THE

WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

JULY AND OCTOBER,

1870.

"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.

GÖTHE.

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XXXVIII.

LONDON:
TRÜBNER & CO., 8 & 60, PATERNOSTER-ROW.
MDCCCLXX.

THE

WESTMINSTER

AND

FOREIGN QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY 1, 1870.

ART. I.—UNPUBLISHED LETTERS, WRITTEN BY SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE IN 1815-16.

PART II.

EARLY in 1816, Coleridge wrote to his friend at Devizes, offering the usual greetings and good wishes for the New Year, describing his literary occupations, and speculating on the probable fate of what, in another letter, he calls his dramatic enterprises. Hitherto Coleridge had made but one attempt to write for the theatres, but that attempt had issued, if not in a triumph, at least in an ovation. The success of the *Remorse* invited a renewal of his efforts. It is true that the author's nascent ambition had been at first discouraged by the unhandsome conduct of Sheridan, the brilliant genius that then presided over the fortunes of Drury Lane. The careless wit, to whom the manuscript of the *Remorse* had been entrusted, not only omitted to return the document, but, as Coleridge was credibly informed, amused and delighted a large company with an audacious burlesque of the first line, presenting it as a fair specimen of the whole tragedy. It appears that in the original copy Isidore was made to commence his soliloquy in the cavern with the words—

> "Drip! drip! a ceaseless sound of water-drops!"

From the cave to the kitchen, from the sublime to the ridiculous, was but a step, and Sheridan took it, turning the words into—

> "Drip! drip! drip! drip! There's nothing here but dripping!"

But if this was the only notice that Sheridan accorded the play, Coleridge had no reason to complain of the treatment which it

experienced when the theatre had fallen into other hands. In 1812 the play was accepted. Whitbread read and admired it; and Arnold, the manager, prophesied its triumphant reception. On the 23rd January, 1813, the *Remorse* was performed for the first time. Among the spectators was the late Mr. Crabb Robinson, a personal acquaintance of Coleridge, and therefore naturally anxious for the success of his play. The result satisfied him. His "Diary" reports that notwithstanding the redundancy of metaphysical speculation, the improbability of the action, and the too ornate diction, the tragedy was received with great and almost unmixed applause, and was announced for repetition without any opposing voices. Three years later, when Coleridge was pleasantly domiciled with Mr. Gillman, at Highgate, *Remorse* again took possession of the stage. Lord Byron was then a member of the Sub-Committee of the Drury Lane Theatre, and it was owing principally to his exertions that this play was revived in 1816. Though without the advantage of a single new scene, it brought an overflowing house. For this act of theatrical economy, Coleridge's biographer makes Mr. Whitbread responsible. If the imputation is well founded, the niggardly provision complained of must have been the consequence of an anticipative edict, for Mr. Whitbread died on the 26th of July, 1815, shortly after Byron's accession to theatrical office. This scenical stinginess perhaps inspired Coleridge's sarcastic *jeu d'esprit* when, affecting to define "Whitbread's Entire," he described it as "Dregs halfway up and froth halfway down." To the great brewer's greater colleague he seems to have been differently disposed. In consequence of the interest which Byron took in the success of his tragedy, Coleridge was frequently in his company. On one occasion, Mr. Gillman being present, Byron said, with a delightful frankness, "Coleridge, there is one passage in your poems I have parodied fifty times, and I hope to live long enough to parody it five hundred." With such graceful compliments we can hardly wonder that Byron made a favourable impression on Coleridge. From a letter, dated April 10, 1816, we borrow a poet's portrait of a brother poet:—

"If you had seen Lord Byron you could scarcely disbelieve him. So beautiful a countenance I scarcely ever saw; his teeth so many stationary smiles; his eyes the open portals of the sun, things of light and for light; and his forehead so ample and yet so flexible, passing from marble smoothness into a hundred wreaths and lines, and correspondent to the feelings and sentiments he is uttering."

Previously to these interviews Coleridge had written to Lord Byron, apparently asking his advice or interest for the promotion of his dramatic projects. The letter which he received in

answer is dated Piccadilly, March 25, 1815. The franked cover of the original, addressed to "S. T. Coleridge, Esq., Calne, Wilts," with its red postmark of half a century since stamped on the time-discoloured paper, is lying now before us, and it is from this cherished autograph of the Pilgrim of Eternity (so Shelley called Byron) that we transcribe the following sentences of his reply:—

"DEAR SIR,—It will give me great pleasure to comply with your request, though I hope there is still taste enough left among us to render it almost unnecessary—sordid and interested as it must be admitted many of 'the trade' are, where circumstances give them an advantage. I trust you do not permit yourself to be depressed by the temporary partiality of what is called 'the public' for the favourites of the moment; all experience is against the permanency of such impressions. You must have lived to see many of them pass away, and will survive many more—I mean personally; for, poetically, I would not insult you by a comparison.

"If I may be permitted, I would suggest that there never was such an opening for tragedy. In Kean there is an actor worthy of expressing the thoughts of the characters which you have every power of embodying; and I cannot but regret that the part of Ordonio was disposed of before his appearance at Drury Lane. We have had nothing to be mentioned in the same breath with *Remorse* for very many years, and I should think that the reception of that play was sufficient to encourage the highest hopes of author and audience. It is to be hoped that you are proceeding in a career which could not but be successful. With my best respects to Mr. Bowles,

"I have the honour to be,

"Your obliged and very obedient servant,

"BYRON."

The counsel thus agreeably tendered encouraged Coleridge to persevere in his dramatic project, if already formed, or, if not yet formed, suggested it to him as a congenial undertaking. Accordingly, in a letter to Moore, October 28, 1815, Byron says, in his lively, off-hand way, "You have also written to Perry, who intimates hope of an opera from you. Coleridge has promised a tragedy. Now, if you keep Perry's word, and Coleridge keeps his own, Drury Lane will be set up." Some months after this, Byron, at Sotheby's instance, wrote a second letter to Coleridge, and it is this letter, we presume, which Coleridge, in writing to Dr. Brabant, describes as courteous but unsatisfactory.

After the publication of the "Biographia Literaria," in which Coleridge wound up with a severe castigation of Maturin's *Bertram*, a *successful* play, Byron, who had read the critique,

assures his correspondent, Mr. Murray, that there was every disposition on the part of the Sub-Committee to bring forward any production of Coleridge's, if only it were feasible. The play he offered, Byron goes on to say, though poetical, did not appear at all practicable, and *Bertram* did, and hence this long tirade. The drama thus characterized was certainly *Zapolya*, or, as Mr. Moore was pleased to call it, *Zopolia*. We rather doubt, however, whether the "wonderful and beautiful performance" which Byron, on the 4th of November, 1815, recommended to his publisher as a perfectly safe investment, *was* the play of *Zapolya*, as Moore fancied, being inclined ourselves to identify the subject of Byron's eulogy with the wild and lovely "Christabel," which Murray published not very long after. If Moore's conjecture, however, be correct, and Byron read the tragedy which his friend misnames, and forwarded the MS. to Murray in the autumn of 1815, we should have *independent* evidence that *Zapolya* was *not* the play which Coleridge was completing in the middle of January, 1816. As it is, his own description of the two plays leads to the same conclusion. *Zapolya*, we are told by Mr. Gillman, was dictated by Coleridge, while walking up and down, to Mr. Morgan, the "disinterested" friend who shared his solitude at Calne. Rejected by Mr. Kinnaird, the critic for Drury Lane, who groaned over its "metaphysics," it met with a cordial reception from the public as soon as it appeared in a printed form, no fewer than two thousand copies being sold in six weeks. *Zapolya*, no doubt, was one of the two plays on which Coleridge descants in these letters, and it could not be the play to which he was then "putting the finishing hand," because he distinctly says that this last production was *not* the tragedy promised to Drury Lane, and *Zapolya*, we may reasonably assume, inasmuch as it was sent to Drury Lane, *was* that tragedy. What, then, has become of the Anonymous Play? The qestion is as difficult to answer as Mr. Browning's anxious inquiry, "What's become of Waring?" Was Coleridge dissatisfied with this youngest offspring of his invention, and did he destroy the precious casket which enshrined it? for the alternative that it is still in existence is improbable. Leaving the solution of the problem to the spiritual descendants of Œdipus, that "witch at a riddle," we add only that the letter in which Coleridge announced the mysterious conjunction of a double dramatic star was conveyed to its destination by the ball-going Miss Brent, one of the "two sisters in spirit,"* to whom Coleridge, in November, 1817, dedicated his "Lines on Taking Leave"—

> "To know, to esteem, to love, and then to part,
> Makes up life's tale to many a feeling heart," etc.

* Miss Mary Morgan was the other.

"Calne, Tuesday, Jan. 16, 1816.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I wrote to you some weeks ago, and though I well know that your multiplicity of avocations should preclude not merely the expectation, but almost the desire of hearing from you in return, when at least there is nothing, as in the present case, that required an answer, yet I have felt a little anxious to hear either of you or from you. And as Miss Brent accompanies Mr. John Merewether to the Devizes ball, I will not let her go without bearing from me a happy New Year and a succession of them, decreasing in toil and in *friction* of business, which wears us out, and leave* you a choice among better ways of preventing rust. In wishing this to you, I have included the best good wishes to Mrs. Brabant and the little ones.

"I go on pretty well, and am decently industrious. Three acts of a play, amounting on an average to 400 lines each, all in verse and carefully revised, you will deem no contemptible proof. I only wish I could settle with my own mind the exact point of duty. Lord Byron has behaved very *politely*, but never answered the most important part of my letter, and this which I am now putting the last hand to is not the tragedy I promised to Drury Lane, while the present piece must depend almost for its fate, certainly for its success, on the talents of the actresses in an equal, perhaps in a greater, degree than on those of the actors, for there are three female characters, each perfectly distinct from the other, and all prominent. Now, at D. L. they have not a single tolerable actress, and, excepting Kean, scarcely one effective tragic actor. If I send it to C. G. it will either be damned on the first night, or have a more than ordinary run, from the boldness and originality of the plan. If I send it to D. L. it will run a still greater risk of instant failure from the technical criticasters, and no chance of popularity.

"My best respects to Mrs. B. and the Miss Hugheses, and believe me, my dear sir, with unfeigned and affectionate esteem, your obliged, "S. T. COLERIDGE."

The following letter introduces a painful episode in Coleridge's life, and announces an impending change in his external position. We have already intimated that Dr. Brabant had gladly afforded this remarkable man, who was a constitutional invalid, the benefit of his professional knowledge and skill. After a grateful allusion to the practical advantage which he had derived from his friend's advice, and some tiresome medical details, interesting only to a physician and his patient, Coleridge proceeds to associate his anticipated success as a dramatist with the desired emancipation from a pitiable slavery, "the fetters of which do indeed eat into

* Query, *leaving?*

the soul." The slavery, so pathetically deprecated, was the habitual subjugation to the most seductive of tyrants—opium. In this place he calls the deadly drug poison. In the next letter he identifies it under the stronger and more emphatic name of THE DEATH. Mr. De Quincey has recorded that Coleridge began the practice of opium eating, not as a relief from bodily pains or nervous irritation, for his constitution was strong and excellent, but as a source of luxurious sensations, and insinuates that Coleridge, having tasted the enchanted cup of youthful rapture incident to the poetic temperament, was always wanting better bread than was made of wheat. Mrs. Henry Coleridge replies that her father never had a vigorous constitution, and cites the evidence of Mr. Stuart, editor of the *Morning Post* and part proprietor of the *Courier*, to both of which papers Coleridge had been a contributor, in corroboration of this statement. She further reminds us that it was in search of health that Coleridge visited Malta, and expresses the conviction that if her father "sought more from opium than the mere absence of pain, it was not luxurious sensations or the glowing phantasmagoria of passive dreams, but that the powerful medicine might keep down the agitation of his nervous system, like a strong hand grasping the jangling strings of some shattered lyre." This testimony is confirmed by that of Mr. Gillman, who assures us that Coleridge began the use of opium from bodily pain and rheumatism, and for the same reason continued it till he had acquired a habit too difficult under his own management to control. Coleridge himself wrote in a pocket-book, as far back as 1804, "my sole sensuality was not to be in pain." A memorandum, written two-and-twenty years later, supplies an interesting and apparently true account of the circumstances under which he was beguiled into a practice at once so fascinating and so destructive.

