fortunes and position of our country more than two centuries after the death of Edward Tudor. The present volume reports the events and transactions of that part of the Georgian period which elapsed between 1781—1793. Opening with an account of the military operations in the Carolinas, of the treason of Arnold, and the execution of the compromised though gallant and patriotic André, the historian relates the retirement of Lord Cornwallis into Virginia, his occupation of York Town and Gloucester, his frequent repulses of the enemy, and finally, after vainly awaiting the arrival of the reinforcement promised by Sir Henry Clinton, his capitulation to General Washington. This capitulation was the critical point of the American war. A year after

³ "A History of England during the Reign of George III." By William Massey, M.P. Vol. III. 1781—1793. London: John W. Parker and Son, West Strand. 1860.

the surrender of York Town the preliminaries of peace were signed. The treaty concluded, not without some sharp practice on the part of the American commissioners, between Great Britain and the United States, was arranged in entire independence of France and Spain, the avowed allies of the insurgent colonists in their struggle for liberty. Rodney's brilliant victory compelled the French to lower their ambitious demands; and as after America's defection from the common cause, neither France nor Spain had any motive or protest for a continuation of hostilities, treaties with both these countries were shortly after concluded on the basis of the peace of 1763.

Mr. Massey's judgment of the War of Independence appears to us to be scarcely consistent. He concedes that the war was illiberal and unjust, yet supports England's assumption to tax her colonies in pursuance of the right reserved expressly in her charters. The constitutional ideal, that taxation and representation are co-extensive, an ideal that tends more and more to pass into historical reality, was assuredly violated by George III. and his ministers; and the continued enforcement of the selfish and tyrannical commercial policy of Great Britain, seems to have rendered the armed resistance of Washington and his compatriots an almost inevitable alternative.

Passing from the American War to the position of the country at George III's accession, we come across some curious details of the political England of that day. Constitutional government seems then to have been wholly suspended. We find a dominant oligarchy, with opposing factions, a decaying constituency, a corrupt electorate, an increase of nomination boroughs, a servile Parliament, and a "Doge of Venice" King. Mr. Massey shows us how George III. determined to free the Crown from the dictation of the Revolution families, and finding open war impossible, introduced a system of bribery and corruption, unexampled in the worst days of the Hanover succession. The jobbers and place-hunters, who, under the name of the "King's friends," worked that vast engine of moral pollution, prettily called Influence, were in time superseded by that obsequious agent of the Court, Lord North, whose administration is described by Mr. Massey as the worst "which has directed the affairs of this Empire since that infamous Cabinet known by the name of Cabal." Lord Rockingham's brief exercise of ministerial power, attended as it was with really beneficial results, receives due commendation from our author; while Fox's secession from the Government, under the administration of Lord Shelburne, in 1782, and his conduct in joining the coalition, in the following year, is condemned as wayward and factious. The unconstitutional expedient to which the King resorted, during the discussion on the India Bill; the accession of Pitt to the highest ministerial functions, as the presumed champion of the royal prerogative and the restorer of a national policy; his liberal political and commercial measures; his successful career as peace minister—are some of the many topics treated and illustrated by the present historian. All these passages, as also those which relate to Edmund Burke, the bold reformer of the civil establishment, and brilliant vindicator of freedom in commerce and religion; to Fox, to Hastings, to the unworthy Prince of Wales, and

the poor blind King, we are constrained by the imperious exigencies of space, to pretermit.

The important facts brought out in this historical narrative are that the India Policy of the Coalition determined the general character of the British Government for nearly fifty years; that the Whigs allowed the opportunity of restoring and improving Representative Government to go by; that most of the large manufacturing towns of our own time were in the period previous to the French Revolution so many scattered hamlets; that the election proceedings in the open boroughs were disgraceful; that the counties and the metropolis were the sole centres of public spirit and patriotic effort; that Pitt, naturally a man of liberal tendencies, was perverted by his terror of the French Revolution, into the chief agent of a repressive and arbitrary Government; and that the tremendous social explosion of the neighbour kingdom postponed for nearly half a century the settlement of the great question of Parliamentary Reform in our own country. Though neither artist nor philosopher, Mr. Massey is entitled to some credit, for the clear and informing presentment of facts, events, and transactions, which his facile and agreeable narrative of English history in the time of the third George contains.

During this reign the acquisition of a new empire in the East compensated England for the loss of her splendid colonial possessions in the West. A History of India, by Mr. Henry Beveridge,⁴ is designed to narrate the rise, progress, and actual circumstances of that empire, in its civil, military, and social aspects, from the first landing of the English to the suppression of the Sepoy Revolt. The first volume, the only one we have seen, commences with a sketch of India, in the remotest historic period, and closes with a notice of Clive's second government. The three books into which it is divided, treat,—the first, of India, ancient, mediæval, and modern; the second, of the earlier voyages of the original "Company," its fortunes and its policy, to the establishment by Act of Parliament of a rival corporation; the third, of the progress of the French in India; the war between France and England; the operations in the Carnatic; the intrigues of Dupleix; the treaty with the Nabob of Bengal; the battle of Plassy; the destruction of French interests in the Deccan; the disposition of Meer Jaffier; and Clive's career and government, down to 1767. The narrative of Indian events which Mr. Beveridge has drawn up appears to be comprehensive and candid, and his style simple, intelligible, and unassuming. The entire work is to be enriched with about five hundred illustrative woodcuts. The present volume contains a fair proportion of these engravings, a frontispiece and title in steel, and six appropriate maps.

In the first volume of his compendious but not very original History of France,⁵ Mr. Cròwe traced the political and social progress of that

⁴ "A Comprehensive History of India," &c. &c. By Henry Beveridge, Esq., Advocate. Vol. I. London: Blackie and Son. 1860.

⁵ "The History of France." By Eyre Evans Crowe. In five volumes. Vol. II. London: Longman, Green, Longmans, and Roberts. 1860.

country, from the successes of Clovis and Pepin to the reduction of the nobles and the compulsory unity of the nation, under Philip the Fair. In the recently published volume of this work the narrative commences with the reign of Charles the Sixth (1380), and terminates with the death of Henry the Second (1559), comprising a period of one hundred and eighty years. The struggle of the civic and lower classes against the princes and an almost regal aristocracy, complicated by the resistance of the Flemings and the rivalry of the Dukes of Orleans and Burgundy, extends over about half of Charles the Sixth's reign. During this and the preceding reign it was the constant endeavour of the French citizens "to guard their property, and acquire power or rights for the purpose of doing so." Class antagonism and independent and separate action, however, frustrated their repeated efforts. For about five-and-thirty years the English Invasion and Conquests in France, ending in the expulsion of the Foreigners, under the leadership of the Maid of Orleans, but by the material force of the middle and lower classes, who rose to defend and save the monarchy, constituted the absorbing social interest of the century. With the cessation of war, Mr. Crowe shows us how domestic discord, and in an aggravated form, once more appeared; the old landed families, who had formerly provided for all public exigencies, considering the industrial classes, with their newly acquired wealth, as convenient materials for taxation, but as very unfit depositories of power! The temporal anarchy that characterized this period was accompanied by a moral anarchy. The power of reason had been perverted in the schools; a doctoral logic was ready to sanction or at least shelter every crime or villany. The Church, which to the men of that generation, was the material synonym of religion and morality, had since the "annexation" of the Papedom by Philip the Fair, fallen into a precarious, if not perilous condition. To recall people and princes to the paths of right and justice was the first requisite of the age; and to many the sole agency for the accomplishment of this end seemed to be the re-establishment of the controlling power of the Papacy. The human intellect, however, was not without its vindicators. Gerson, who was a sort of French Wycliffe, denounced *factitious* religion, limited the power of the keys, and while he desired to "save morality from princely logic," sought to make the Pope amenable to general councils, and "constitute the Church in an enlightened aristocracy of prelates and laymen."

The reconstruction of France, after the withdrawal of the English, was the work of the dissolute but politic Charles VII. His son Louis XI. was a principal founder and consolidator of the territorial kingdom. In recording his impression of their characters, Mr. Crowe assigns to these sovereigns the merit of combating and destroying an oligarchy in order to establish on a broader and a stronger basis the power of a national aristocracy. To Louis XI. he gives some credit for an irregular encouragement of trade and an occasional cession of a shadowy municipal right. The remaining topics of this volume are the Regency of Anne of Beaujeu, the Invasion of Italy by the eighth Charles, the law reforms, domestic policy, and military career of Louis XII., the reign of Francis I., with its "immoderate monarch worship," and the progress of the Reformation under Henry II., the kingly victim of

Montgomery's lance, or rather after the tournament, held in the Rue St. Antoine, in honour of the nuptials of Elizabeth of France. It was in this reign that England surrendered her last stronghold on the continent, Calais. It was in this reign, too, that France retired behind the Alps, in consequence of Henry's chivalrous restoration of Savoy to Philibert Emmanuel, because it was right to do so, and because he liked the *gentil prince* and gallant soldier.