"I wrote a few stanzas* three-and-twenty years ago, soon after my eyes had been opened to the true nature of the habit into which I had been ignorantly deluded by the seeming magic effects of opium, in the sudden removal of a supposed rheumatic affection, attended with swellings in my knees and palpitation of the heart, and pains all over me, by which I had been bedridden for nearly six months. Unhappily, among my neighbour's and landlord's books were [*sic*] a large parcel of medical reviews and magazines. I had always a fondness (a common case, but most mischievous turn with reading men who are at all dyspeptic) for dabbling in medical writings, and in one of these I met [with] a case which I fancied very like my own, in which a cure had been effected by the Kendal Black Drop. In an evil hour I

* These stanzas have not been found. See Gillman's "Life of Coleridge" for the extract.

procured it: it worked miracles; the swellings disappeared, the pains vanished; I was all alive, and all around me being as ignorant as myself, nothing could exceed my triumph. I talked of nothing else, prescribed the newly-discovered panacea for all complaints, and carried a bottle about with me, not to lose any opportunity of administering instant relief and speedy cure to all complainers, stranger or friend, gentle or simple. Need I say that my own apparent convalescence was of no long continuance. But what then? The remedy was at hand! Alas! it is with a bitter smile, a laugh of gall and bitterness, that I recall this period of unsuspecting delusion, and how I first became aware of the Maelstrom, the fatal Whirlpool, to which I was drawing fast when the current was already beyond my strength to stem."

It is greatly to Coleridge's praise that, half-paralysed as he was by the spells of the sorcerer, he succeeded at last in reconquering his freedom.

> "He knew the foul enchanter, tho' disguised,
> Entered the very lime-twigs of his spells,
> And yet came off."

Meanwhile, the lamentable practice gave rise to some disagreeable gossip in the quiet neighbourhood of Calne and Devizes; for the tale related by Dr. Brabant to Mr. Morgan, and by Mr. Morgan in part communicated to Coleridge, had its origin in an incident connected with the fatal Nepenthes, that momentarily "bathes the drooping spirits in Elysium." The apologetic explanation of the incident in the letter is a curious bit of autobiography.

As the result of a final determination to fortify his own feeble powers of resistance by invoking extraneous aid in his efforts to emancipate himself from this degrading slavery to the Circean cup, Coleridge resolved on a change of residence and the adoption of means for securing this aid. The project unfortunately menaced him with separation from his old and valued friend, Mr. Morgan—a separation which the poet feelingly deplored.

Turning from the contemplation of his "worser self," Coleridge suddenly plunges into the subject of phrenology, with special reference to the arguments that Dr. Brabant had adduced in his hearing against the pretensions of the new "science." But before we go further, some words in explanation of the chemical metaphors, obsolete terminology, and punning rhetoric which the philosophical critic forces into the discussion, will not be considered superfluous. Butter of lead, to which Coleridge irreverently compares the heavy style or slippery logic of the phrenologist whose work he is reviewing, is, as we learn from the books, a hydrochlorate of that metal, and a hydrochlorate (formerly called a muriate) is a supposed compound of hydrochloric acid

and a base, and is really a chloride. Butter, in the vocabulary of an exploded pharmacy, was a term applied to various butter-like substances—as, butter of lead, butter of antimony, or, as in Coleridge's own selected instance, butter of bismuth. Bismuth, says Mr. Roscoe, reduced from the native to the metallic state, exhibits a pinkish-white colour; it melts at 264°, and is volatilized at a white heat. Molten bismuth, according to Dr. Tyndall, acts exactly as water acts. Water contracts till it reaches a temperature of 39° Fahr.; from 39° downwards to the freezing point the liquid expands. Ice, explains Dr. Arnott, floats on the surface of the water, defends it from cold air, and renders it a fit dwelling for the finny tribes until the return of the mild season. This important exception, he continues, to a general law of nature, "many regard with delight as one of the clearest instances of Providential interference." Now, if water had a monopoly of this supposed teleological privilege, the wonderful property in question *might* have been construed as "an irresistible proof of design unique of its kind, suggestive of pure benevolence;" but no sooner do we make this hypothetical concession, than Dr. Tyndall comes, like a killing frost, to nip the tender leaves of hope, invalidating the argument by showing that the case is not an isolated one. In fact, bismuth, in which there are no finny tribes, behaves exactly in the same way as water, and so annihilates at once this pretty argument *de finibus* and the amiable enthusiasm of Dr. Arnott's delighted philosophers. Badly, however, as bismuth may behave, it hardly deserved the penal coercion of the abominable punster, who, taking a mean revenge on Spurzheim's phrenological jargon, tortures its innocent name into the English *twy-mouthed*, and the Latin *bilinguis*, and then slips in the synonym *ore duplici prœditus* to furnish the desired counterpart to the "duplicity of organ" which follows. Plattner's Anthropology, to which Coleridge refers in the context, has for its complete German title, *Anthropologie für Aerzte und Weltweise.* The first edition of the work was published at Leipzig, in two volumes, in 1772-1773. Plattner's Latin style is said to be admirable. His philosophical and physiological lectures won him a splendid reputation. Sir William Hamilton attested his merit when he recognised in him a man no less celebrated as an acute philosopher than a learned physician and an elegant scholar; and Mr. Mill has cited Plattner's instructive representation of the perceptions and feelings of a person blind from birth in support of his own and Mr. Bain's doctrine that our idea of extension is due to a particular mode of discriminative sensibility in the muscular sense. Plattner died in 1813. There are two other savants whom Coleridge signalizes—Morgagni and Lieutaud. The latter is not discoverable in any of our literary guide-books, but of Giovanni Battista Morgagni we are enabled

to state that he was born at Forli, 25th February, 1682, practised medicine in his native town till his twenty-ninth year, and then, accepting a professorship in Padua, resided there till his death, on 5th December, 1771. To the initiated, Morgagni is known as the founder of pathological anatomy. His works were published at Vienna in and after 1765, in five folio volumes. Probably the one which Coleridge wished to consult is that which bears the title, *De Legibus et Causis morborum per anatomen indagatis.*

Coleridge, it will be seen, not only attacks Dr. Bayley for his phrenological heresy, but for favouring the hypothesis of equivocal generation, or, at least, of absimilar generation—that is, reproduction of a specific individual from an organic part of a diverse individual without impregnation. A passage from Dr. Carpenter's "Manual of Physiology"* may serve to illustrate, if not to confirm, Coleridge's view of absimilar generation.

Among many of the lower animals, a multiplication of individuals takes place by a process that closely resembles the *budding* of plants: this must be regarded, not as a proper act of generation, but as a modification of the ordinary nutritive process. . . . . Although the buds thus produced and separated are usually developed into the likeness of the parent stock, yet this is sometimes not the case, the stock possessing one form and the bud another, which may be quite different; as when certain fixed composite zoophytes bud off free-moving solitary Medusæ, these last depositing ova from which the zoophyte type is regenerated. When, however, this phenomenon, to which the name of "alternation of generations" has been given (erroneously, in the author's opinion), is carefully examined, it is found that the bud thus detached is really the generative apparatus of the parent stock, furnished, it may be, with nutritive and locomotive organs of its own, and that neither can be regarded as a complete organism without the other.

As instances of this reciprocal integration, the free-moving, solitary Medusæ, and the aggregate Salpæ, are cited by Dr. Carpenter. Whatever may be thought of Coleridge's view of the doctrine of absimilar generation, his rejection of that of spontaneous generation is victoriously justified by recent research.† The experiments of M. Pasteur, the opponent of M. Pouchet, a professor at Rouen, who thought there was a truth in the doctrine, prove, says Mr. Huxley, in the most conclusive manner, "that all the appearances of spontaneous generation arose from nothing more than the germs of organisms which were constantly floating in the air."

After this scientific "prattle," as he apologetically calls it, Coleridge terminates his letter with a sentence from St. Augustine,

---

* P. 471, 2nd edition.

† Since this sentence was written the germ controversy has been revived. See the letters of Dr. Bastian and Dr. Tyndall in the *Times*.

who, by the way, seems to have been pretty much of M. Pouchet's opinion on this no longer debateable subject.* The import of the quotation is, that however long and tedious the letter might really be, it would not be so regarded by the friend to whom it was addressed, since that friend was never better pleased than when he received the page on which his correspondent's garrulous effusions were inscribed. "Lord! gie us a gude conceit o' oursels," was the prayer of the bonny Scot, who might, perhaps, have been met with the obvious criticism that he did not seem so very deficient in the commodity for which he was petitioning. To anticipate a similar objection on the part of his friend at Devizes, Coleridge comments on the text supplied by Augustine: "Whatever this quotation wants in self-flattery I attribute to your kindness."

"Calne.

"MY DEAR SIR,—By following your plan, as far as the nature of my circumstances permits, I am as well if not better than I have been for some years. In one thing only I have ventured to make an alteration. * * * *

"Should I have such success in my dramatic enterprises as to be able to say, 'for six months to come I am not under the necessity of doing anything,' I have strong hopes that I should emancipate myself altogether from the most pitiable slavery, the fetters of which do indeed eat into the soul. In my present circumstances, and under the disquieting uncertainty in which I am concerning my place of residence for the ensuing years, all I can do is to be quite regular, and never to exceed the smallest dose of Poison that will suffice to keep me tranquil and capable of literary labour. What I refer to in this last sentence I would rather say than write to you. Therefore, be so good as to take no notice of it. It will be a sore heart-wasting to me to part from Mr. Morgan, for never was there a man of stricter integrity or higher honour, nor have I, nor can I have, a more faithful, zealous, and disinterested friend.

"Before I had given up the thought of accompanying Mr. Money to All-Cannings, Morgan thought it advisable, if not necessary, to communicate to me part of what you had told him. Need I say it only strengthened my esteem and gratitude towards you? But a plain statement of the facts will prove to you that even the Devil may be painted too black. The worse parts of the charge were that I had been, in the first place, imprudent enough, and in the second place, gross and indelicate enough, to send out a gentleman's servant in his own house to a public-house for a bottle of brandy. What is the fact? I was taken

* "De Civitate Dei," Lib. xvi. cap. iii.

ill at Mr. Money's, and unluckily had no laudanum with me. I desired Mr. Money's servant to procure a lad for me to take a letter into Calne. He did, and procured a boy, the son of one of the labouring masons then at work. Him I despatched with a letter to Mr. Bishop, our Calne druggist, in which I desired Mr. Bishop to put up two ounces of laudanum, two ounces of tincture of rhubarb, and half an ounce of tincture of cardamoms, in and with a half-pint flat bottle of British gin, to wrap each and all in *tow*, and making up the parcel in brown paper, and sealing it, to send it by the bearer directed to me, and with the word *medicine* at the corner. This was accordingly done. I suppose that I carelessly left the bottle, and that this and my desiring to have a tumbler and some hot water, furnished the grounds for the present shape of this precious anecdote.

"'One nectar drop from Truth's own shop will flavour a whole butt of slander.'

"To turn from what is always wearisome to me, and on these subjects disgusting, namely, writing concerning my worser-self, I had read Spurzheim's book and Bayley's 'Morbid Anatomy.' The former is below criticism. Of Gall's anatomical discoveries, of course I can be no judge; but even of these so-called discoveries I can show at least one-half stated either as truths or as absurdities, in one single chapter of Plattner's 'Anthropology,' a work published twenty years before Gall had been exhaled from the Bœotian swamp of Vienna. Of the rest I have two grounds for wonderment: the first, that it should have been extolled by Dr. Parry; and second, that a book so stupendously absurd should be so dull. It is mere butter of lead. Let the twy-mouthed English-Greek terminal jargon stand for the *Bismuth* (by an allowable, at least, appropriate derivation as correspondent to Διστομος, *bilinguis*, or *ore duplici prœditus*), the beggarly glitter of his facts and analogies for the tin-foil; only the lead needs no explanation. His answer to your objection rests on the assertion of the duplicity of every organ, analogous to two eyes, two ears, two nostrils, two arms, &c. &c. &c. And the cases of Hydrocephalus he explains by asserting that in these instances the brain is only expanded, not disorganized; and this Dr. Bayley, in his last edition of his 'M. A.,' has condescended to borrow. Of the latter work I guess your opinion is that it does not contain much; but, perhaps, almost all that can be relied upon. But I should like, if I had time, to examine Morgagni and Lieutaud for myself. It is more certain that Dr. Bayley favours the hypothesis if not of equivocal, yet of *absimilar* generation or reproduction of a specific *individual* from an organic *part* of a diverse individual without impregnation, by deranged

action or metastasis of function. His facts are—1. Worms in animals, appropriate to each animal and incapable of living elsewhere. 2. Hydatids, at least those of the liver and the ovarium, whose vitality he supposes proved by the undoubted vitality of the mouth and neck hydatids in the heads of sheep. 3. By the cyst of hair and fangless teeth, &c.

"The last appears to me a perilously narrow basement for so gigantic a column, that swells too as it rises; and in the two former I can see neither plausibility nor common logic. How many scores of germs would have been actualized if no putrefaction had ever furnished the requisite nidus? Why should not nature have made vermin to live within other animals as well as on their skin? I doubt not if any new arrangement of edible or calorific matter were to take place, germs pre-exist, who would be the Adams and Eves of the new Paradise. And as to the cysts it is not a case in point; for the question is not what metamorphosis life may be capable of effecting in the compounds subject to its action, but the possibility of an organic living whole by the single deranged energy of a component part of an animal utterly ἑτερο γενος.

"Excuse both my scrawl and my prattle. I wish I had you here to read an act to you of a play I have just finished. Affectionate respects to Mrs. B., and love to Rufa and her brother.

"Your obliged friend,

"S. T. COLERIDGE.

"P.S.—'Ultra solitum modum usque in tædium hanc epistolam peregi, sed non apud te, cui nulla est pagina gratior, quam quæ me loquaciorem apportat tibi.'—*Augustini*, Epist. 72.

"Whatever this quotation wants in self-flattery I attribute to your kindness."

The next letter is a short one. It is a kind of postscript to the preceding; a sort of after-thought, supplementing his former bill of health. The asterisks imply no intentional omission, but are designed to represent an excision from the original letter, a few lines having been removed, perhaps as a memorial, for an autograph collector.

TO THE SAME.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I do not know that I can add anything to my yesterday's communication, except that for some years before I began to take the Death I was subject to faintness and sinking in the stomach, and to very weak bowels, so that any mental agitation, any domestic dispute, would, like a flash of lightning, shoot through my bowels and bring on a temporary diarrhœa. But I shall, I trust, see you at Mr. Methuen's on Friday or Thursday, according as the weather may be. I am set down to

work again, and in tolerable good spirits. I thank you for the pheasant. It is a rose-leaf floating on a full cup, but * *
* * * * * *

"My respectful regards to Mrs. Brabant, and love to William and Rufa. Mrs. Morgan's compliments."

With the return of the spring Coleridge proceeded to carry into effect his scheme for the change of residence, which was a necessary preliminary to the conduct of that great moral struggle on which he had resolved to enter. "Coleridge," said some sarcastic contemporary, "is a good man, a very good man, but somehow as soon as a duty presents itself in a practical way, he cannot do it." At this critical juncture, however, the poet belied the not very flattering testimony volunteered to his character. The adventitious aid that he determined to invite to supplement his own feeble volition was procured for him by Dr. Joseph Adams, of whose kind offices he had availed himself. On the 9th of April, 1816, Dr. Adams wrote to Mr. Gillman, of Highgate, stating that a very learned but in one respect unfortunate gentleman had made a singular application to him. The misfortune, Dr. Adams then explains, lay in the habit he had formed during several years of taking large quantities of opium, and in his inability to discontinue the deadly drug. Anxious at last to overcome this evil habit, he proposed to submit himself to any regimen, however severe. "With this view," resumes the benevolent physician, "he wishes to fix himself in the house of some medical gentleman who will have courage to refuse him any laudanum, and under whose assistance, should he be the worse for it, he may be relieved. As he is desirous of retirement and a garden, I could think of no one so readily as yourself. Be so good as to inform me whether such a proposal is absolutely inconsistent with your family arrangements."

On the receipt of this letter Mr. Gillman, though indisposed to assume this fresh responsibility, determined to confer with Dr. Adams. The conference was by no means re-encouraging. The frightful consequences which the discontinuance of the customary stimulant might involve, had been announced by eminent physicians to the patient himself, as Mr. Gillman now learned from Dr. Adams, and the independent experience of both gentlemen led them to regard the proposed experiment as replete with danger. It was finally agreed, however, that Dr. Adams should drive Coleridge to Highgate the following evening. On the following evening, accordingly, Coleridge presented himself to his new ally. He was alone. His air, his appearance, his conversation fascinated his listeners, for an accomplished gentleman happened to be in the room when Coleridge was announced, though fancying, from something he saw in Mr. Gill-

man's manner, that an "old friend" had arrived, he retired as soon as courtesy would permit. The next evening the enchanter came again. He now detailed his unhappy history, "repeating some exquisite but desponding lines of his own." Like the wedding guest under the glittering eye of the Ancient Mariner, Mr. Gillman stood spellbound under the talismanic influence of this eloquent voyager on "a wide, wide sea." He had previously had no intention of receiving an inmate into his house, but now "he listened like a three years' child," and in the end "the Mariner had his will." Mr. Gillman was the saint that took pity on "his soul in agony." Shortly after this interview Coleridge wrote to the friend whose assistance he had thus happily secured, proposing to commence his residence at Highgate on the following Monday. The letter in which he makes this intimation is dated April 13, 1816, but the brackets enclosing the date seem intended to indicate that it was filled in by the editor. On the evening appointed—it was a Monday evening—Coleridge entered the house which was to afford him shelter for the remaining years of life. In his hand he brought the proof sheets of "Christabel," which was now for the first time printed. Eighteen years had elapsed since the completion of the opening canto and its publication at this time by Murray. This glorious fragment consists of two parts, one of which was written at Stowey, in Somersetshire, and the other at Keswick, in Cumberland, in 1800. Lamb, enraptured with the witching beauty of the earlier lay, disbelieved in the possibility of an adequate continuation. "I was very angry with Coleridge," said he to Mr. Gillman, soon after the poet's death, "when I first heard that he had written a second canto, and that he intended to finish it; but when I heard the beautiful apostrophe to the two friends it calmed me." Coleridge asserted that he had always had in his mind the plan of the poem as a finished whole; but in Crabb Robinson's "Diary" Wordsworth declares that in this Coleridge deceived himself as well as some of his friends. On the other hand, Mr. Gillman, who appears to have had too little invention to draw upon his imagination for his facts, assures us that the following relation was to have occupied a third and fourth canto, and to have closed the tale. Believing it fairly to represent the intended completion of the poet himself, we gladly transfer it to our own pages.

Over the mountains the bard, as directed by Sir Leoline, "hastes" with his disciples; but in consequence of one of those inundations supposed to be common to this country, the spot only where the castle once stood is discovered, the edifice itself being washed away. He determines to return. Geraldine being acquainted with all that is passing, like the weird sisters in *Macbeth*, vanishes. Reappearing,

however, she waits the return of the bard, exciting in the meantime by her wily arts all the anger she could rouse in the Baron's breast, as well as that jealousy of which he is described to have been susceptible. The old bard and the youth at length arrive, and therefore she can no longer personate the character of Geraldine, the daughter of Lord Roland de Vaux, but changes her appearance to that of the accepted, though absent, lover of Christabel. Next ensues a courtship most distressing to Christabel, who feels—she knows not why—great disgust for her once-favoured knight. This coldness is very painful to the Baron, who has no more conception than herself of the supernatural transformation. She at last yields to her father's entreaties, and consents to approach the altar with this hated suitor. The real lover returning enters at this moment, and produces the ring which she had once given him in sign of her betrothment. Thus defeated, the supernatural being Geraldine disappears. As predicted, the castle bell tolls, the mother's voice is heard, and, to the exceeding great joy of the parties, the rightful marriage takes place, after which follows a reconciliation and explanation between the father and the daughter.

While Coleridge was printing and reciting "Christabel" in the blossoming bowers of Highgate, he was deriving benefit from the enforcement of the severe regimen which he had had the courage to adopt. About three months after his arrival at the "Dodona Oakgrove," he was reported by Mr. Crabb Robinson to have already profited by abstinence from the witch's cup. "I never saw him look so well," said the visitor; "his talk was sensible, though less eloquent and vehement than usual." Coleridge's "pure anticipated cognitions" of Schelling's philosophy are well known; but we are indebted to Mr. Robinson for the information that he advanced pretensions that make him a co-rival of Goethe. He discovered the theory of colours many years before the great German poet, and would have reduced it to form had not Southey diverted his attention to poetry! Southey could hardly have done a wiser thing.

This boast of prior "emancipation from the Newtonian Spectrum" was made on July 13. No further trace of Coleridge is discoverable till September 21, when a letter of that date shows us that during an interval of immoderate literary labour the Devil's Elixir had regained a temporary ascendancy. The lay sermon which he had undertaken to write at the request of the house of Gale and Rest Fenner had for its occasion one of those periodical distresses which visit this country once in every nine years, and which was punctual to its engagement in the spring and summer of 1816. The first of the two lay sermons, addressed to the higher and middle classes of society, was entitled, "The Statesman's Manual; or, The Bible the Best Guide to Political Skill and Foresight." The necessity for rapid execution, the futility of the efforts made to gain time, the exhaustion con-

sequent on overwork, the recourse to *The Death*—first as a narcotic, and then as a stimulant—the distress in which valued friends were involved; the calumny of which he was himself the object; the alarming illness of a lady in whom he had a family interest, and the harassing effect of a painful interview with the sufferer, terminated in a complete prostration of body and mind alike. Flying, as soon as he could gather strength to fly, from these scenes of agitation and sorrow, Coleridge, accompanied by Mr. and Mrs. Gillman, took refuge in a small cottage at Muddiford, near Christchurch, on the Hampshire coast. To aggravate his misery Coleridge received, about this time, an unkind and even an angry letter from his old Wiltshire friend. The immediate occasion that prompted the serious impeachment conveyed in that letter cannot now be ascertained, but from Coleridge's half-sorrowful, half-indignant remonstrance, interpreted by such general knowledge as we possess, we are disposed to refer it to the singular mental attitude which the poet assumed in his treatment of the Theological Problem. In an eulogistic estimate of the intellectual services of this memorable man, Mr. J. S. Mill observes that Coleridge's great object was to bring into harmony religion and philosophy, and believing that there is little prospect at present that philosophy will take the place of religion, or that any philosophy will be speedily received in this country unless supposed not only to be consistent with, but even to yield collateral support to Christianity, the friendly critic gives a cordial welcome to Coleridge's attempt at reconciliation. That such an attempt may be honestly made, it requires little generosity even in an opponent to concede; but that the expedient usually resorted to, in order to attain this end, the adoption of a non-natural sense, the pre-determination to find in old records the results of modern scientific investigation, is calculated to generate a theological casuistry which ends in a more or less conscious insincerity, is a complementary proposition the truth of which must also be conceded. There was not only a dreamy mysticism, but an amiable mystification about Coleridge. "Coleridge," said Lamb, "has the art of making the unintelligible appear intelligible." Leigh Hunt pictures him persuading a Deist that he was a Christian, and an Atheist that he believed in God; and Mr. Carlyle expatiates on the beautiful Coleridgean paradox,* that while "Atheistic philosophy was true on its side, and Hume and Voltaire could on their own ground speak irrefragably for themselves against any Church," the Christian dogma was also true, the dead Church being capable of revivification into "pristine florid vigour" by the elevation of all alike into a "higher

* See the admirable chapter on Coleridge, in Carlyle's "Life of Sterling."

sphere of argument," an end easily attained "by attending to the reason of man and duly chaining up the understanding of man." This was evidently a theory for only elect souls. Any such "subtlest hocus-pocus of reason *versus* understanding' would have seemed to Dr. Brabant, as to Mr. Carlyle, "high treason against the truth;" and if an exaggerated report of particular applications of this ingenious method of reconciling contradictions had reached Coleridge's uncompromising and unimaginative friend at Devizes, he would in all likelihood have stigmatized as hypocrisy, if not the attempt itself, at least the insincerities almost inseparable from its practical evolution, and from the courtly accommodations into which a sympathetic harmonizing nature like that of Coleridge would involuntarily glide. Perhaps it was harsh to apply such an ugly word to an occasional miscarriage of a reconciling criticism. In marking the distinction between "the precious truth or prefigurement of truth which lay in Coleridge's pious, ever-labouring, subtle mind, and the fatal delusion which was there too," Mr. Carlyle has more charitably indicated the unconscious insincerity of the philosophical theologian.

"Muddiford, Christchurch, Hampshire,
21st September, 1816.

"DEAR SIR,—The uppermost thought in reading your letter was that of the pain you would suffer when you learnt the truth. It was but yesterday that I read your angry letter, not a single paper or message having been brought to me from the very day I received your short note. I am so weak and low, I am obliged to narrate with broken conciseness. I had been solicited by the house of Gale and Fenner, whom I had conceived at least to have felt kindly towards me—no small merit in an age of atrocious calumny—to give them a small tract on the present distresses, in the form of a lay sermon; but it was to be done immediately. I undertook it—money I was to have none, but as a mark of respect; and assuredly I never conceived the promise interpretable otherwise than as conditional—viz., that I would do my utmost. My only fault was, that thinking too much of what I had often done and *too* little of my then strength, I suffered it to be advertised. Then began the spell; the stimulant was aggravated into a narcotic. I laboured from morning to night, and found myself writing a volume, not a tract of a single sheet. I erased, and having worked from nine till five on the one day, I sat up the whole night and continued writing and erasing. The consequence was almost immediate, and I soon found I had to deal with persons incapable of understanding the circumstances, though Mr. Gillman waited upon them as my medical attendant. A few days came in the fulfilment (*sic*) of

what I had indeed long anticipated; but yet in that mood of nerves and thought was not the more prepared for the blow. Spite of your unkind letter, I cannot but write to you as a Friend: in one word, therefore, and to your own eye alone—I mean the A.B.'s circumstances. The man who was their agent or employé was (as it was scarce possible to be otherwise) a sort of a rascal—in my opinion, as rascals go, a venial one. And on me, unable to support myself and the object of the cruellest calumnies, which however I deserved from the mental cowardice that has ever made me the Slave of the present Distress before my eyes—on me alone to any effective purpose * * * but the detail is not for a letter. A third thing: a sister of ——, the only one of the brood that I had any regard for, and who deserved it; whom the fine ladies at Keswick had left as a laborious mantua-maker in London, after having tantalized her with a year's intercourse with Sirs, Lords, and Dukes at Keswick, with a broken constitution, because a broken heart, had neglected a catarrh, the air-vessels of the lungs became mechanically obstructed with mercury —in short, the people of the house had heard her talk of me, and sent up to beg that I would come instantly, for that she was dying; and that in the interval of her convulsions she had uttered my name repeatedly. I took a carriage at nine o'clock at night, and found Dr. —— with her, who had given her over: her pulse, however, made me suspect that the doctor meant to have the honour of a miracle. Dreadful, however, was her state, as you must well know, who have seen, doubtless, many cases of aggravated spasmodic catarrh. After twelve hours, expectoration was produced, and she was able to express her wishes to a female friend, and when I left her there were avowed hopes of her recovery. This was my last effort. On my return to Highgate, I sunk into complete outward nothingness. I could think as before, my inward mind seemed the same; but even to take a pen in my hand—nay, the postman's knock—brought the big drops not only on my forehead, but all over my head and chest, and I longed for Death with an intensity that I have never seen expressed but in the Book of Job.