The origin and development of the House of Savoy are amply explained in Mr. Butt's new History of Italy.⁶ This work, of which only a portion is at present issued, is intended to be mainly a narrative of the progress of events in modern Italy; but the comprehensive recital of previous and remote incidents, which introduces the story of the more recent fortunes of that beautiful peninsula, recalls with sufficient clearness and detail the whole of its historic past. The volumes now before us open with the memorable era of Napoleon's abdication, and terminate with the re-establishment of German ascendancy in Italy, as a result of the political reconstruction attempted in the Congress of Vienna—an arrangement which, after being overtly or covertly disputed for forty-five years, has been in part actually and in part virtually exploded, through the patriotic combustion of this and the preceding year. In the modern portion of his history Mr. Butt describes the changes experienced in Italy during the wars of the French Revolution; explains the commanding position of Piedmont; relates the principal events of the long reign of Ferdinand of Naples; the transient triumph of French power in 1799; the exile of the king; the plots of the Queen, and the atrocities of the restoration. The conduct of Lord Nelson, in annulling the capitulation made with the Neapolitan revolutionists, is made the subject of a long and elaborate note, in which our English hero is acquitted of deliberate violation of good faith, but is held to have taken an erroneous view of his position, and to have exceeded his power, when he repudiated the terms granted to the republicans, in an instrument "solemnly signed by the vicar-general of the Sicilian king, by the commanders of all the allied forces, and among them by the British officer in command." Leaving this in part technical question to the decision of competent judges, we follow rapidly the course of our author's narrative, as it sets forth the recognition of a free constitution, the annexation of Genoa to Piedmont, the surrender of Lombardy and Venice to Austrian rule, the fall of the kingdom of Italy, and the brief splendour and final eclipse of the fortunes of the chivalrous but irresolute Murat. We have also a very full account of the connexion of Sicily with England—of its early history—of its parliaments, jurisprudence, and feudal tribunals; of its later history—of the Constitution of 1812, of the endeavours of Lord William Bentinck to secure to the Sicilians the blessings of freedom,

⁶ "The History of Italy from the Abdication of Napoleon I. With Introductory References to that of earlier Times." By Isaao Butt, formerly Professor of Political Economy in the University of Dublin. Vols. I. and II. London: Chapman and Hall. 1860.

and of Sir William A'Court to abolish their existing liberties; and of the ultimate re-establishment of despotism by the edict of 1816.

Turning to Mr. Butt's thoughtful survey of the remote history of Italy, we find him describing that country as great, prosperous, and free, while the rest of Europe was struggling with barbarism. Among the more striking facts which he commemorates, is the indigenous and ancient origin of municipal freedom in Italy, instancing Rome as an example of the transmission of old republican forms, and San Marino, a free municipality in the days of Constantine, in illustration of the position that the famous cities of Northern Italy were but the fragments of the great Roman system, which on the fall of the empire was shattered but not annihilated. Other noticeable facts are the ante-Teutonic existence of commercial companies, as well as of an armed civic militia supplied by them, and the rudimentary adoption of the defensive system of the Middle Ages during the period of the first invasions of the Goths from Gaul. In one important respect, Italy differed to her disadvantage from nearly all other European countries. This country has never yet attained a collective unity. The failure is mainly attributable to her singular position. The Papal sovereignty was, perhaps, the only possible form of ecclesiastical Christianity, in its turn the only possible form of religion, adapted to the Middle Ages. Papal power in extending the influence of Italy to Europe, provoked the intervention of European influence in Italy. German Imperialism, perhaps the only available check on the usurpations of the Papacy, claimed, in the name of the Casars, a supremacy over the Italian States. The Emperor, scarcely known in Italy but as an enemy, served to prevent the union of the lesser sovereignties into one monarchy; the Pope, occasionally the direct champion of Italian, and perhaps indirectly of European independence, yet required the coercion of the Imperial power to abate his arrogant pretensions. Liberty was imperilled by the tendencies towards a secular universal monarchy on the one hand, and a formidable theocracy on the other: and Italy, temporarily sacrificed to the interests of humanity, was unable, in this system of equiponderant antagonisms, to consolidate into one central government the elements of national strength.

The contest of the Imperial power in Italy is distributed by our historian into four periods: 1, that of the struggle with municipal Rome for the nomination of the Pontiff: 2, that with the Papacy for the right of investiture: 3, that with the Northern Republics, in the assertion of royal prerogative against civic privilege: and 4, that with the Papal See, for the supremacy of the temporal sovereign in opposition to the universal dominion of the successors of St. Peter. In Rome for many centuries four different influences divided the authority over the Eternal City; the influence of the Emperor, that of its Bishop, that of its democracy, and that of its barons. We have thus given a general outline of Mr. Butt's meritorious "History;" an outline which sufficiently indicates the amount of reflection and research bestowed on its production. Valuable in itself, it will have additional value now for all Englishmen who wish success to Italy in

that glorious Chase of the Barbarians, which was the dream of the patriotic Pope's (Julius II.) dying hour.

Believing that the time is not far distant when England "will be more closely connected by sympathies, and by ties political, commercial, and social, with the people of Italy, than with any other European nation," and deeming it desirable that his countrymen should learn better to understand what the Italians were, Mr. Adolphus Trollope has essayed to contribute towards this improved comprehension by a historical reproduction of that critical period, which was for Italy "the sunset hour preceding a night of three centuries' duration." The "fast moving and highly coloured life of that time" he has embodied in the story of Filippo Strozzi,⁷ whom he regards as its representative man. This story Mr. Trollope has written out very minutely, with a vigorous and appropriately *fast* mannerism, and with an occasionally strong flavour both in thought and dialect of Mr. Carlyle's literary spice-box. In this vivid biographical delineation we follow Strozzi, from his birth at Florence, 4th January, 1489, to his mysterious death, on or about 18th December, 1538. The friend of the Medici, we see him, from motives of ambition, contracting a marriage with Clarice, daughter of Piero di Medici, and niece of Leo X., a masterful dame with a power of tongue, but a faithful wife and true helpmate to the son and successor of the great banker and leading patrician of Florence. As the Medici were then under the ban of the republic, Strozzi was menaced with condign punishment for holding communication with exiles, Clarice, and her mother, at the time being resident in Rome. Defending himself with some address and much mendacity, Strozzi escaped with a nominal punishment for three years and a fine of seven hundred golden crowns. In six months after, he was again living in Florence, where he, in fact, remained till the whole time of his exile was over. His support of the Medici; his relations with Clement VII.; his conduct, in favouring the revolution which excluded the Medici; his submission to the arrangement by which Clement and Charles V. imposed Alessandro di Medici as their duke on the people of Florence; his subsequent discontent; his efforts to induce the Emperor to remove Alessandro; his retirement to Venice on the break-up of the emigrant party; his return, after the assassination of Alessandro, and election of Cosmo, with the other refugees; their armed irruption into the Florentine territory; his capture, imprisonment, torture, murder or suicide; with "the due embodiment of social environment," make up the story of Mr. Trollope's "strikingly" representative man. Filippo Strozzi appears in this volume neither as hero, nor as patriot, but as a man of rare endowment, extreme prudence, and great intellectual dexterity; as a scholar, a libertine, a scoffing sceptical *pessimist*, a magnificent pawnbroker with a colossal fortune, whose success in life has proved systematized dishonesty to be the best policy to attain such ends as dishonest men most value, and who "remains extant as a

⁷ "Filippo Strozzi. A History of the Last Days of Old Italian Liberty." By T. Adolphus Trollope. London: Chapman and Hall. 1860.

worshipful mortal in a grand fur coat, hung out for the admiration of posterity in the front of these pages and elsewhere."

Contemporary with this dishonest and successful man lived the noble artist, Michael Angelo. His biography has lately been in part re-written by Hermann Grimm;⁸ we say in part, for only one volume has as yet, we believe, been published. This volume contains the story of the thirty-five years of Michael Angelo's life which elapsed between 1475, the date of his birth, and 1520, the date of Raphael's death. Conformably with a prevalent method of writing history and biography, Herr Grimm commences with a survey of the past of Florence and Italy, travelling rapidly back to the glorious days of classical antiquity, and especially apostrophizing Athens, which "lies like a sudden sunshine over our hearts." The oldest periods of Florentine history are then delineated: notices of Dante, Cimabue, Giotto, the Medici, Ghiberti, Brunelleschi, Donatello, Leonardo da Vinci, and a brief dissertation on heroic men, occupy nearly seventy pages of the volume. The materials for composing a life of Michael Angelo are then reviewed, and after some criticism of Vasari, Gondivi, and the Italian historians, we are introduced to the Buonarroti family, and page 81, at two o'clock in the morning of the 6th of March, 1475, to the subject of the present memoir, properly called Michelagnolo. The year after his birth the future artist was entrusted to the care of a nurse, a stone-cutter's wife, at Settignano, three miles from Florence, where his father had an estate. The boy began to draw almost from infancy. His first paintings on the walls of the house, in which he passed his earliest childhood, used to be shown during the last century. At thirteen years of age he commenced his artistic apprenticeship under Domenico and David Grillandojo (Ghirlandaio). His early life at Florence; his residence in the house of Lorenzo di Medici; his first efforts at sculpture; the Statue of Snow; the marble Cupid; his visit to Rome; the works which he executed in that city and afterwards at Florence—the Madonna, the David, and the Cartoon for the ducal palace; the second residence at Rome; the design for the monument of Julius II.; Michael Angelo's indignation at the refusal of the Pontiff's servants to admit him into the palace, and his consequent sudden departure; his return to Rome, at the Pope's command, backed by Soderini's permission; and the Cartoons for the Sistine Chapel, are the principal topics strictly connected with Michael Angelo's life which are treated in the present volume. In addition, however, to the narrative of incidents of which the great sculptor is more immediately the subject, there is a constant outlying, biographical or historical, field of event or commentary, intended to illustrate the times in which Michael Angelo's lot was cast. Thus we have a sketch of the French invasion of Italy, a portrait of Savonarola, criticism on Raphael, notices of Julius II., Leo X., generally interesting, clever, and implying a sort of unity of idea, if not of subject. The work is conceived in a liberal and noble spirit; it indicates a mind that venerates human worth, and

⁸ "Leben, Michelangelo's, von Herman Grimm. Erster Theil." London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate. 1860.

believes in human improvement. The language in its clearness and simplicity approaches nearer to the French than the German type. As a history of the times as well as of the development of a great mind, of a man who was at once painter, poet, sculptor, architect, and engineer, who was grand alike in his life and in his art—the Milton of Italy—Herr Grimm's "Leben, Michelangelo's," will be read with pleasure by those who share the tastes and aspirations of its author.

Descending to a lower period and a lower subject, we find in the "Memoirs of the Duke de Luynes"⁹ much minute information relative to the court life of Louis the Fifteenth, during nearly half a century, with occasional glimpses into the life of other princes and potentates, and even of some really illustrious men, all which at least serve to show us how a royal, fashionable, and literary Europe looked when seen through the ducal quizzing-glass of M. de Luynes. Charles Philippe d'Albert, Duc de Luynes, as we learn from the introduction to the present work, was born at Paris the 30th July, 1695, being the eldest son of Honoré Charles d'Albert, duke of Montfort, and Marie Jeanne de Courceillon, daughter of the Marquis of Dangeau. At nine years of age he lost his father, who was mortally wounded before Landau. His grandfather, the Duke de Chevreuse, who among his friends numbered Fénelon and St. Simon, then took charge of his education. In 1710 he married Mademoiselle de Neufchâtel, a wealthy and beautiful daughter of the house of Bourbon-Soissons, who, ten or eleven years after her marriage, died suddenly, leaving the Duke free to form a second matrimonial alliance, in 1732, with Marie Brulart, widow of the Marquis de Charost, who was killed at Malplaquet, a lady subsequently appointed maid of honour to the Queen of Louis XV., Marie Leczinska, the daughter of Stanislaus, ex-King of Poland. In 1717, the Duke de Luynes was nominated to the command of a regiment of cavalry; in 1719, he served during the Regent's war with Philip V., the king of Spain; in 1723, when he took the oath of a peer of France, he resigned his military appointment to his son; and during the remainder of his life, he contented himself with the prosecution of serious studies, severe devotional exercises, and the faithful discharge of his domestic duties. The Duke de Luynes died at the Château de Dampierre the 2nd of Nov., 1758, aged sixty-three years.

Of his Memoirs, which will, we suppose, consist of many volumes, only four are as yet given to the public. Each volume has its index. All are subdivided into chapters, corresponding with the months of the year, and every chapter possesses a topical analysis to aid the reader in his search for such facts or incidents as he may desire to turn to; which, in a work that possesses no literary attraction, is surely a commendable arrangement. Commencing with 27th December, 1735, shortly after the nomination of the duchess to be one of the Queen's ladies, they terminate with 20th October, 1758, some days before the death of the author. Accuracy and propriety would seem to be the

⁹ "Mémoires du Duc de Luynes sur la Cour de Louis XV" (1735-1758). Par MM. L. Dusieux et E. Soulié. Quatre tomes. London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate. 1860.

leading characteristics of this *occasional* Court Journal, for the duke did not write every day, but only when he had collected material for a connected narrative. The journalist had access to the best authorities. Among his informants were the Queen, the Princess of Conti, M. de Maurepas, the Bishops of Mirepoix and Soissons, and the duchess herself, who enjoyed the friendship and confidence of "the pious Marie Leczinska." Among the weightier subjects which the editors tell us are illustrated in these Memoirs, are the military events of the war of 1740; the early part of the Seven Years' War, the transactions in Canada under Montcalm, and in India under Dupleix. The creation of the *Ecole Militaire*; the government of Stanislaus in Lorraine; literature, art, and science, receive more or less of the ducal diarist's attention. Tronchin and inoculation; Voltaire, his verses and letters; the Great Frederic with his newly published *Anti-Machiavel*; Buffon; Frélon, and other notable personages are introduced, some of them with considerable detail, into these Memoirs. In some sort these volumes are a picture of the times; they furnish, too, a record of antique usages, and help to explain the origin of, at least, one institution, that of the Marshal's bâton. Those who are curious about the arrangements of "king's houses," will find abundance of important information on this subject. When the king takes medicine, or the queen is bled, when grace is said at the king's right hand, and when it is said at the king's left hand; when his majesty hunts, and when her majesty has new lace and new linen: *who* gets the wax candles when the queen eats in her chamber; *who* gets them when she eats in her *cabinet*; and *who* gets them when she eats in her ante-chamber, with many another bit of intelligence equally edifying, may be ascertained by the inquiring human mind, from the elaborate report of the palace Boswell of France, during the middle of the last century. In describing the subject-matter of the Memoirs, we have, in part, derived our knowledge of it from the introduction, which apparently refers to the entire work and not merely to the four volumes already published; the last of which closes with the transactions of April, 1743, leaving ample room and verge enough for several similar tomes wherein we shall find recorded the events of the succeeding fifteen years.

A patriotic and pious little book, by a German clergyman, entitled "*Das Leben des Freiherrn von Stein*,"¹⁰ is compiled from the larger biography of this statesman by Pertz, to meet a growing want of the time. In a small compass and for a moderate sum the German people may now procure the "Life" of the energetic political opponent of the first Napoleon; and as the profits accruing from the sale are destined as a contribution to the "*Stein Memorial*," now in contemplation, the admirers of the Prussian Minister have an additional incentive to its purchase. Friedrich Karl von Stein was born on the 26th October, 1757. He passed his childhood in the picturesque castle of his ancestors, who for seven hundred years had flourished on the banks of the Lahn, near the little town of Nassau, in the Duchy of that name.

¹⁰ "*Das Leben des Freiherrn von Stein. Nach Pertz erzählt.*" Von Wilhelm Baur. London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate. 1860.

From 1773 to 1777 he pursued his studies at the University of Göttingen. Three years after, he entered the service of the great King of Prussia. By a series of promotions he became in 1804 a Minister of State. As the adviser of the Emperor Alexander, as the determined antagonist of Napoleon, as the patriotic champion of German independence, as nobleman, and as Christian, Von Stein is represented by his biographer to be deserving the admiration of free Protestant Germany. So strenuous and effective was Stein's agitation against Napoleon, that in 1808 an imperial decree proclaimed him an "enemy of France and the Confederation of the Rhine," enjoined his arrest, and sequestered his property. There is much interesting matter in Wilhelm Baur's biographical sketch of the patriot minister. In particular, he gives us a pleasing though very brief account of Goethe's visit to Nassau, and his reception and entertainment by Herr von Stein, shortly after the decisive battle of Waterloo. Stein died 29th June, 1831.

Among the English humorists and poets Thomas Hood appears to occupy a position peculiarly his own. He is neither a great poet nor a great creative humorist. He cannot be ranked with the Swifts or the Sternes on the one hand, or the Miltons and the Byrons on the other. Yet he has written verses of genuine pathos and power, and some productions of his comic muse are altogether unique. Thus, in his own way he seems a Meister-singer.