"I can write no more. If I was to live, an absolute seclusion became necessary. I left Highgate, and am now in a small cottage at the seashore, but I shall move as soon as I have strength and can command resources enough to procure a horse, and mean to spend a month in travelling about ten or fifteen miles a day.

"I attempted to dictate a something that is coming out; what you will think of it I cannot conjecture, for I was not able even to look over the copy. It is entitled, 'The Bible, considered as containing the Elements of Political Wisdom and Foresight.'

Of the confluent distresses that have rushed upon me I have here mentioned the most predominant, only the immediate causes; there have been many more. Oh, Brabant! indeed, indeed you ought not to have suspected my heart. If I had had less I could very easily have appeared to have had more, and what motive, in the name of God, could you imagine acting to turn me into a hypocrite? But oh, it is not in my nature to feel resentment. Grief swallows it up when the indifference of sickness and despondency does not preclude it. I must particularly request you not to mention to any one my address. I shall not be here, I hope, above a week, unless I should be, as I still fervently wish, here underground. What I ever have thought and felt respecting you and yours I have never ceased to think and feel.

"God bless you and Mrs. B., and your dear children, and

"S. T. C.

"Mr. Gillman came down with me and Mrs. G. against my will, for it is not medical skill that can restore me."

The gracious magnanimity of the outraged philosopher did not permit him to resent the explosive rhetoric of his indignant correspondent. The last letter in our collection still testifies to the continuance on his part of the old esteem and attachment.

The difficulty in prose composition of which Coleridge complains in an ensuing sentence becomes intelligible when we recall his affluent but laborious style. Often rhythmical, sometimes emphatic, occasionally rich with striking felicities of language or splendid with an illuminating rhetoric, it is yet painfully elaborated, and somewhat deficient in sweet natural grace and spontaneous ebullience. The only wonder is that with his "threefold ordonnance of Sound, of Image, and of Logic," and his grammatical double decalogue or "bis-decalogue" ever before him, the spontaneous activities necessary to successful composition were not terrified into hopeless asphyxia! Quite in keeping with his pedantic apparatus is the term "Evoluta," which he confers on the essays thus tediously constructed. The particular *evolutum* which the author commends for its style was probably the first of the projected Lay Sermons, two of which in due time appeared. The third, intended for the benefit of the Lower Classes, like the grand book on the Logos,* with which, according to Carlyle, Coleridge proposed "to bridge the chasm for us" between the Credible and Incredible, remains in the voluminous catalogue of his unwritten works. The primary Evolutum, or first Lay Sermon, was noticed in the *Edinburgh Review*, before

* See Carlyle's "Sterling."

its publication, towards the close of the year 1816. This anticipative critique, dictated, Coleridge affirms, by an avowed and exclusive malignity, was attributed, apparently on good grounds, to the vigorous pen of his old associate, William Hazlitt. One of the editors of the *Biographia Literaria* calls it a portrait scrawled in the dark. The essay on Coleridge, separately published by Hazlitt, is characterized by the same writer as a minute study of life curiously distorted in every part, and with every distortion enormously magnified. To produce such a full-length likeness of Coleridge, with a certain sham-truth of colour, was an achievement facilitated by personal and intellectual precedent afforded by Coleridge himself. Thus Coleridge, an anti-utilitarian moralist, had expressed his opposition to an ideal fabric of general consequences; a Jacobin in early life, he had abandoned Jacobinism and inveighed against the rights of man as metapolitical delusions; an Unitarian when Mr. Hazlitt heard his voice rise from the pulpit of a Shrewsbury meeting-house like a steam of rich distilled perfumes, he had reasoned himself into a belief in the Triune God; and yet he had been heard to say, "Were I not a Christian, I should be an Atheist with Spinoza, resting my only hope on the gradual, and certain because gradual, progression of the species, and this, though negative Atheism, is, next to Christianity, the purest spirit of humanity." With such or similar materials to turn to account, it is not wonderful that an unscrupulous critic could produce the plausible caricature in the Political Essays in which Coleridge is represented as an author who "considers a belief in God as a very subordinate question to the worship of the three Persons of the Trinity; who makes the essence of devotion to consist in Atheism, the perfection of morality in a total disregard of consequences; and who defines Jacobinism to be an abstract attachment to liberty, truth, and justice, and finding that this principle has been abused and carried to excess, argues that anti-Jacobinism, or the abstract principles of despotism, superstition, and oppression are the safe, sure, and undeniable remedy for the former, and the only means of restoring liberty, truth, and justice in the world." In the review of "Christabel," political alienation or personal antipathy misled Hazlitt still more deplorably. He declared that there was not a ray of genius in the poem, not a gleam of fancy or feeling, nothing to admire but the description of the quarrel between the friends. This is Hazlitt's judgment of a poem which had haunted Scott with its melody and delighted Byron with its beauty and originality; a poem which Leigh Hunt praises for perfect sentiment of music and creative excellence, ranking the witch in "Christabel" with the kindred productions of Shakespeare's genius.

Mr. Hazlitt's critical blindness has been attributed to political prepossession. Coleridge, in the letter, ascribes his animosity to an unworthy impatience of the obligations under which a signal good service of his own had placed the splenetic reviewer. Can "whispering tongues have poisoned truth" when they breathed into the poet's ear the malignant words which he cites as Hazlitt's own utterance: "Damn him! I hate him, for I am under obligations to him." This ferocious attack of Hazlitt was the subject of general discussion at the time. Mr. Crabb Robinson talked the matter over with Lamb, who thought it fair enough between the parties. Lamb, it seems, was not averse to hard hits, but, always on the side of the Charities, he generously said of Hazlitt, whose acquaintance, like Coleridge, he eventually dropped, "Hazlitt does bad actions without being a bad man." Deploring his critic's ingratitude, Coleridge refers in his letter to the poem in which Catullus before him had grieved over some similar shortcoming. The same allusion is repeated at the close of the *Biographia Literaria*, where the lines are quoted in full;* and in the postscript of the present letter he recalls some words of the poem as he sighs over the ingratitude of his old master in poetry, Lisle Bowles—

"Desine de quoquam quicquam bene velle mereri,
Aut aliquem fieri posse putare pium.
Omnia sunt ingrata: nihil fecisse benigne est:
Immo etiam tædet, tædet obestque magis;
Ut mihi, quem nemo gravius nec acerbius urget
Quam modo qui me unum atque unicum amicum habuit."

"Thursday, 5th December, 1816.

"MY DEAR SIR,—Be assured that I both love and honour you, and as my esteem and even personal attachment were not the creatures of time, so neither are they its dependents. I work hard not only for myself, but (as it happened, though at an unfortunate period) for others, and day after day I am at it from

* We have given the verses as cited by Coleridge, but in the copies of Catullus accessible to us the fourth line runs, "Immo etiam tædet statque magisque magis." The meaning of the lines, it is hoped, is reflected with sufficient fidelity in the following version:—

"For no kind deed from any man again
Hope kindness back or common piety:
The world's an ingrate! All kind service done
It counts for nothing. Nay, it counts for worse,—
For weariness and hurt, that, more and more,
Wearies and hurts. Such fortune now is mine,
For none with keener hate or heavier hand
Besieges me, than he that yesterday
Saw his one friend, his one sole friend in me."

between nine and ten to four before dinner, and from seven to twelve, nay one afterwards, ever since I returned from the sea-side, and yet every year I compose more slowly and with greater effort, not from any decrease in the stream of my thoughts, for the contrary is the case, but from the increasing difficulty of satisfying myself, and the increasing self-teasing when I let a sentence go off that I know to be faulty. One of the Evoluta I hereby entreat your acceptance of. In point of *style*, I believe it to be greatly superior to any of my former compositions.

"Mr. Gillman, who has written and published a very sensible tract on 'Hydrophobia' (a prize essay), observed a few days ago, that till the hour he had been occasionally my amanuensis he had not the remotest conception of what, how great, and (almost) how endless the difficulties are of composing, when the writer understands and binds himself down to attend to the threefold ordonnance of Sound, of Image, and of Logic. Wherever I corrected a sentence I described the fault for which it was corrected, generalizing it, and then designating it with a Greek letter. I looked into half a dozen modern books, and looking here and there for instances of faults, which from habit I could not fall into myself, I designated them likewise till I had a tolerably complete catalogue—a sort of bis-decalogue of breaches of the intellectual commandments. I then took the first pamphlet, a medical review, which came into the house after that time, and, without the least hypercriticism, in the course of fifty pages, I had written the whole Greek alphabet five times over, and on the supposition that by endless watchfulness and wearisome revisals, I had avoided all these, and how little probable this, the corrections made in your copy, as the last clearing, will show you, and I doubt not that you would enable me to return from the field with another sheaf under my arm; but supposing a more complete success, yet to what end? Lord Nelson might, I fear, have counted on his remaining fingers all the readers that would thank me for any toil or be aware of it. The man who has so grossly calumniated me in the *Examiner* and in the *Edinburgh Review* is a William Hazlitt—one who owes to me more than to his own parents. His reason I give in his own words. 'Damn him! I hate him, for I am under obligations to him.' When he was reproached for writing against his own convictions, and reminded that he had repeatedly declared the 'Christabel' the first poem in the language of its size, he replied, 'I grumbled part to myself while I was writing, but nothing stings a man so much as making people believe lies of him.' You would scarcely think it possible that a monster could exist who boasted of guilt and avowed his predilection for it. All good I had done him of *every* kind, and never ceased to do so. The only *wrong* I have done him has been to

decline his acquaintance. Thank God! I feel these things more philosophically than Catullus did. Turn to that affecting overflow of his mind, his LXXI. 'In Ingratium,' in the last but five or six pages of his works. *How* I feel you may see page xxi. of the appendix to my Sermon. Next week I expect the two other Lay Sermons to come out—to the middle and labouring classes. My Biographical Sketches so long printed will then be published, and I proceed to republish 'The Friend,' but as a complete Rifacimento.

"The sea-air did me good, and the benefit would have been far greater if I could have added leisure. But I literally have not time to enter into particulars concerning my health. I will do this when I send the other Lay Sermons.

"Pray make my most affectionate respects to Mrs. Brabant, and my kind remembrances to her sister, and with love to her little ones, whose faces are often before my eyes,

"Believe me a very neglectful correspondent, but most un-unfeignedly your obliged and affectionate friend,

"J. Gillman's, Esq., Highgate. "S. T. COLERIDGE.

"P.S.—It would amuse me to learn what Mr. T. Methuen thinks of my Sermon. What Bowles will think and say I know beforehand! though I have not, thank God! quite so clear an insight into what his feelings were when he read the first chapter of my Biographical Sketches; if, indeed, he collated the passages concerning himself, with his own speeches, &c., concerning *me*. Alas! I injured myself irreparably with him by devoting a fortnight to the correction of his poems. He took the corrections, but never forgave the corrector. *Nihil fecisse benigne est: Imo etiam tædet, tædet obestque magis.*"

The last memorial of Coleridge to which we have a kind of personal title to refer is a portrait of him now lying before us. It is an engraving presented "by the old man eloquent" to one of the ladies that formed the old Devizes circle, when, shortly before his death, she saw him in his flowery retreat at Highgate. The expression of the countenance is calm, self-complacent, and dignified. The head is white as snow with those "blossoms of the grave" which are the more appropriate accompaniment of a maturer age than Coleridge had yet attained, though we must remember that as far back as 1810, when he was but thirty-eight years old, he had sung mournfully of his "locks in silver slips." Under the portrait may be traced an interesting autograph, in which, by a curious act of obliviscence, the poet has overrated the number of his years. The self-appreciation implied in the verse cited from Ovid is a complimentary certificate to the persuasive power of his oratory, which he doubtless wrote with

silent internal laughter at the harmless vanity which prompted the panegyric. The entire subscription is—

S. T. Coleridge, æt. suæ 63.

"Non formosus erat sed erat facundus Ulysses."—*Ovid.*

The donor had first written *famosus*. He then erased all the letters composing this word but the initial *f*, and wrote *ormosus* above the erasure. Below, the privileged recipient of the gift from the "not beautiful but eloquent Ulysses," has recorded the date of his death—

Died July, 1834, at Highgate.