Pending the settlement of this question, we may learn something of his every-day life and character from the "Memorials"¹¹ recently edited by his children. These "Memorials" are not, properly speaking, a biography. They consist of letters, ranging over a period of about ten years, and addressed to various friends, chiefly by Hood himself, sometimes by Mrs. Hood. A connecting narrative, or an occasional note, serves to complete or explain this epistolary autobiography. Thomas Hood was born in the Poultry, on May 23rd, 1799. He was the second son of Thomas Hood, a bookseller, and a Miss Sands, sister to the engraver, to whom the young poet was afterwards articled. His father, a native of Scotland, was a man of cultivated taste and literary acquirements. He wrote two novels, "which attained some popularity in their day, although now their very names are forgotten. Little or nothing more seems to be known of Hood's parentage. His own joking account was, that as his grandmother was a Miss Armstrong, he was descended from two notorious thieves, *i.e.* Robin Hood and Johnnie Armstrong." The close confinement which the young engraver had to endure impaired his health. It became necessary to terminate the compact with his uncle, and he was removed to the house of a relation in Scotland. In 1821, his literary career commenced. He was engaged to assist the editor of the "London Magazine." Among the contributors to this periodical was John Hamilton Reynolds whose sister, on May 5th, 1824, became the wife of the young aspirant of letters. In conjunction with Mr. Reynolds, Hood wrote and

¹¹ "Memorials of Thomas Hood, collected, arranged, and edited by his Daughters, with a preface and notes by his Son," &c. In two volumes. London: Edward Moxon. 1860.

published the anonymous "Odes and Addresses to Great People," attributed by S. T. Coleridge to Charles Lamb. In 1826, appeared the first series of "Whims and Oddities;" in 1827, two volumes of "National Tales," and the "Plea of the Midsummer Fairies." In 1831-2, Hood wrote some pieces for the stage. While residing at Lake House, in Essex, he composed his only completed novel, "Tyluey Hall," much of the scenery and description being taken from Wanstead and its neighbourhood. At the end of 1834 the failure of a firm involved Hood in pecuniary difficulties. Resolved, if possible, to score off his debts, Hood, after leaving every shilling behind him, started alone for the Rhineland, finally fixing his residence at Coblenz, where he was joined by his family in 1835. Here he worked hard at the "Comic Annual," and his German book, "Up the Rhine." In 1837 he left Coblenz for Ostend, where he suffered greatly from the impure atmosphere; and in 1840 he returned to England with buoyant spirits, though with broken health. On Theodore Hook's death, in August of the same year, he succeeded to the editorship of the "New Monthly," and with it enjoyed a comparative affluence. In 1844 he issued the first number of "Hood's Magazine," a periodical which lived little more than sixteen months, expiring with its proprietor on May 3rd, 1845.

Hood's life was one of incessant harassment and noble endurance. He was a sincere, generous, and kind-hearted man; a lover of all that is true and good; a hater of all that is false and pretentious, of all bigotry, quackery, and pedantry. The letters published in these volumes evince the unflinching kindness, the simple goodness, and genial humour of the man. They abound in clever sayings, amusing banter, and quaint witticisms. The quiet fun, not unmingled with melancholy, and the audacious *make-believe* of the letters written to the three little Elliots are specially noticeable. Addressing "Jennie" at Sandgate, he says, "Some time ago exactly there used to be about the part of the coast where you are, large white birds with black-tipped wings, that^e went flying and screaming over the sea, and now and then plunged down into the water after a fish. Perhaps they catch their sprats now with nets or hooks and lines. Do you ever see such birds? We used to call them 'gulls'—but they didn't mind it." Hood sketched and designed cleverly as well as wrote admirably. Some specimens of his artistic skill are inserted in these records of his life. The wild and ghastly fancy of "The Missing Vessel" reminds us of a parallel vision of terror in Coleridge's "Ancient Mariner."

In the "Autobiographical Recollections of the late Charles Robert Leslie,"¹² we have a pleasant and entertaining series of notices and reminiscences, by an amiable man and genuine artist. In addition to the autobiographical compilation, the volumes before us contain selections from Leslie's correspondence, with a prefatory essay on the merits of the artist, by the editor, Mr. Tom Taylor, who has admirably

¹² "Autobiographical Recollections of the late Charles Robert Leslie, R.A." Edited, &c., by Tom Taylor, Esq. In two volumes, with portrait. London: John Murray. 1860.

discharged the double duty which he has undertaken. Early in the last century Leslie's forefathers emigrating to America, settled as farmers in the State of Maryland. His paternal ancestors were from Scotland; his mother's from England. His parents, Robert Leslie and Lydia Baker, were both natives of Cecil County. Robert Leslie, an ingenious mechanic, in 1786 repaired to Philadelphia, where he successfully carried on the business of clock and watchmaker. In 1793, accompanied by his family, he determined, for professional purposes, to visit England. On the 19th October, in the following year, Charles Robert Leslie was born in a house in Portman Place, Edgeware-road, London. On the death of his partner, Mr. Price, old Leslie returned to America. On their voyage back they fell in with a French privateer of thirty guns, which they fought and beat. Compelled to go to Lisbon to refit, they were detained there during the whole of the winter of 1799, and did not arrive at Philadelphia till the 11th May following. About four years after the father died, leaving his family in extremely distressed circumstances. The widow was obliged to open a boarding-house, and it was owing to the liberal conduct only of two of the professors at the university of Pennsylvania, that Charles and his brother were enabled to remain at this school. In 1808 Charles was apprenticed to Messrs. Bradford and Inskeep, booksellers of Philadelphia. His artistic tendencies, which now sought appropriate expression, were systematically discouraged by a kind but strict master. The young painter's destiny was, however, soon determined by the enthusiastic interest which followed the arrival of the celebrated actor, Frederic Cooke. A portrait of this popular idol raised the boy-painter to unexpected fame. A subscription fund, which Mr. Bradford collected and to which he contributed—for he now appreciated the talent which he had before discouraged—enabled the young artist to study painting for two years in Europe. Sailing for England, under the care of Mr. Inskeep, Leslie arrived at Liverpool on 3rd December, 1811. Proceeding to London, he found his first instructors in painting in West and Allston. From Coleridge he learnt something of the philosophy of art. The picture which established his reputation was his "Sir Roger de Coverley going to church," exhibited in 1819. In 1821 he was elected an Associate of the Royal Academy, and in 1826 he was made R.A. An appointment to a military academy in America induced him to return to that country in 1833. Retaining this appointment for but seven months, he again sought the society of his brother artists in England, sailing from New York to Portsmouth, which he reached in twenty days. On 11th April, 1825, Leslie was married; in 1847 he was elected to the Professorship of Painting in the Academy, and in 1859 he closed a life "spent in the affectionate discharge of family duties—which no man ever fulfilled better—and in the happy practice of his art." For power of rendering character, particularly of a humorous kind, for the genuine, if homely beauty and grace of his women, and for intense feeling for the domesticities, Mr. Taylor assigns Leslie a high place as an artist. From 1813 to 1859 Leslie was a regular exhibitor at the Royal Academy. Acquainted with nearly all the leading celebrities of his time, he jots down numerous pleasant reminiscences in his autobio-

graphy. His "Recollections" are replete with racy anecdote or striking delineation. You may pass from Wellington to Guizot, or from Melbourne to Peel, or from Rogers to Scott, and find some welcome touch of humanity or entertaining snatch of wit. Why, asked a quasi-military coxcomb of the Great Captain, didn't the French attack you in such a place? "Because they weren't d—d fools." was the ready and overwhelming answer of the "Iron Duke." Again, "Mr. Cadell told me that, as Sir Walter was leaning on Purdey's arm, in one of his walks, Tom said, 'These are fine novels of yours. Sir Walter: they are just invaluable to me.' 'I am glad to hear it, Tom.' 'Yes, Sir, for when I have been out all day, hard at work, and come home vara tired, if I sit down with a pot of porter by the fire, and take up one of your novels, I'm asleep directly!'"

BELLES LETTRES.

IF a cartload of bricks, thrown at random on the ground, could be called a house, Mr. Windsor's "Ethica" might be called a History of the last two centuries of English Literature;¹ it is a book that no one could have written who had not devoted many years of study to the subject; the author's reading is extensive, his materials abundant, but they lie in his mind in the most undigested state. He endeavours to give coherence to his studies by grouping his most desultory remarks round some celebrated man, and the names of Montaigne, Milton, Dryden, Defoe, Pope, and Goldsmith are used, not as key-notes to a disquisition on their times, or estimate of their influence on their contemporaries, but as pegs on which to hang the scattered notices and opinions which have been entertained of them, and which a very extensive research has consigned to the author's note-book. In his preface Mr. Windsor remarks that

"Stray waifs and straws in the intellectual atmosphere—not infrequently afford material for the most efficacious mental characterization, where the formal facts of Biography proper, though at first sight more imposing, give a less authentic portraiture.

"To arrest these notes of intelligence, now fast eluding the ken of the present generation, and winnow them on the threshing-floor of biological criticism, is my object."

This extract very fairly describes the author's purpose. We are somewhat at a loss to determine the exact meaning of Biological Criticism, and think the author would have to pass it under cover of that fondness for *insolentia verba*, which he shows throughout his volume. The "motes of intelligence" which he has brought together dance with a painful, dazzling effect before the eyes, and are so winnowed from their husks, if motes have such things, that it is very difficult to recognise the value of the grain.

¹ "Ethica; or Characteristics of Men, Manners, and Books." By Arthur Lloyd Windsor. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1860.

It is very questionable whether the facts are more accessible in Mr. Windsor's book than before they were exhumed from cotemporary memoirs and correspondence; while reading, we feel as if we were in a museum of *Bric-a-brac* which must be confusing to the uninitiated and irritating to the well-informed; each curiosity loses half its interest from being torn from its original site, where alone it possessed any descriptive features; we turn over an ancient wardrobe where the garments of our ancestors are huddled together in confusion, and though each article has been brushed up for our inspection, we have great difficulty in putting the costume together, much less to realize our ancestors who wore it.

Mr. Windsor abounds in allusions, and is so full of details that he has no room for detail; he forgets that descriptive phrases are not equivalent to description. Without any large grasp of his subject, the author is singularly deficient in sympathy with the men he has to treat of, and the result is a small chronicling of cotemporary scandals which, like all gossipings, are of an uniformly defamatory character; few will leave this book with a higher estimate of any one mentioned in it. The author has broken down a great subject into its smallest parts, and his style speaks in the same manner; it is a constant hail of disjointed periods; opening the book at random, say at pages 292, 323, 324, which each contain thirty-five lines, we find them to contain respectively twenty-four, twenty-seven, and twenty-six full stops. The effect is one of intense fatigue, like that resulting from a walk in a sandy country.

The concluding chapter, on the Characteristics of Ancient and Modern Orators, is in our opinion superior to the rest, though it partakes of the peculiarities of the former ones; they are less annoying in the discussion of a general subject like oratory than in an inquiry into individual character, or an estimate of national manners and progress.

M. Delepierre's volume on "*Flemish Literature*" is more a bibliography than a literary history;² it is far more learned than critical, and much better calculated for a Belgian than an English public. A multitude of authors who have but a local reputation, are treated in a tone of vague and indiscriminate laudation that leaves but an indefinite impression on the mind. It is somewhat strange that a country which has produced so original a school of painters should have left such slight traces of its character in European literature. That *Mabuse* and *Van Eyk* at one period, and *Cuyt*, *Ruysdael*, *Jan Steen*, and *Teniers* at another, should be without literary correlatives, is a curious feature of Flemish history. The disturbed and struggling political history of the Low Countries may explain much of this singular anomaly. Vernacular literature at all times had too powerful an opponent in the influence of French ideas, and maintained, at the best, but a precarious existence. The repressions of *Alba* and the influence of the Reformation produced similar results at an earlier period. M. Dele-

² "A Sketch of the History of Flemish Literature and its celebrated Authors, from the 12th century down to the present time." By Octave Delepierre, LL.D. Compiled from Flemish sources. London: John Murray and Co.

pierre's book will, we have no doubt, be very welcome in his native country, where fresh threatenings from its old enemy make anything which can contribute to a firm national feeling peculiarly welcome. To one of his heroes, Jacques Van Maerlandt, the Belgians have recently decreed a statue by Pickery, and the morals of Conscience gain much on their native soil from the present attitude of men's minds in Belgium. Though hardly to be called a literary history, the book contains the materials and indications for one, if it should ever be desirable to write that of a nation possessing so feeble a nationality.

The late Mr. Kennedy, during his residence in the Havana, solaced the tedium of a tropical life by the composition of the lives of the most celebrated modern Spanish Poets, and by translating specimens of their shorter works.³ The MS. has been published by his friends. The Biographies are careful, but written in too general terms to be very interesting, and the Poems have the general air of metrical Exercises, and betray an overwhelming influence of English or French models. What little national complexion the originals have is lost in the process of translation.

The author, we understand, has also left behind him linguistic and ethnographical studies of great value, which are in process of publication by Messrs. Williams and Norgate.

There are few more beautiful districts in England than the Yorkshire and Lancashire border, few rivers more interesting than the Ribble. The author of "Scarsdale," whom we should suppose to be a medical man practising in that country, and who with this book, there is but little doubt, introduces himself to a novel-reading public, is fortunate in such a background to this tale.⁴ He is evidently well acquainted with those wild moors and romantic valleys, and fills his canvas with striking sketches of the strange forms of character which are in such curious keeping with the country they inhabit.

The rough, hearty, passionate, and sensual northman has been, since the Brontë novels, a very favourite figure in romantic fiction, and is perhaps too often treated somewhat too romantically. This is very much the case in "Scarsdale." The individuals, though characteristic, are exceptional; the weavers, poachers, peasants,—the Sunday School teachers,—the loom-breaking rioters, and the members of the secret societies which in periods of commercial distress come to the surface of the prevailing discontent, and misuse the misery of their fellows for the gratification of their own passionate hatreds, are but little distinguished in "Scarsdale" from such personages in other books; they are well studied and consistent, but do not affect us with a very vivid idea of their personality.

We accept the general truth of the picture, but no feature haunts our memory; we associate no member of the author's very varied dra-

³ "Modern Poets and Poetry of Spain." By James Kennedy, Esq., Her Britannic Majesty's Judge in the Mixed Court of Justice at the Havana. London: Williams and Norgate. 1860.

⁴ "Scarsdale; or, Lancashire and Yorkshire Borders thirty years ago." London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1860.

matis personæ in an indissoluble manner with the part he plays in "Scarsdale."

A population in distress, living through the period in which the power-loom was displacing the hand-weaver, throws up into strong relief the characters of the chief personages of the story, who consist of a circle of noble gentlemen and beautiful ladies intent upon the amelioration of the society in which they live, animated by lofty notions of duty, and inspired by a mysterious French noble—a philosophical philanthropist—who is a sort of improved Fourier; they devote themselves to high feeling and lofty talk, taking the fate of their inferiors into daily consideration, and offering themselves as models to their cotemporaries in all the relations of life. Not content with the simple antithesis of poor and rich, the author gives us that also of the debased and pure; and for this purpose we have a dissolute and sceptical French duke, as foil, who comes among these somewhat superfine English homes, that he may be converted and die. The progress of the story is dramatic, if it be not more correctly termed melodramatic—but there is a vigour of invention in the incidents that takes from them all vulgarity. The reader is sure to be interested, if not disturbed by the constant discussion of social problems, and annoyed by the oracular utterances of the interlocutors who, as the tale is said on the title-page to be one of thirty years since, find no difficulty in confidently prophesying what has taken place during the last generation. This artifice is throughout the book too transparent; the vaticinations of his sages are not even disguised by the author in safe generalities, but assume the party phraseology of the present day in the most open, and often in a laughable manner. There are few topics of modern sociology on which some of the characters do not give their opinions, and we are promised by the author that under favourable conditions we may perhaps hear of them again. The book is very able, but too full; the study overwhelms outdoor observation, and taking it altogether, it is but little in harmony with the savage natural scenery it paints, and paints too often in a stilted language that struggles to be as picturesque as the object it describes.

If the author in his next work can refrain from chronicling the progress of his own studies, and give us a faithful picture of what he has really seen around him, his readers have every reason to expect from his unquestionable abilities a very different and very superior work to "Scarsdale."

In his preface to "Elkerton Rectory" the author gives his opinion that "it is easy to tell a good story if you have not more conscience than to invent as you go," but in the story which follows, he shows us that something more than an easy conscience is required for the production of any story at all.³ A collection of village gossip, the most curious feature of which is that any human-soul should have been at the pains of chronicling it, is very far from constituting a good story. "Elkerton Rectory" is nothing more than an account of the petty

³ "Elkerton Rectory," being Part Second of "Twenty Years in the Church." By the Rev. James Pycroft. London: Booth.

annoyances undergone by that very querulous gentleman, the Rev. Henry Austen, whose acquaintance we made some time since in "Twenty Years in the Church." Modern fiction abounds in heroic and high-minded parsons, and if we are sometimes wearied by sentimental and silly ideals of the clerical character, there is always some sort of nobleness which reconciles us to the partial conceptions.

The pictures of parochial life which we meet with in Mr. Pycroft's two tales have been praised as practical, but they are so at the expense of an amount of triviality which is in the last degree wearisome. The self-denying regenerator of a neighbourhood sunk in poverty and ignorance, although often presented to us with theatrical and unreal attributes, offends the judgment only by the exaggeration with which his personality is brought before us; but no good purpose that we can discover is to be served by the delineation of such a journeyman parson as the Rev. Henry Austen; the prosiness with which he works up his elaborate nullities is, however, uniformly harmless, his little jokes are of the tamest possible description, and his genteel vanities are amusing from the unconsciousness with which they are displayed. This kind of book may be prolonged *ad infinitum*, and we fear that we have yet to read the "History of Elkerton Vestry," "Elkerton Sunday Schools," "Elkerton Penny Bank," or "An Account of the Elkerton District Mission," for any one of these titles would serve as well as the present for a fresh collection, as much wanting in coherence, significance, and purpose as "Elkerton Rectory."