Art. II.—Indian Taxation: Lord Cornwallis's Land Settlement.

THE right of taxation being the right to levy from the subject a certain contribution proportioned to the value of the property secured to him by the Government, it follows that the land tax should vary as the value of the land. It is inequitable that, while a tradesman is assessed this year at twice the amount of income tax for which he was liable the year before, when his profits were one-half less, the land tax levied from the landholder is no higher than it was seventy years ago, when the land may have fetched only a tenth of its present value. Nor is the argument affected by the circumstance that the Indian landholder now pays an income tax equally with the tradesman. For, while an income tax, like other direct and indirect taxes, is a tax on the *personal* property owned severally by both classes, the land tax is a *property* tax, payable in consideration of the grant to an individual of an exclusive possession from the enjoyment of which all others are barred. Hence the justification of any land tax whatever is equally the justification of an enhanced assessment, varying with the market value of the land.

To give a practical illustration of that oft-quoted abstract proposition, "civilization is expensive," we may assert that a certain increase in the value of land in any period represents, proportionately, the cost in the same period of the civil and military organizations under which greater security is afforded and larger profits are made. The efficiency of the military and police forces which protect the crops from foreign and internal aggression; the superior intelligence and integrity of the civil administration under which the general progress is promoted and individual rights are secured; the ports and harbours, roads

and canals, which enable the farmer to get better prices for the produce of the land; the progressive and more costly civilization which raises rents and the price of provisions, together represent a certain money value whose equivalent should be found in the value of the land and labour of the country.

Taxation, proportioned to the present value of each individual's property and the profits accruing from it, is only an equitable distribution among the inhabitants of a country of the aggregate cost of all the intelligence and integrity, the skilled labour and enterprise, which have combined to create and maintain this property at the price it commands. Consequently it is impossible to exempt one section of a community from contributing its fair share towards the national expenditure, without inflicting on the rest of the community the injustice of levying from them more than their fair share towards it. For, either the deficiency caused by the exemption from taxation of a portion of the aggregate value of the collective property of the country, maintained at a certain cost, must be made good by the imposition of additional taxes on the remainder of the property of the country; or, the Government will be unable to discharge the debts it has contracted, and further progress in prosperity and civilization will be impeded or effectually stopped.

Least of all can justice, or the needs of progressive civilization, counsel exemption for the most valuable portion of the property of a country, the very property which is most directly and permanently affected by good or bad government. For while skilled labour and personal property can be transported at discretion to other lands, escaping from impending evil, or resigning all share in the benefits derivable from costly works and useful institutions, the interests of real property are indissolubly bound up with good government and substantial progress.

"But there is the Permanent Settlement in Bengal. The Government is pledged to it. To raise the Government demand on land which has been permanently assessed, would be a breach of faith." To this objection the answer must be, that a contract to be binding must be lawful. If an individual should make a contract to transfer to another property which does not belong to him, such contract is null and void, because the contracting party was not competent to execute the instrument under which the property is claimed by the transferee. Similarly, the Permanent Settlement Act of Lord Cornwallis is not binding on the Government of to-day, because no Government is competent to bind posterity. Governments do but legislate for their own day and generation. If a Government sees fit to do so, the enactment of to-day may be repealed to-morrow, and should be repealed if the enactment is found to be unjust and oppressive.

How much greater is the right and obligation of a new generation, or the new Government which represents it—presumably more just and enlightened than their predecessors—to correct and nullify the more ignorant and less righteous legislation of the past. It is inconceivable that a Government, which exists and makes laws purely by the permission of the society which it represents, should claim to legislate for generations yet unborn, whose consent it cannot obtain and whose interests it is incompetent to foresee. It is further inconceivable that every act of a less intelligent and more despotic Government that is past—borne and suffered by a comparatively ignorant and servile generation—should be tolerated by their more enlightened successors, with a keener sense of their rights, and the strength to assert those rights. To suppose it, is to suppose man competent to resist the inevitable law of progress, and to withstand the new adaptations which are continually impressed on him by continually altered conditions.

Extending the general argument to the particular case of the Permanent Settlement, Lord Cornwallis's Government gave away that which was not theirs to give. The land belonged of right to the generation then living. When that generation passed away, the land became the property of the new generation which succeeded it. Lord Cornwallis's Government, representing the collective inhabitants of the country then living, may be presumed to have imposed such taxes on real and personal property as sufficed to defray the cost of supplying their requirements. But Lord Cornwallis's Government could not foresee the larger wants and expenditure of the present day, nor the enhanced value of property which is due to the larger expenditure, which must be provided for by more taxes. His Government could not have determined in 1793 the cost in 1870 of the army and the civil administration, and of such Imperial works as canals and railways, of the last of which it had not the most remote conception. Shall the personal property which is sunk in these developments of real property be taxed in proportion to income, and the owners of land be exempted from paying proportionately on *their* improved property towards the aggregate expenditure incurred in creating and maintaining the source of their enhanced profits?

Once more, the question—"Is the Government to break faith with the landholders of Bengal?" is best answered by the question, Is the Government to break faith with the millions who are not landlords? Shall the Government deal unjustly by the great body of the people that it may be just, so to say, to a comparatively inconsiderable section? Shall the interests of the many be sacrificed to the interests of a few? The obligation to dispense

justice between man and man is of more authority than all laws and contracts whatsoever. It is for this that Governments exist; not for an obstinate adherence to arbitrary and unlawful engagements, executed through ignorance or selfishness. The natural rights of man cannot be abrogated by legislation. The right to live and to enjoy life is of Divine origin, and therefore paramount and inalienable. The instrument under which the landlord claims an exceptional and unjust title is invalid, because it claims to strip our common humanity of a right which no man can take away.

But, fortunately for the landlords, their true interests are, in fact, identical with the interests of the whole community. It is as much the interest of the landlord to contribute his fair quota to the increasing cost of civilization, as it is his interest to lay out his money in sinking wells or building embankments, or in making any other improvements which will give him a fair return for his outlay. Without adequate funds, Government, or the community which Government represents, can no more execute expensive works or maintain an efficient administration—the effect of which is to raise the value of the landlord's property—than the landlord can raise crops or guard them without a certain outlay. Hence, to withhold his full contribution to the general expenditure is to depreciate the value of his property, and to lose his chance of making hundreds by the prudent expenditure of tens. For it is impossible that the productive industry of the rest of the community should long be content to support—as it manifestly cannot support—the extra burdens which must be put upon it to make up for the deficient tale of the class of landholders. The natural result of such a course must be a financial crisis, followed by the stoppage of productive public works, the absence of useful institutions, and an ill paid and inefficient administration.

Indeed, the natives of Bengal, notoriously and by their own admission a timid and unwarlike race, and so recently under Mussulman domination, owe more, much more, to the English Government and to European settlers than do the inhabitants of any other province in India. And if the existing chronic state of deficit, and the necessity of stopping useful public works, and of starving the administration, and irritating alike English settlers and Government servants by unequal taxation, is to continue much longer, the question is apt to be revived whether the Indian Empire is worth the cost of governing it. What the value of the fertile lands of Bengal would be to its present owners if the English were to leave India may be easily imagined. No Indian province has benefited so much by the presence of the English, and it is certain no other province would

lose so much in such a contingency. It is not for the landholders of Bengal—who have gained under British rule so much more than the landholders of the rest of British India, and who would lose so much more by the withdrawal of that rule—to demur to pay according to the increasing value of their lands, as their less favoured and less dependent brethren have to do. They, of all the people of India, have the greatest interest in the continuance of a strong government; and they, of all people, should be most forward to contribute their fair share to maintain and extend those appliances of civilization from which they have profited so much, and from which they must profit yet more, the more those appliances are extended and improved. Let them be wise in time. Of course there will be started the usual objection of the large party who would rather maintain wrong, which they call peace, than make a sacrifice to right it. "Think of the injury," they say, "to the new proprietors who have bought land at the present market rates." Let the injury be admitted, and there is at most a case for compensation, none for perpetuating the wrong. And the sooner the wrong is set right, the smaller will be the accumulated injury to be repaired and the amount of compensation which may be justly claimed, not by landholders alone, but likewise, it should be noted, by the great body of non-landholders who have been oppressed all these years by disproportionate taxation.

But from what source is the compensation to be made? If real property must be compensated out of personal property, from what source shall personal property recoup itself? For it would be too absurd to say that personal property must again be taxed to repay itself. The difficulty suggested in this question indicates all the more strongly the necessity for an early settlement of claims which only increase with time. The question of compensation, moreover, gives rise to the further question—Of whom may compensation be fairly claimed? By whose fault has one portion of the community been permitted to escape payment of its fair contribution to the general expenditure, and the other portion been saddled with the payment of more than its fair share? Neither of the parties concerned—from whom alone the necessary assets can be realized—had any part in making the inequitable law which has entailed this difficulty on the present generation; while the men who passed the law for which they are accountable are beyond reach. The stern moralist and humanitarian cannot approve the disposal of rights and interests without the consent of their owners, by strangers against whom there is no remedy or appeal. For the consequences of their own act the people may be justly held to be jointly and severally responsible. But can they rightly be made to suffer for the acts of another?

The remedy is plain. A representative constitution is the only condition which can insure the possession of equal rights and the greatest possible happiness. But the savage element of selfishness and cruelty is still too strong, and the moral sense and sympathetic feelings are still too weak, to permit the hope that might will surrender to right. There is no such mental obliquity as that which Self interposes against the perception of equal rights. There is no unwillingness like the unwillingness of the dictator to lay down his dictatorship, or admit another to a share of his authority. And many and frivolous are the excuses, and great are the powers of self-delusion and misrepresentation, with which self-constituted authority has ever sought to persuade the world that it would not be for the good of individuals or communities that they should manage their own affairs in their own way, and do with their own as may seem best in their eyes. For see you not how these self-made executors somehow contrive to apportion the common heritage of Heaven to man in such a way as to leave but a small remainder for the millions after allotment has been made among a few hundreds or thousands who think it best that they should have absolute authority over the earth and its teeming inhabitants.

Another objection remains. "If Government is to repudiate its obligations at pleasure, cancelling to-day the bond which it executed the day before, there must be an end of all faith in the promises of the Government, and there will be no certainty in commercial transactions, if they do not cease altogether."

The form in which this objection is put conceals more than one assumption and illegitimate conversion of terms; and it is incumbent on us to weigh well each word and its implied thought, if we would expose that dexterous shuffle of phrases by which hundreds are imposed upon for one who is misled by direct false reasoning.

First, there is the assumption that the repeal of a particular law, which is shown to be unjust and unwise, is the same as the constant or frequent displacement of one law by another. The implied apprehension is that one such act will be the precursor of many, and there can be no assignable limit to the continual reversal of one enactment by another if the competency of the Government to make frequent and radical changes in the laws is once admitted or allowed.

The obvious answer is that the repeal of one law does not necessitate the repeal of other laws; that the history of the legislation of a country reveals the fact that radical changes in the political constitution occur at very distant periods, while the great body of legislative enactments consists only of slight and

gradual modifications of old laws—the reflex action which corresponds to the slow development of the national character; that an intelligent and just Government is not likely to cancel its engagements except on the strongest grounds of justice and enlightened policy, seeing that the most ignorant and selfish of rulers are notoriously careful not to commit any such flagrant or frequent breaches of faith as would inevitably endanger the continuance of their rule; that whatever the danger or the sacrifice incurred in cancelling an engagement, the purchased experience will be useful in making Government most careful in regard to any future pledge it may give or obligation it may contract; and that, to conceive a Government as constantly or even frequently committing the most serious mistakes—which can be repaired only by repeated revocations, involving enormous sacrifices of money and the public credit, and attended with grave political dangers—is to conceive a Government incompetent to rule, and deserving to be superseded by a better Government.

Next, there is the transparent fallacy of regarding the public act of the people's representative—such as an equitable redistribution of the public burdens among the whole community—in the light of a private contract which an individual executes for his personal benefit, or as the repudiation by Government of a money obligation for value received, for the discharge of which the public faith has been pledged. To permit either of two contracting parties to fulfil, or not to fulfil, the terms of his contract, as he may find it his interest to do, would be an undoubted wrong to the other contracting party, and the inevitable result would be the suspension of all trade. The act of a Government, however, when it is not the act of an interested party representing interests which conflict with the interests of the nation, must be considered the act of the whole community, or of a majority consenting to the act of their representative for their collective benefit; or, more strictly, what may *seem* at the time in their then state of knowledge to be for their benefit. The Government, *per se*, is an abstract symbol, without any personal interest in what it enacts or annuls; and, considered as one body, the nation at large, in whose behalf and with whose consent any law is made or annulled, cannot have conflicting interests. An Act, such as a redistribution of the public burdens on an equitable basis, is entitled to be held an act done in good faith, and it would be a gross perversion of terms to call it a breach of faith, as though the Government were repudiating the payment of a debt. The landholder's claim to the exceptional privilege of being assessed on a portion only of the value of his property, as against the claim of the bulk of the community to

be relieved of the extra taxes on personal property, imposed on them to make up for the defective contribution of real property, has no resemblance to the repudiation of a public debt, due to the public creditor for moneys advanced to the Government on the faith of the public credit.