"Herbert Chauncy" is a great improvement upon "Below the Surface;" the interest is more uniform, and the thread of the story simpler.⁶ Indeed it is a question whether the constant harping on one string does not become irritating. The hero, finding that a boyish passion for the daughter of Sir Hugh Littlecot had given way to a more engrossing affection, forsakes his first for his second love, and draws down on his head the vengeance of Sir Hugh, a stern and harsh father and husband, whose only affection, that for his daughter, had been thus outraged. The progress of his revenge constitutes the interest of the tale, which progress is shown in its results, Sir Hugh but seldom appearing on the stage of action, but carrying out his purposes by suborning every one in the immediate environment of the hero. By spending a great fortune on so base a purpose, he makes himself acquainted with the most private affairs of his enemy, and aided by the weakness and carelessness of his prey, he gradually involves him in a mesh of misrepresentation that destroys his career as a member of parliament, deprives him of his estate by forged documents, ruins his reputation, and at last destroys his domestic peace by leading his wife to suppose him unfaithful to her. Reduced to the greatest poverty, separated from his wife, and shunned by all his acquaintance, the death of his enemy releases Chauncy from the persistency of his pursuit.

⁶ "Herbert Chauncy; a Man more Sinned against than Sinning." By Sir A. H. Elton, Bart., Author of "Below the Surface." London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1860.

It is a fault in the book that such an elaborate persecution should be shown only in its results. The motive powers of Sir Hugh's tools are too slightly indicated; the reader desires to know more fully by what steps he acquired that absolute control over the fate of his adversary. Sir Hugh's plots would make a more interesting novel than this, in which we observe their operation only; but such a work would call for powers of mental analysis far greater than those displayed in "Herbert Chauncey." There is something too fortuitous in the mischances that befall him; indeed his trials fall upon him so much *ab extra*, that before we have finished the first volume we tremble for him when he stoops to tie his shoe; let his actions be ever so indifferent, they are always big with some adverse fate; we feel that the air is electrical with misfortune, but know not where the next bolt may fall. This persistent persecution on the part of Sir Hugh has caused him to be compared to Falkland in "Caleb Williams"; but the moral interest of Godwin's great work has no analogies in Sir Arthur Elton's. Indeed we fancy that his model has rather been the Count of Monte Christo, and if this be the case, we are the more surprised that the avenger should be so little seen, and the victim so exclusively brought before us. The injustice of his fate, and the accumulated exaggeration of each succeeding incident, leave the mind of the reader in a most unsatisfied state. The hero succumbs not to any large plan of revenge, in the detail of which some interest could be taken, but to repeated blows, each disconnected with the other; the uniformity of interest is the result of accumulation rather than of evolution, and the effect is consequently too often fatiguing and oppressive. The idea of the general situation has so filled the author's mind, that he cannot refrain from occasional incidents that border on the ludicrous, which is the more to be regretted as the humorous characters and situations are the weakest and least original features of the book. "Below the Surface," we see, has been republished in their cheap issue of standard works by Smith, Elder, and Co., but it hardly comes up to the average excellence of that series, which now contains some of the most characteristic fictions in modern literature.

The author of "The Queen's Pardon," in her preface informs her readers and possible critics that she was a young and hopeful girl when the story first presented itself to her imagination, and that she has brooded over it until it has become, to her at least, an actual truth.⁷ There are evident signs of patient study in the development of its plot, but it is somewhat surprising that the author's labours should have been so exclusively directed to the elaboration of the incidents, and that she should have so little questioned the moral assumption on which the whole story turns. William Gray is foreman to a silk-mercer named Langton, to whom he is under the greatest obligations; in the progress of the story he marries, and his home is described as a model household, a sort of compound of the proprieties loved by Mrs. Ellis, and an

⁷ "The Queen's Pardon." By Mary Eyre. London: James Blackwood.

instance of those homes of taste adorned by Mrs. Loudon. In the full confidence of his patron, and looking forward to a prosperous and happy life, the well-merited reward of his honourable character, he one day discovers that Langton's son has robbed his father to meet a gambling debt. Once, in his youth, Robert Langton had been warned by his father, that any disgrace brought by him on the good name his father so highly prized, would be at once punished by disinheritor; and Gray knows how dearly the old man loves his son in spite of his distrust of his character. The story turns upon Gray's resolution to spare his benefactor this bitter trial by making it appear that he himself was the thief. This course he courageously carries out, and allows himself to be transported as a felon. The author thus sets up gratitude as the height of moral virtue, and throughout the whole tale does not seem to be aware of the falsity of her foundation. There is no lack of acuteness in pursuing the consequences of this romantic self-devotion; there are few consequent trials that her fertile imagination omits as falling to the lot of this perverse martyr. His wife's mistrust, his children's shame, his own dependence on a rough good-natured farmer in Australia, to whom he is assigned as a convict labourer, are some of the most obvious consequences of a course which is treated as heroic by the author, but which any sound moral judgment must condemn as quixotic and unjust. After he has undergone twenty years of exile, Robert Langton, who has inherited his father's enormous wealth, and is amusingly represented as married to the daughter of the Prime Minister, dies in consequence of a fall from his horse, but not before he has confessed that he was guilty of the crime for which Gray was enduring the punishment. Hence the Queen's pardon and a happy return to England, where Gray somewhat absurdly finds himself the heir to a peerage, that his reward may be as abnormal as his virtue. It is impossible to sympathize with such perverse conceptions of duty as those which prompt and support the course of conduct pursued by Gray; at bottom it is profoundly selfish, and we are surprised that the author, who has such a clear insight into its consequences, should not have arrived at truer notions of its character. If it were possible to escape from the constant influence of this defect, there is much in this novel that is interesting—the Australian scenes are very descriptive, and the reader's interest in the fortunes of the family is not at any time allowed to cool. *

In the preface to his novel—"Castle Richmond," Mr. Trollope declares that his antipathy to second titles alone prevented him calling it a tale of the Irish famine year.⁸ There are better reasons for this forbearance than his reasonable antipathy. The Irish famine has but little to do with the story; it furnishes, or rather Mr. Trollope's note-book has supplied, one or two good stories and a few very graphic descriptions, but these have the feeblest connexion with the story itself, which might as well have been accommodated with the general scenery of any other period of quasi-contemporary history. A second

⁸ "Castle Richmond," a novel. By Anthony Trollope. London: Chapman and Hall. 1860.

title generally partakes of the character of an advertisement, and is more or less a lure to the jaded public.

Mr. Trollope's book stands in need neither of one nor the other, and the second title could have only assured any one, on taking up the book, that at any rate here was a story with something better than a parson for a hero, and that the circle within which the clever author has been so long confined is not altogether impassable by him.

"Castle Richmond" has the first merit that a novel should possess — it is very interesting, it is not easy to lay it aside when you have once become acquainted with the persons whose fortunes it displays, and this is the more to be admired as the interest is not drawn from any feeling of suspense, and relies upon no mechanical art in the gradual unfolding of a well conceived catastrophe.

Indeed the whole progress of events is perhaps too fully foreseen from the outset of the story, but the skill with which the separate characters are sustained, and the clearness with which they are conceived and brought forward, renders the book in the highest degree a pleasant novel. The plot revolves about the succession to the estate of Castle Richmond. Sir Thomas Fitzgerald has married the widow of one Talbot, who had deluded the young daughter of a Dorsetshire clergyman with the belief that he was a man of property, and forsaken his wife after a few months' union, leaving nothing but debts behind him. He is supposed at the time of his wife's second marriage to have died in Paris after some disgraceful conduct in a gambling house. After an interval of twenty years he again appears as Mr. Mollet, and by endeavouring to live upon his power of branding the Fitzgerald family with illegitimacy, worries poor Sir Thomas to death with threats of exposure. Before Sir Thomas dies he has made up his mind to publish his misfortune, and to escape with honour from his tormentor, even at the cost of ruin to all he holds dear.

His son Herbert, and his cousin Owen Fitzgerald, of Hap House, a poor bachelor of £800 a-year, are competitors for the hand of Clara, the daughter of the Countess of Desmond, who, at first betrothed to Owen, is brought by her mother to prefer the richer cousin. The interest of this part of the plot is drawn from the conflict of feeling produced in the minds of all concerned by the change of Owen's position when he becomes heir to Castle Richmond, on the discovery of Sir Thomas's unfortunate marriage. The scoundrel Talbot, whose vile efforts at living on the Fitzgeralds set in motion all the moral elements of the action, is of course discovered to have been himself married at the time of his dissolute deception of poor Lady Fitzgerald, and all things revert to their ancient course.

The character of Owen—the passionate and chivalrous Irishman, is perhaps the best drawn of all, and certainly the low villain Aby Mollet, the son of the *soi-disant* Talbot—who in revenge disarms his father, is the least successful; his consummate ignorance and cockney conceit, and the elaborate confusion of his notions of the use of the aspirate, somewhat overstep the modesty of nature, and reduce him to a merely farcical sketch among studies of character that have been treated with more seriousness, and we think much greater felicity.

If Mr. Walt Whitman's "Leaves of Grass"⁹ had been printed on paper as dirty as his favourite topics,—if the book itself had presented the general aspect of that literature which usually falls under no other criticism than that of the police office, we should have passed it by without notice, as addressing only such a public as we have no concern with; but when a volume containing more obscenity and profanity than is perhaps elsewhere to be found within the same compass, presents itself in all the glories of hot-pressed paper, costly binding, and stereotype printing, and we believe as a fourth edition, it is manifest that it not only addresses, but has found a public of a much wider class, and it becomes a question how such a book can have acquired a vogue and popularity that could induce an American publisher to spend so much upon its outward setting-forth.

Perhaps loose thinking and tall talk are nowhere so efficacious in attracting notice as in the United States, and Mr. Whitman, by pretentiously assuming to be the exponent of Hegelian morality, by offering himself as the high-priest of that religion, whose sole dogma is comprised in the proposition *Homo sibi deus*, attracts and perplexes readers, whose natural good sense would otherwise soon cast aside his frightful fustian. That he has any direct acquaintance with those forms of German speculation on which he falls back for the justification of the language he makes use of, we think may be confidently denied, not only from the manner in which he conceives its problems, but from the absence of any German catch words with which he would otherwise have infallibly adorned his motley, for even an ignorance of its grammar does not daunt him when the French language offers a term to his taste. Mr. Emerson has much to answer for, and will in reputation dearly pay for the fervid encomium with which he introduced the Author to the American public. That to the public defence of polygamy and slavery, should now be added that of the emancipation of the flesh, is an indication of a moral disorganization in the States, which is of every evil promise. That a drunken Helot should display himself without shame in the market place, speaks sad reproach to the public that does not scourge him back to his cellar.

In form these poems, if poems they can be called, are composed in irregular rhythmical lines, after the manner of Tupper, and in fact they may be described by the following equation,—as Tupper is to English Humdrum, so is Walt Whitman to the American Rowdy. They have been praised as containing many poetical passages; in this opinion we cannot concur. That sometimes a poetical expression occurs among a dreary waste of rhetorical verbiage may be allowed, but this might have been expected—a naked savage has often a wild grace of movement that a civilized man can hardly possess, but certainly not display.

These "Leaves of Grass" are the symptoms of a moral fermentation in America, which no doubt will result in a broader and clearer life—but the progress is painful and the yeast nauseous.

⁹ "Leaves of Grass." Boston: Thayer and Eldridge, year 85 of the States. 1860-1861. London: Trübner and Co.

Our agreeable remembrances of "La Rabbia" and the "Sabine Maiden" led us to take up the third series of Paul Heyse's tales with an anticipation of pleasure, that we are sorry to confess it is far from yielding.¹⁰ It is true the volume contains one Italian story of the genus on which Heyse's fame as a novelist rests and in all probability will rest. While in Italy he seems to have enjoyed the country, and studied the people with a genuineness and sympathy that leaves a warm reflex on all he writes about the south. When he has to deal with Neapolitans his situations are striking and his pictures of passionate feeling have a truth and vividness about them peculiarly their own. It is strange that when he leaves his favourite localities, when he introduces us to German interiors and brings us in contact with a polished society, his plots should become forced and his characters unnatural or wholly exceptional. It is clear that he sympathises with the semi-savage exaggerations of the Southern temperament, and that the attempt to assume the cold and smooth exterior of cultivated society is irksome to him. In the three stories which follow the Italian tale in this volume called "Die Einsamen," Herr Heyse makes laudable but very unsuccessful efforts to attain the light touch of the better French novelists. The topics and treatment of these stories are all more or less questionable, there is a certain air of the *coulisses* about them which is unpleasant, and apart from that facility of expression and purity of style, which are Heyse's acknowledged merits, they possess but little to attract the reader either in interest or originality. "The Lonely Ones," however, in which the author has to contend with no conventionalities, but to tell a simple and pathetic tale of Southern passion, is like his previous sketches of a similar character, pleasing, picturesque, and attractive. It opens indeed in a very heavy manner, with a German poet hard up for inspiration walking out into the Italian fields round Naples, note-book in hand, in the hope that fortune would be more propitious than his muse; nor is he disappointed. He meets a lovely peasant returning to her home in the hills, who allows him to enter into conversation with her, or rather, who gives him mysterious monosyllables in reply to somewhat adventurous questioning. As she however allows him to perceive that she takes him for an artist, he seizes upon the opportunity her error offers, and prolongs their intercourse by promising to paint her portrait, which she evidently longed to present to a beloved brother who shared her solitary dwelling. Anxious to penetrate the mystery which attracts him, and trusting to some chance opportunity to escape from his pledge, he accompanies her to her home in the hills, a mill in a lonely ravine. While he is pretending to be occupied with her portrait, they are interrupted by the arrival of a beautiful woman, who has travelled up the valley to see her brother, and towards whom Theresa evidently entertains an instinctive aversion.

Before she enters Theresa thrusts her companion into an inner room, saying that she will explain his presence to her brother after Lucia's

¹⁰ "Vier neue Novellen." Von Paul Heyse. Dritte Sammlung. Berlin: W. Hertz. London: Williams and Norgate. 1859.

departure. The brother is called from the field to receive the visitor, and after a little while hints to his sister to leave them alone together; she does so, and from their conversation the concealed poet becomes aware of the sad tie which connects but does not bind them together.

Tommaso has loved her while she was another's wife. But his best beloved friend Nino is her husband's nephew, and sets his face against the intrigue which he frustrates with a constantly wakeful ingenuity. One day these friends go out to sea together, for Tommaso was then a fisherman; they come to an explanation; Nino will not withdraw his opposition, he is so heavily indebted to his uncle; they quarrel; the boat upsets; Tommaso, however, soon rights it, but allows his friend to perish, that the obstacle to his illicit love may be removed. As Nino sinks his struggling hand displays to Tommaso Theresa's ring which he had that day exchanged for his own. Tommaso struck with horror and repentance, exhausts himself in vain attempts to save his sister's lover, whom two minutes earlier he might have rescued without effort. He returns alone a stricken man—his sister in ignorance of these events is his only consolation—but a consolation that only adds coals to the fire of his remorse.

He gives up his occupation on the shore, and retires with her to the lonely mill. The death of Lucia's husband brings her to the mountain valley to tell her lover that nothing now stands between them and happiness, and there she hears from Tommaso what the eaves-dropping German overhears, that the dead Nino must for ever stand between them, and that with an undiminished love, Tommaso cannot but renounce its gratification. They part with mutual tears—Tommaso rushes to the top of the mountain to watch her departure, and Theresa releases her visitor, calling upon him to rejoice in her happiness. Her brother is hers alone. And thus he leaves them in their lonely home; the brother a prey to unsatisfied love and constant remorse, his sister leaning on him for consolation in that affliction which she knows not was brought on her by his hands.

The personal vanity which raised an altar to itself in the Countess Hahn-Hahn's early novels, in which the heroines occupy positions aspired to by the author, gave at any rate a certain piquancy to those works which fluttered about in an atmosphere most congenial to its display.¹¹ The Countess has turned her back on those frivolities, but is the Countess still, and invites the public to her oratory as she used of old to her toilette table. The instruction in elegance and super-refined feeling, is exchanged for a display of orthodox observances and exquisite ecclesiasticality.

The old worldly novels sometimes reflected, in however strange a manner, something of the thoughts and feelings of the world, but the new ones only dress up Romanist notions of ascetic morality in the discarded ball dresses of the recent convert. More unsatisfactory

¹¹ "Maria Regina, eine Erzählung aus der Gegenwart." Von Ida Gräfin Hahn-Hahn. Mainz: F. Kirchheim. London: Williams and Norgate. 1860.

reading than such novels as "Maria Regina" it is impossible to conceive.

While written and published as edifying books, they are as utterly without real depth of piety as the old style was without genuine feeling. If religion is recommended, it is so as the appropriate tone of good society, while its duties are evidently regarded as a constant rolling of the stone of Sisyphus which yet must be cheerfully renewed, the painful no-progress being of the essence of the act. The story is languid and wearisome, and the want of human interest is the more oppressive from the dreary wastes of garrulous description that must be crossed in the painful passage from incident to incident. The author has long used the public as her confessor, but it is an abuse when this relation is so perverted that the penitent also imposes the penance.