Then, it is to be noted especially, that the repeal of the Permanent Settlement Law would be a return to the straight line of impartial justice, not a deflection from that line. A departure from the strict line of duty, in itself wrong, is open to the further objection that each such deviation leads to further deviations. On the contrary, every return to the right path serves more nearly to establish the inclination to continue in that path. The repeal of an unlawful regulation which unjustly favours a section of a community at the expense of the nation, would be the assertion, once for all, of the right to equal justice from which it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, again to depart. The fallacy of the objection consists in not distinguishing between the tendency of a deviation from the right to repeat itself, and the closer approximation to right which is the effect of a reverse action. The lesson of history is that whereas every act of despotism unresisted is the precursor of fresh acts of despotism, the freedom, on the other hand, of the English constitution has been secured and established by successive vindications of the right from Magna Charta up to the last Reform Bill and the disestablishment of the Irish Church.

To recapitulate. The Permanent Settlement Law is an unlawful engagement and of no effect, because the representatives of the people then living gave away to certain persons, and their heirs after them for ever, that which did not belong to the people of that generation to give away for ever. The law is an unjust law, because it exempts precisely that portion of the community who have benefited most from the common fund of labour, from contributing their due quota towards the public expenditure; while it levies additional taxes from the bulk of the people—owners of personal property who have not derived from this common fund the amount of benefit which has accrued to real property. The Permanent Settlement Act is a violation of the first principle of justice and taxation, which demands that each individual of the community shall be taxed in proportion to the value of his property, in the enjoyment of which he is secured by the collective industry of the whole community. While the profits accruing to personal and real property are taxed alike, through the indirect taxes which affect their owners as consumers, and through the *income* tax on profits or income, property in land—the cost of maintaining which is distinct from the cost of protecting personal property—is further justly liable to a *pro-*

perty tax proportioned to the present value of the land, as representing the value of the accumulated labour expended in creating and maintaining it. The land tax, as distinguished from the taxation of personal property possessed alike by landholders and non-landholders, is recognised in all countries as the just contribution of a certain proportion of the gross produce, levied by the whole community, through their representatives, in return for the exclusive possession conferred on the individual landholder by the community to whom of right the land belonged in common; and the justification of a land tax is equally the justification of an enhanced rental varying with the increased value of the land. The claim of new landholders, who have bought the land at the high rates consequent on the smallness and fixity of the Government demand under the Permanent Settlement, can be no other than a claim to compensation, not a claim to the perpetuation of the public wrong done by an unjust law. The cancellation of an unjust law is the paramount duty of Government, which exists solely for the administration of equal justice; and a charge of breach of faith would properly lie against the wilful perpetuation of a public wrong, not against the annulment of an unlawful and unjust promise unwittingly made in an age of comparative ignorance. The question, Shall Government be unfaithful to its engagement with the landholders? is answered by the question, Should Government commit the greater breach of faith of unjustly levying taxes on the non-landholders who constitute the bulk of the nation, in excess of the quota for which they are fairly liable? The redistribution of the public expenditure, by their own representatives, in due proportion among the members of the community, is by no means analogous to the repudiation by an interested party of a bond for which a valuable consideration has been received. Change, to be injurious, must be a change from right to wrong, not from wrong to right; a departure from the right path, not the return to it, and an unlawful engagement which violates higher obligations, is an engagement more honoured in the breach than the observance. The objection that the violation of one pledge is likely to lead to fresh acts of violation, and to beget a want of confidence in the Government, would be applicable to the case of an interested party who may be tempted to swerve from the path of justice for the sake of a personal advantage; not to the impartial judgment of a disinterested umpire, vindicating the claims of justice, and affirming once for all the only equitable principle on which the public burdens should be adjusted for the future. Finally, a grave political error must be repaired, an enormous injustice must be removed, at any cost; and those who are but too fearful of the effect due to the violation of an unjust

pledge which should never have been given, have only to consider that the progress of civilization and good government has always lain through the successive rectification of past errors, and a closer approximation to the ideal of justice after each departure from her stern requirements.

But the Government must take the people into its confidence. Public opinion must be enlightened, and its support secured. The reasons which demand the recall of a public pledge must be set forth and clearly understood. The dumb classes, who have till now borne, without complaining so as to be heard, their hard lot of poverty and suffering—which but too many ignorantly regard as their normal and inevitable condition—must be taught their rights as well as their duties as citizens, and they must be encouraged moreover, nay invited, to represent *their* claims to equal justice, as against the self-assertion and unjust claims of the screaming classes—the upper ten thousand. The Government would then command, in the reasonable cries for equal justice to the yet unrepresented millions, the irresistible strength and moral support which may be needful for undoing the unrighteous work of the Permanent Settlement; for surely the approving voice of the nation is more than the feeble clamours of a self-seeking class.

The unprecedented succession of year upon year of drought and famine, and the yearly increasing dearness of the necessaries of life, rising at a much faster rate than wages have yet risen, is filling the country with sadness and discontent, though as yet the low mutterings of the suffering poor appear not to have reached the ears of the Council Chamber. What to *them* are railways and telegraphs, the great highways of commerce and the diffusion of education, to which our Legislators proudly point as the work of their hands? *They* only contrast their present condition with the past, when grain was cheap and they had plenty to live upon, and when they used to enjoy their native sports and pastimes, all of which are fast dying out with the decay of the princes and nobles who supported them—and nothing to replace their loss! By whose fault all this suffering has been entailed on them, and what are the causes and the remedies thereof, it is not *their* duty to find out. *Their* part is but to obey and suffer; and how great their sufferings are they would say if they had an organ through which to say it. And who would listen to them if they had aught to say in this matter, and they said it? For are they not accounted an ignorant people who cannot think and act for themselves, and so other people must think and act for them? *And it is so good of them to do it too.* Nor is it any use for the Government to say it cannot. For the people might well reply, why then have our rulers undertaken to do what they

cannot do, and why are they paid for doing work which they do not do?

And now the most hateful of all forms of taxation—an income tax—is imposed on the country, to aggravate the general irritation and discontent. "This is a new thing" (*zulm*) "the people are wont to say: we never paid such tax before. If the Rajah demanded certain sums of money, he took it from certain individuals whom he believed able to afford it. He did not levy a certain income tax on all, and it was not assessed anew from year to year. He did not send assessors all over the country to estimate the income of each individual, and we were not required to produce our books."

An income tax without a representative assembly is an anomaly. If you *will* put your hands into a man's pocket, he will want to know the reason why. Before the natives of British India can be expected to respond to a call for more money in the shape of a direct contribution, they must know what has been done with all the money you had before, and what you mean to do with the ordinary collections of the empire in the future. The balance-sheet of the empire must be laid before them, or their trusted representatives, not in its present English form, which they are unable to understand; but in a form and in a language and character which shall be perfectly clear and intelligible to them. What do the people of India yet know of the financial condition of the empire, or of the crisis to which you appeal in justification of the tax? They know nothing of your receipts and expenditure—how much is received or spent, and in what ways it is spent, legitimate or illegitimate. Can you justify to them the heavy cost of the Abyssinian war as a charge upon India, or the addition of fifty lacs a year to the pension of the Mysore Family? the Home charge of seven millions a year, or the wasteful expenditure of the Public Works Department, with its high estimates and bad work which has to be pulled down and done over again? As they have not the means of learning, or the inducement to learn, what is the actual revenue of the empire, their imagination, naturally enough, supplies the absence of facts, and the imaginary total far outstrips the actual. On the other hand, as they see and hear of a part only of the whole expenditure, they naturally take the part for the whole, and they will not believe that the cost of governing India is anything like so large as it is represented to be. It is very difficult, therefore, for the native population to believe, and in fact they do not believe, that there is not a very large balance of profit which goes somewhere, or that there can be any necessity for exacting a direct contribution from them.

Finally, as all good is only relative, no law is good absolutely.

To be a good law, it must be good in relation to the present condition and requirements of the people. Unless the law is adapted to those conditions, it is a bad law, however good the law may be relatively to other conditions. How then is the particular adaptability in this instance to be predicated, and how is a full and accurate knowledge of the conditions to be acquired, unless you go to the fountain head and hear, out of their own mouths, what the people or their trusted representatives have to say for themselves? The heads of the people must be taken into consultation. Without this you do but legislate in the dark, and vainly plume yourselves upon measures which, in your conceit, you designate as calculated to effect immense good; but which the people, if you gave them the opportunity, would satisfactorily prove to you, were working for themselves and for the country incalculable harm.

Art. III.—The Nationality Question in Austria.

1. *Österreich und die Bürgschaften seines Bestandes* (*Austria, and the Guarantees of its Stability*). By Dr. Adolph Fischoff. Second Edition. Vienna. 1870.
2. *Revue des Deux Mondes. 1er Août,* 1868. *Article, "L'Allemagne depuis la Guerre de* 1866." Par M. Emile de Lavelaye.

A QUARTER of a century ago, the most observant traveller in Bohemia and Moravia would not have remarked in those countries signs of enmity of race. Yet they are inhabited by two very distinct branches of the human family—the Teutonic and the Slavonic. According to the latest statistical researches,* there are now in Bohemia 3,200,000 Czechs, and 2,000,000 Germans; and in Moravia, 1,480,000 Czechs, and 530,000 Germans. At the time alluded to, the populations of those countries were somewhat less than at present, but the relative proportions of the nationalities much the same. Any difference in the latter respect is now to the advantage of the Czechs. Then, as now,

* "Die Völkerstämme der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Monarchie." Nach Adolf Ficker. Vienna, 1869.

their language prevailed in all the central and eastern parts of Bohemia; was spoken by the peasant proprietors, and lower classes generally. A traveller, at the date we have mentioned, would likewise have heard the Czech language extensively spoken in the capital of the country, as it was only the aristocracy, upper, and a portion of the middle classes, who used the German tongue. Many of these understood Czech sufficiently for purposes of intercourse with servants and workpeople; and it was the fashion with members of the aristocracy to have their children taught Czech grammatically. It was likewise a common custom in Bohemia, at the time we are speaking of, for Germans of the middle class to send their children to pass a year or more in Czech districts, and, *vice versâ*, for Czech parents to place their children in German parts of the country, that in early life knowledge of both languages should be acquired. It was customary, too, for all inhabitants of the kingdom, without reference to their nationality in an ethnological sense, to call themselves Bohemians. Germans and Czechs appeared to be alike imbued with patriotic feelings—to be equally proud of the history, the geographical and other physical advantages of their common country. Its distinctive arms and colours, and everything connected with the ancient crown of St. Wenzelaus, seemed to be generally held in honour.

We may here mention that similar feelings of patriotism prevailed in other Crown lands of Austria. Austrian subjects invariably called themselves after the countries of their birth. Loyalty and regard for the Imperial House and Crown may have largely prevailed, especially in aristocratic and bureaucratic circles; but Austrian patriotism in a broad and general sense did not seem to exist. So far indeed was Austria from being regarded as a unified State, that the ordnance map of the empire was at that time entitled "Karte der österreichischen Staaten" (map of the Austrian States).

Although the two nationalities in Bohemia appeared to live together on terms of equality and in perfect harmony, yet an intelligent foreigner, on becoming well acquainted with the country, and looking beneath the surface of society, would have found many proofs that injury had been done to the Czech nationality by the tyranny of Austrian rulers, especially by their Germanizing policy, which had left a sting in the heart of the people. The Germanizing efforts of Joseph II. were particularly held in hateful remembrance. But whatever oppression in long past or recent times the Czechs had experienced at the hands of rulers of the German House of Hapsburg, it did not seem to be associated, in their minds, with feelings of enmity towards the Austro-German people. In Bohemia, as in other Crown lands

with mixed populations, all who thought at all on political questions—whatever their nationality, however strong their love of their mother-tongue—were animated by one prominent feeling; had one bond of sympathy, namely, detestation of absolutism and bureaucratic rule. To these above all other causes the people generally attributed their burdens and whatever forms of misery they had to endure. No doubt the Austro-Germans, under the absolutist system, had many advantages. It was easier for them to obtain Government employment, and to profit by such educational establishments as the empire afforded. In the gymnasia of Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, &c., as likewise in the University of Prague, only those Czechs who had mastered the German language could pursue a regular course of study, and make their way in life. Minds of the highest class amongst them may not have felt this a grievance, nor could objection be taken to the use of German as the official language of the Central Government. But that German was forced upon the inhabitants of purely Czech districts generally, undoubtedly impeded their education and progress. No axiom more true than that nothing takes place absolutely on a sudden. In human affairs, as in the physical world, all convulsions or disturbances on the surface have long been inwardly preparing.