Varnhagen von Ense has been very unfortunate in his female friends : his niece, Ladmilla Assing, anxious that the world should know how far Humboldt's politeness could go in praising her performances, which the world at large spoke of with much cooler approbation, has thrust into publicity a correspondence, no line of which would ever have been written, except in reliance upon a discretion so well tried as that of the person to whom the letters were addressed.¹²

Fräulein Amalie Bölte, animated by a similar vanity, cannot refrain from showing a somewhat indifferent public that Varnhagen von Ense could write a very agreeable and flattering letter to a lady who took great pains to supply him with the materials of one of his latest hobbies—Autograph Collecting. It would appear a strange retribution, if, indeed, it were not so very natural, that the vanity in question should be blind to many hints and warnings conveyed by her acute correspondent, which show him to have entertained the opinion, that most English readers will form from these letters, that they were addressed to a very intrusive and indiscreet person. The gossip with which Fräulein Bölte has evidently supplied Von Ense by no means confined itself to literary topics, but extended, in the worst possible taste, to the domestic and even pecuniary concerns of all whose celebrity allured her irregular curiosity ; in some cases she has evidently given her own hasty conclusions, based on the vaguest rumour, as ascertained facts, and in one very striking instance, she has made the character of a lady the subject of discussion in a most unwarrantable manner, and this must be the more annoying to the injured party, as Von Ense's diplomatic replies leave even the nature of her exceptions in a mysterious twilight. We cannot refrain from the expression of our opinion, that such publications as these are utterly unjustifiable ; that persons still living should be condemned to find in print discussions about their private affairs carried on by ill-informed third parties, is a nuisance that should be abated if possible by the most consistent reprobation. There is an essential vulgarity of mind—longing for notoriety

¹² " Briefe an eine Freundin aus den Jahren 1844 bis 1853." Von Varnhagen von Ense. Hamburg : Hoffmann and Campe. London : Williams and Norgate. 1860.

—which cannot conceive the wound it inflicts by giving the notoriety it would itself rejoice in, to the domestic relations of those already famous; to come in contact with such persons is an affliction, and is one of the many justifications of that English reserve, so much complained of by foreigners. In this case, however, any considerations of the propriety of publishing these letters ought to have been at once cut short by Von Ense's alarmed remark in one of them, "You surely do not show my letters about?"

His death can hardly be taken as a justification of a course which, in a much milder form, he objected to during life. It may perhaps strike our readers as somewhat strange, that a book published anonymously should be at once publicly associated with the editor's name, but though the name does not appear on the title, *Fräulein Bülte* could not refrain from allowing it to escape in the course of the book itself, and any appearance of personality in remarks of a general application are fixed upon her by her own indiscretion.

The letters themselves have all the usual merits of Varnhagen's works—the polish and transparency of style make them pleasant reading, though the intellectual quietism which characterizes his opinions is somewhat irritating; we rejoice in his good sense, but long for more heartiness. How little, however, the greatest good sense can venture on prophecy the following extract will amusingly show.

"I have been a spectator of the conflict on the 18th and night preceding the 19th March. Its isolated features were not new to me; but I can compare the whole with nothing I have ever experienced. The heroism, endurance, and contempt of death, shown by the combatants, surpass everything I witnessed in my soldiering days. Our neighbourhood was closed by barricades which were defended and held until broad daylight. Artillery, cavalry, infantry,—all were engaged—the cannonade and volleys of musketry were incessant, and to them must be added the rattling of stones thrown from the roofs, and the shouts of the combatants. Under my windows, a troop of infantry were defeated by this stony hail—the house was searched for weapons, but nothing else taken—the whole affair ended by the troops withdrawing from the town, and by the most complete concession on the part of the King, so that we are now in full revolution and on the eve of a new period, in which we are progressing, destroying, and reforming amidst the greatest disorder and confusion, from which, however, it is to be hoped order may soon arise.

"The King has heartily adopted the new order of things, he has accepted the night between the 18th and 19th as the judgment of God, and accommodates himself to what was once most hated by him. The people have a right feeling in this respect, and still keep a place in their hearts for the King. On the other hand, the prince of Prussia is an object of most burning hatred, and it is thought impossible that he should ever succeed to the throne.

"To him is imputed all the blame of the former obstinacy and this last bloodshed. Even though it should be shown that this were erroneous, it will be long before the deep-rooted prejudice will give way. The chief thing however for us is, that the Prussian Parliament is soon to be called together, and after that, the German. This is the object of all endeavours. It is true that everything must be done in the hurry of daily-renewed surprises, which is to be regretted. We are however in for it and must work through it. The world at any rate will not come to an end."

From this correspondence we gather that the author introduced

M. Hartmann, whose "Erzählungen meiner Freunde" we noticed in our last number, to Mr. Carlyle; and we have the result that might have been expected in a new collection of fugitive pieces by Herr Hartmann, called "Portraits and Busts,"¹³ among which is to be found one of those indelicate abuses of private hospitality which have of late been so deplorably frequent. After a very rapid and ill-informed review of Carlyle's works, Herr Hartmann enters upon a detailed account of the personal appearance and domestic habits of his host; indulges an over-curious public with a private view of his furniture, and acquaints them with what he can gather about his social position and influence. We extract the following paragraph because it is but little offensive, and also on account of the concluding sentence, in which no one can fail to recognise that Herr Hartmann has been successfully bubbled by some sly humourist.

"As soon as you enter his reception room or study, you perceive that you are in the house of the hero-worshipper. Everywhere you find reminiscences of the individuals who are Carlyle's heroes or demigods. We were most interested by those of Goethe, who is of the number of his heroes, and whose "Wilhelm Meister" he long ago translated. Everywhere on walls and fire-screens are hung or pasted up pictures connected with Goethe—Goethe at different periods of his life—the house in which he was born—his house at Weimar—his garden house—Goethe in Pompeii—illustrations of his works—and in his talk constant quotation from Goethe's prose and verse. Carlyle's reverence for Goethe approaches religious worship, and the easiest way to answer him is with an expression of Goethe's. To that he will bow down like a believer to a Bible text, or a citation from one of the fathers. It is even said that his clever and amiable wife often holds some extravagant enterprise of her husband's in check by a citation from Goethe, and that she conducts and orders her house by sentences from the works of her husband's patron saint."

The other papers in the volume on T. Rude, Beranger, Barye, Stephen Heller, and the Princess Orsini, have but little to recommend them.

It is a long time since we have read so pleasing a German novel as "Diana and Endymion," by Natalis Victor, with whose name it first makes us acquainted.¹⁴ The interest is well sustained without appeal to any of those questionable moral problems which characterize so many modern continental fictions. Itself in no sense puerile, it can safely be put into the hands of any youthful student of German, a peculiar merit that is by no means of every-day occurrence. The story is occupied with the fortunes of the family, and a very charming one, of the Baron von Arnheim, and chiefly with the character of Eugenie, his daughter, the Diana of the tale, a lovely, high-spirited girl, and whose conduct *vis-à-vis* of the numerous lovers attracted by her remarkable beauty forms the central moving power of the plot.

There is much marrying in the tale, and a sort of theory peeps through the incidents which opposes the favourite tenets of love at

¹³ "Bilder und Busten." Von M. Hartmann. Frankfurt: Meidinger. London: Williams and Norgate, 1860.

¹⁴ "Diana und Endymion" Ein Roman. V Natalis Victor. Frankfurt: Rütten and Löning. London: Williams and Norgate. 1860.

first sight, none of the characters being paired off as we at first expect; but the changes are brought about with delicacy and much truthfulness and felicity of observation. Perhaps there is something too much of this apprenticeship of the affections, but the highest moral feeling can raise no objection to the particular incidents by which this view is supported. The novel abounds in general reflections which give evidence of careful study, and is written in a style as remarkable for beauty, clearness, and facility, as the story itself is for graceful inventions and poetical treatment.

Messrs. Cotta are publishing what the Germans call a "Pracht Ausgabe" of Schiller's Poems, and indeed it promises to be one of the most splendid volumes extant.¹⁵

The paper and type are of the highest beauty, and the volume is illustrated in a novel manner by photographs of drawings made expressly for the work. Each number contains five sheets of letter-press, and one large and several smaller photographs, with an abundance of ornamental initial letters and tail-pieces in wood cutting. The first picture is a perfect reproduction of the year 1780, called "Laura at the Piano." Schiller in his uniform of the Carl Schule listens to that Madame Vischer described by Peterson "as an uncultivated woman, both in mind and body a perfect mummy," whose subsequent career makes us easily agree with Schwab, that Schiller at that time carried in him that drink which made Goethe's Faust see Helen's charms in every woman he met. Rainberg, however, in this picture has given her charms quite adequate to sustain that platonic attachment, which, though it lasted but a short time, has yet given her immortality in the Laura odes; a very fine headpiece surmounts the Kindesmörderin. That it is possible to publish works so excellent as these in a book which is sold at so cheap a rate as five shillings a number, points to a very different condition of art and artists from that with which we are familiar. For pictures in any degree approaching the excellence of these, an English artist would not only ask, but with facility get, an amount of remuneration that would put it quite out of the power of any publisher to undertake a similar enterprise.

¹⁵ Schiller's "Gedichte, Jubiläum Ausgabe," Stuttgart: Cotta. London: Williams and Norgate.

17