Already, in 1835, enlightened Bohemians not of Slavonic origin—amongst whom Count Leo Thun deserves favourable mention—had taken up the cause of their Czech compatriots, and demanded for them improved and extended means of education, through the medium of their vernacular tongue. We can but allude, likewise, to the learned men of Slavonic descent—Kollar, Palacky, Safarik, Gaj, Hanka, &c.—who, long before 1848, had devoted their energies to the revival and further development of Slavonic literature. They had greatly contributed in calling forth enthusiasm for their nationality in the Southern and Western Slavs of Europe, especially inspiring the young with hopes of a grand future for the Slavonic race. When therefore, in 1848, in consequence of the French Revolution, the people of Central Europe appeared, as it were, to be suddenly awakened from a trance, to be seized with ardent desire to cast off such trammels of absolutism and feudalism as still impeded their welfare and progress, the claims of the nationalities in Austria, as logically belonging to those democratic principles of liberty and equality which everywhere found expression, came prominently to the front. "Equal rights of nationalities" soon became one of the popular mottos of the day. The Germans, in their reaction against the small-state system which so long had prevailed amongst them, and in their aspirations after unity and central power, paid no regard to the sentiments and require-

ments of the Slavonic populations with whom they were more or less intimately connected. It seemed to be expected of the latter, as a matter of course, that they should sympathize in German dreams of establishing a vast centralized empire, extending from the Baltic to the Adriatic. That a fourth part or more of the eighty million souls this great German realm, it was hoped, would comprise, were of Slavonic origin, was held of little account. But this large demand of German hegemony—to use the current phrase of the day—so emphatically pronounced in Frankfort and other German cities, and echoed in Vienna, soon called forth great opposition from the Slavonic populations of Austria, especially from the more advanced of them, the Czechs, who, as we have shown, in Bohemia and Moravia numerically preponderate over the Germans. The dread of being absorbed by Germany, and forcibly denationalized, gave birth to many wild schemes for preservation. But the Panslavistic idea, as a counterpoise to Pan-Germanism, vaguely expressed at the Slavonic Congress held at Prague in the spring of 1848, cannot be said to have had any influence at that time, nor indeed subsequently, on the policy of the leading Czech politicians. Even German historians of the future will, it is to be hoped, do justice to Palacky, the eminent historian of Bohemia, and acknowledge the patriotism and sound political views expressed by him in that memorable year. We allude to his reply to the committee of notables assembled in Frankfort to deliberate on the affairs of Germany, and their invitation to him to take part in a German Parliament. "Had not an Austrian realm existed already," he said, "in the interest of Europe—in the interest of different nationalities requiring a common bond of union and focus of power on the Danube—it would have been necessary that a State like Austria should have been called into existence." A properly-constituted Austrian realm, Palacky then and subsequently has asserted, should acknowledge the historical rights of each Crown-land, grant local self-government in all non-imperial affairs, and allow of progress in civilization according to the requirements and aptitudes—the individualities, in fact, of each nationality. Only on this basis of equity, he further declared, could the political union of all be permanently accomplished. Despite the soundness of these principles, and the warm wishes expressed by Palacky for the success of the German patriots in achieving union and liberty for their country, yet, in consequence of his refusal to proceed to Frankfort in 1848, and of his continued advocacy of an Austrian policy such as described, unbounded has been the abuse showered upon him by German writers at that time and to the present day.

The antagonism of the nationalities in Bohemia, as well as

in other Austrian countries, first came conspicuously to the surface, as stated, in 1848. In that and the following year it was utilized for dynastic and Imperial purposes against Austro-German and Hungarian revolutionists, on the old Hapsburg principle, *divide et impera.* On the failure of the Frankfort Parliament, the collapse of the "Great Germany" bubble, and after the dismissal of the Austrian (Kremsier) Parliament, and the bloody end of the Hungarian revolution, military, police, and clerical rule again became established more stringently than ever throughout the whole of Austria. Again the national parties, sympathizing in discontent, ceased to show animosity towards each other. But the Imperial disasters in Italy in 1859, which gave the death-blow to absolutism, introduced an era of experimental constitutionalism which soon fanned the conflict of the nationalities into full flame. More than ever has the antagonism of aims prevailed in Bohemia and Moravia since the year 1857, in consequence of the dual system in Austria then introduced, and the persistent refusal of the Czechs to forego the historical rights of their country and assist in forming a unified Cis-Leithan State.

Unfortunately, the Liberalism of the German centralists has its dark side. Not only have liberal legislation and radical reforms been their aim, but German supremacy likewise. To this end, the historical rights of the Bohemian Kingdom, the requirements of the Slavonic nationalities in general, have been ignored, and the complicated *octroyé* electoral laws of Schmerling upheld ("the group-system," "representation of interests," and indirect elections in country districts*), whereby the Germans—the least numerous of the Cis-Leithan people—have had secured to them a monopoly of power.

To this long-standing cause of dissatisfaction on the part of the Czechs has been added in the last three years a most severe persecution of their press. Scarcely a newspaper editor has escaped imprisonment, loss of "caution-money," and extraordinary fines. Nor have moral causes of discontent been wanting. The German centralists and the Viennese press have ceaselessly heaped abuse and insults on the leading Czech politicians, and indeed upon the whole Czech nation. The alarm-cries of "injury to German interests," of "danger from Czech pretensions and aggression," of "Panslavistic aims," and such like bugbears, have been reiterated until a sore has been produced in the susceptible German mind. The late Cabinet has much to answer for in fostering prejudices for party aims,

* For an *exposé* of the electoral system in Austria see *Westminster Review*, April, 1883, article "Austrian Constitutionalism."

and in causing in the Germans of Bohemia unprecedented bitterness of feeling towards their Czech compatriots. The late Minister of Justice, Dr. Herbst, has done much to promote disharmony. "Hussars and artillery," he has openly said, "are the best instruments for keeping the Bohemians in order." And even since the advent to power of Count Potocki and other men who approve the policy of conciliation, a Viennese organ of the late ministry has called "the hangman the best medium of compromise."

The foregoing indication of wrongs inflicted on the Czechs of Bohemia and Moravia by Austro-German statesmen and politicians since the year 1848, will suffice to show how it has arrived that the nationality question in those countries has assumed a very different complexion to what it wore a quarter of a century ago. Happily, however, a reaction is apparent amongst Austro-Germans in Bohemia, as well as of the capitals of Upper Austria and Styria. Many enlightened and dispassionate Germans have, from the commencement of the constitutional era, been far from sympathizing with "the Viennese clique." In the admirable brochure by Dr. Fischoff, mentioned in our heading, a federal union of the principal Austrian Crown-lands is advocated, together with equal liberty for all the nationalities. He does not confine himself to theoretical arguments, but, appealing to history, and citing the examples of the Swiss and North American constitutions, he enters fully into the question of decentralization and self-government, and shows the advantages possessed by States organized on those principles as regards stability and power. A "national State," like France, he points out, may be strictly centralized, at the cost of being peculiarly liable to revolutions. But a "nationalities' State," like Austria, strictly centralized, must ever require great military and bureaucratic force, yet be intrinsically weak, and in danger from outward aggression. The term "nationalities' State," applied to Austria, requires some explanation. The Czech ideal of Austria is not that it should be a congeries of nationalities, each with its own peculiar laws and liberties. Stript of misapprehensions and of the wilful exaggerations of the Germans, all that the Czechs demand is the acknowledgment of the historical rights of the Bohemian Kingdom, and a franchise for representation in their Diets, as equitable to their nationality, as to the Germans.

With respect to the Slavonic population of Austria, our author says: "Their backwardness in culture, for the most part, is not their fault. The conqueror forced upon them not only his laws, but his language, in the schools and the administration; and these attempts to force on them an alien tongue have had a worse effect on their intellectual and moral character than political

oppression. Foreign rule forced upon a people humiliates it, but a foreign language forced upon it, demoralizes. Much that is blamed in the character of the Slavs, and considered to be national faults, must be set down to the oppression they have had to endure."

The backwardness in culture of the Slavonic nationalities of Austria, alluded to above, requires great qualification in regard to the Czechs. They are a highly intelligent and many-ways gifted people, as their history, their past and present literary activity, sufficiently attests. A few historical data concerning the language of the Czechs—so intimately associated with their strong sentiment of nationality and their future prospects, will not be out of place.

Neither the fearful persecution of the Bohemians by Ferdinand II. of Austria, nor the long and destructive raids of his Jesuits against their literature ; nor, again, the Germanizing efforts of successive Austrian rulers, have caused the Czechs to discontinue the use of their Slavonic dialect. The Hussite religion was effectually stamped out in Bohemia, and the population of the country reduced in a few years by more than the half ; but the language of such portion as remained in the country has asserted its vitality, and has in some degree always been acknowledged by Austrian rulers. Previously to the battle of the White Mountain (1620) it was the sole language of the government as well as of the Bohemian people. Subsequently to that event, German immigrants were invited into the country, and those of the higher class (many of them Ferdinand's creatures) who obtained the confiscated estates of Czech patriots, began by degrees to speak German in the Bohemian Diet—particularly was this apparent towards the end of the seventeenth century. In 1702, the transactions of the Diet were for the first time printed in the German language; but, until 1848, such official acts as royal speeches at the opening and closing of the Diets, the imperial rescripts concerning supplies, &c., were always first read in the Bohemian language, and then in a German translation. Before the (abdicated) Emperor Ferdinand was crowned King of Bohemia (1836), he was first addressed by the Estates in Bohemian, and the oath of allegiance was taken in that language. Only the few members of the Estates unable to repeat the Czech words gave their oath in German.

Although the Czech language has always received official acknowledgment, yet discontent has frequently been expressed with the Germanizing policy of successive administrations, with the neglect of the language in schools, &c. In 1793, thirty-three "original Bohemians"—so patriotic members of the old families then called themselves—presented to the Diet of that

year an earnest protest against the Germanizing doings of the government, with an allusion to "the happy times when the Monarch and Estates of the country used only the Bohemian language." In the period of reaction following upon the popular risings of 1848, the Austrian Government again displayed strong animosity against the Czechs and their language: not one political newspaper in it was allowed. In 1859, the leading patriots, Palacky at their head, appealed directly to the Emperor, petitioning him graciously to concede one political Czech newspaper, and pointing out the manifold loss to the empire from denying a numerous nationality the means of education. Despite the press-prosecutions alluded to above, the ten years that have elapsed since Solferino have witnessed an extraordinary development of the Czech periodical literature, as the contrast last year to the state of things in 1859 will show.

Last year there issued from the press of Bohemia and Moravia no less than twenty-two political newspapers in the Czech language; four of these were published in provincial towns, two-thirds of the whole being dailies. Furthermore, there were published in the same tongue three illustrated weekly papers, seven journals and reviews on educational subjects, five on scientific subjects, one on Pomology, one on Chemistry, one medical gazette, one on Jurisprudence,—a theatrical, a musical, and a students' journal; likewise, two journals on Agriculture, two on "Industrial," two on commercial subjects,—a Natural History Review, two ladies' papers (journals of fashions, &c.), and lastly, twelve theological journals—seven of them Catholic and five Protestant—bringing the Czech periodical publications to a total of seventy-one. We may further mention, as not devoid of interest, that four newspapers in the Czech language were published last year in the United States of America.

Viewed in the light of the above facts, the ignorance (especially of the principles of human nature), the stupidity, or perversity of an Austro-German bureaucratic mind is prominently displayed. In 1860, about a year after Solferino, the chief of the police in Prague, by name Päumann, informed the government that he required but six years to annihilate the Czech literature, the Czech language, and consequently, to put an end to the Czech nationality. That a high functionary should have dreamt of stamping out a vigorous national life, at a time when no one in Austria possessed of political insight doubted that absolutism was fast crumbling into dust, shows, on the one hand, the intoxicating results of bureaucratic power uncontrolled by public opinion; and, on the other hand, throws some light on the oppression the Czechs must have experienced in the reaction-period preceding Solferino. Equally absurd as the measures deemed sufficient for checking

the spirit of liberty, have been the prognostications of members of the governing class, and of Austro-German politicians in general—of ruin to the empire if the course of events should be other than they in their wisdom approved. Before 1859 it was constantly declared in the tone of apodeictic certainty, that the loss of the Italian provinces must be ruin to the empire. A like result, it was asserted, must follow concessions to the Hungarians of their historical rights, which, moreover, they were said to have forfeited by their revolution. Much amusement was caused last New-year's day in Vienna when one of the German Tyrolean members of the Reichsrath (before he and his party withdrew) read extracts from speeches of leading centralist politicians made before 1867, several of them by members of the then Cabinet, in which prophecies in the above gloomy sense were energetically expressed. Equally groundless, we believe, as the prophecies just alluded to, are those now current amongst the Viennese centralists, that concessions to the Czechs must cause the break-up of the Austrian realm.

In the petition of the Bohemian patriots to the Emperor in 1859, it is said that 7,000,000 of the Austrian people speak the Czech language. This number includes not only the Czechs of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia, but also 1,790,000 in Hungary (Slovacks), and 30,000 in other Crown lands. Having tried to ascertain as nearly as possible how many Czechs are acquainted with the German language, we have been informed by men well qualified to make a sound computation on this head, that 300,000 are sufficiently masters of German to be able to use that tongue for all purposes of life. The majority of these are town residents, and have acquired their knowledge of German in schools. It is now only the children of German settlers in Czech country districts, who from their infancy learn to speak both languages of the kingdom. The Czechs of Bohemia and Moravia, who can speak a little German for the very commonest purposes of intercourse, are not included in the above estimate. That the lower classes of Czechs generally cannot speak German at all, we know by extensive experience.

The Czech press, as thus shown, appeals to a considerable public, and its circulation is extensive. Late statistical data show that 97 per cent. of the children in Bohemia attend schools, and in the primary schools of Czech districts that language is used. The Czech press likewise circulates to some extent in the Slavonic lands of Austria and Hungary generally. It is usual with the well-educated classes in them to cultivate a knowledge of all Slavonic dialects. These dialects, as spoken by the common people in the Austro-Hungarian lands, and, indeed, in Servia, Bulgaria, &c., display a much greater resemblance than the

written dialects do. Whenever a native of any one Slavonic country meets a native of any other, but little difficulty is experienced in understanding one another. This applies, too, to the Russian language. Poles and Czechs, in especial, have great facility in understanding Russians. When in 1698 Peter the Great passed through Prague, on his way from Saxony to Vienna, a banquet was given him in that city by territorial and civic magnates. On this occasion he expressed the pleasure he derived from being able to converse with his hosts through the medium of their respective Slavonic dialects.* At that time Prague was entirely a Czech town, such Germans as then resided in it were looked upon as strangers. Not only were numerous Czechs of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia engaged by Peter the Great to enter into his service on account of the ease with which they were understood in Russia, and their facility in mastering the Russian language, but from his time to the present day Czechs have constantly been invited to that country. Latterly this has more than ever been the case. To enable them to read Russian books, educated Czechs require only to learn the Cyrillic alphabet; and they can translate them readily into their own dialect with the occasional use of a pocket dictionary. As yet the Slavonic race of Europe, though the most numerous, has no common literary language; but circumstances may lead to there being such in course of time. The impulse which of late years has been given to Bohemian literature, according to the law of reaction from oppression, has a moral deserving to be pondered by those Germans to whom the rapid spread of their language and culture, eastwards and southwards, is an object of almost fanatical desire.

An Austrian statesman has lately expressed the opinion that it will be far easier to promote an understanding between the Austro-Germans of the Duchies and the Czechs than between them and the Bohemian Germans. There may be some ground for this opinion, inasmuch as some of the ultra-German centralists, including, as already mentioned, members of the late Cabinet, are Bohemians by birth, and have done their utmost to promote disharmony. To "teach the Germans to hate" has been an avowed principle of action. But the fall of these *doctrinaire*

* The incident respecting Peter the Great at Prague, as related above, has been impugned by the *Pall Mall Gazette* of 28th February last. There is, however, documentary evidence in Prague of its correctness. The *Pall Mall* at the same time hazarded assertions concerning the Czech language and its spread, and further declared "that Polish, Bohemian, or any other Slavonic dialect is absolutely unintelligible to Russians, and *vice versâ*"—herein displaying complete ignorance of facts. The statements in our text are based upon extensive and accurate information.

and "thorough" politicians has already done much good. The Czech press generally now earnestly advocates conciliation. A "brotherly hand" is held out by the Czechs to their German landsmen; and the hope is expressed that ere long all the peoples of Austria will put aside the prejudices of blood, and come to an amicable understanding. As another indication of favourable change in the direction of harmony, we mention a late publication in Mlabá Boleslava (Jung' Bunzlau), one of the centres of Czech national life, of a pamphlet in the Czech language, in answer to the manifesto—if so it may be called—of the Russian General Fadiejeff. His specious arguments for alluring the Austro-Slavs to look to Russia as the sole saviour of their nationalities—as the only great power that will allow the realization of their federalist aspirations—are thoroughly exposed. The author of the pamphlet emphatically denies the existence of Panslavistic tendencies in Bohemia or Moravia; and he points to Poland, and foretells a like fate for Galicia, should the Poles or Ruthenes of that country lend a willing ear to Russian enticements. Although, as the author of the Czech pamphlet says, Panslavistic aims undoubtedly have no existence in Bohemia, nevertheless the words reported by Mr. de Laveleye to have been spoken to him at Agram, in 1866, by pilgrims just returned from the Ethnological Exhibition at Moscow, reflect in all probability the sentiments of Austro-Hungarian Slavs in general. Alluding to the oppression their country has experienced at the hands of the Magyars, these leading Croat politicians said:—

"We hope that Austria will protect us. To preserve the unity of the empire we have shed our blood in torrents. To-day—after having cut the empire in two—we are delivered over to the mercy of those same Hungarians whom we have formerly been called upon to strangle. We are accused of being partisans of Russia. Understand us well. We by no means desire to be subjected to the Russian *régime*. We desire to participate in modern liberties, and we believe our country sufficiently advanced to use them wisely. We admire the patriotism of the Hungarians, their eloquence, their bravery; we follow with interest the efforts they make to develop their literature, their industry, their liberal institutions. We are ready always to tender them a brotherly hand; nevertheless, if they again attempt to rob us of our nationality, they must have a care. We are a small nation, but we belong to a great race. Rather than be deprived of our language, of our proper character—that is to say, of that which is our genius, our blood, our life—we would cast ourselves into the arms of Russia. This is the truth, for political liberty may be conquered, but a nationality once dead never can be resuscitated."

Against the justice of the Czech cause, as against that of the Croats, no theoretical arguments can be advanced. As to

whether it is a practicable one or not, a divergence of opinion still prevails. Our aim has been to give data for sound judgments. In every case, the break-down of the ultra-centralists, the conciliatory policy of Count Potocki, and the amnesty of the Czech press offenders, have already borne good fruits.

There are politicians, we are aware, especially in Vienna, who advance the theory that in international relationships no considerations of benevolence or equity should mitigate the rigour of the law of tho "struggle for existence." The weaker nationalities, it is said, are destined to be absorbed by the stronger, and if not willing to accept a higher culture and superior language, they must be coerced. Yet the sentiment of nationality, attachment to the language of forefathers, form everywhere starting-points for education and progress. Should it be possible for nations—like individuals of the highest stamp—to become cosmopolitan in their views, it cannot otherwise obtain than by a long and slow course of moral and intellectual development. The German politicians of the school alluded to are far from that stand-point. That any nation in its dealings with another should consciously uphold the Darwinian theory, can neither be said to harmonize with the spirit of our age, nor can the admirers of the *jus fortiori* principle appeal to history for results in proof only of its efficacy.

Since the foregoing was written, the policy of conciliation professedly inaugurated by Count Potocki, has not made important progress as regards Bohemia. By his declining to acknowledge the historical rights of that country, and to dissolve the Diet, the Czechs have become more dissatisfied than ever. The other sixteen Diets of Cis-Leithania have been dissolved, and new elections ordered. The present Bohemian Diet was elected under extraordinary government pressure and illegal circumstances, whereby the German centralist party gained a majority. The eighty-three Czech patriots, who notwithstanding were elected, withdrew from the Diet in 1868, after presenting a "Declaration" of their rights and requirements.* They feel it therefore as a particular insult that the Bohemian Diet should not be dissolved like the Diets of the other Crown lands, and the Czech nationality have again an opportunity of expressing its sentiments. Thus, unhappily, is the nationality question in Bohemia still very far from an amicable solution.

---

* See *Westminster Review*, article "Dualism in Austria."

Art. IV.—The Future of the British Empire.

"TO be, or not to be?" That is the question which, in a wider sense than Hamlet's, this great nation is now putting to itself concerning its own imperial existence. Shall the British Empire continue to be a term applicable to a world-wide system of territories and States, or shall it apply merely to a small insular portion of the European continent? Shall the "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland" describe literally, and in fact, the limits of the Queen's rule? Shall that colonial empire which has been built up by means of so much individual sacrifice and toil, and which represents a sphere of political influence and national life, larger than has fallen to the lot of any other people, perish beneath dismemberment? Shall England abdicate her function as the mother of colonies, and force her sons, when necessity sends them from her shores, to find homes and citizenship in alien States? These are questions which surely are as well worth considering now as many other topics of more popular interest, but of far less gravity and significance.

Vast as our Colonial Empire is, it is by no means easy to describe the mode of its acquisition—England has colonized with no set political purpose—on no settled principle of action. Her colonies have spread and multiplied under the mere chance pressure of events. Like Topsy they have grown to their present proportions without any consciousness of the process on the part of their imperial possessor. It cannot be said that in more than one or two instances this country has planted her flag on distant shores with distinct ideas of territorial aggrandizement, or even with any systematic intentions of colonization. The British provinces of the now United States presented perhaps the most perfect examples of colonies designedly formed by the State. Canada, the Cape Colony, Natal, Mauritius, and India, are the most conspicuous cases of possessions acquired by conquest, more with the view of humiliating a European foe and asserting national supremacy, than with any material regard to their value as homes for British people and fields for British enterprise. The great Australian colonies may be considered to be self-grown. It is very improbable that the authorities who selected New South Wales as a convenient place for a convict settlement contemplated a time when a populous and civilized community should be formed there. British colonization has with scarcely an appreciable exception been the work of private enterprise—the result of individual impulse on the part of outgoing British citizens. All that the State has done has been to assert its

authority whenever a community came to need the exercise of governmental functions. According to the feeling so prevalent in many quarters, even this amount of interference would be grudged now. No one will deny that the possession of seaports and the control of coastlines were considered very much more important matters twenty and thirty years ago, and earlier, than they are held at present. The Fiji Islands in the Pacific Ocean afford a case in point. English settlers reside there, and the natives are anxious—or understood to be so—for British rule, but the Home authorities have recently declined to bring them under the Queen's sway. Fifty years ago annexation would have taken place almost as a matter of course.

In one sense, therefore, the responsibility of this country in connexion with her colonies is less than it would be had they been born and reared under the fostering care of State interference. Had England, when taking possession of Australia and South Africa, publicly proclaimed her intention of establishing these communities of her expatriated citizens, and had she carried forward emigration as a national undertaking, it would scarcely be possible for her even to consider the possibility of their abandonment, or to withdraw from them her protection, unless with their express concurrence. But as it is her obligations are binding enough. Writers and speakers in dealing with this question seem often to lose sight of its moral aspects. Do moral rules apply to nations as well as to individuals? If so, then is a nation justified, after accepting and exercising rule over a country throughout a lengthened period, in proposing to abdicate that power when its possession becomes irksome, or seems likely to entail unforeseen responsibilities? The recognition of British rule has in all our colonies led men to settle and form homes there, to invest their industry and their capital, to expend their efforts and make all their arrangements on the understanding that they and their sons lost no rights of British citizenship by migration to the other, but still English governed lands. Nor does the fact of self-government having been given to these communities seem to us to diminish the moral force of the obligations thus created. When these free constitutions were granted nothing was said of their being the foreshadowing of complete separation. They were given as much to suit the convenience of home statesmen as to meet the view of the colonists, and we very much doubt whether the latter would have cared to accept a boon fraught with such perilous and distasteful consequences.

But before we proceed to consider the main question at issue let us glance as swiftly as we can, with due regard for the comprehension of facts, at the growth and the present position of

our colonial possessions. Their manner of growth has been about as unregulated and inharmonious as their mode of acquisition. Spontaneous emigration has peopled them all. In Canada easy facilities for acquiring land have drawn people there. In Australia gold has been the chief magnet. Where these agencies have not been at work colonization — as at the Cape — has advanced but slowly. In India, for we cannot but regard that conquered country as a colony, material growth in all that makes modern states prosperous has been a recent development. Even there — the grandest field for systematic action by a civilizing state that any empire possessed—private enterprise has been the chief operant. Railway construction, tea and cotton culture, and mining industry, all owe their being and their progress to private effort, rather than to Imperial statesmanship.

In spite, however, of this absence of national action the rate of growth has been almost incredible. Few people, we believe, who have not studied the subject, have a fair idea of what our colonial empire has become in a commercial and material sense, and what it contributes to the sum total of our national greatness. When it is remembered how few families there are throughout the United Kingdom unrepresented by some member or connexion in one or other of the colonies, the extent of this ignorance concerning colonial matters is somewhat strange. It is due, however, partly to the distance from home of these scattered countries, partly to habitual disregard of such topics, and partly to the want of trustworthy information on the subject in a compact and accessible form. School books, as a rule, supply every needful particular respecting the pettiest European state, but they are singularly reticent about the affairs of territories occupied by British citizens and subjects of incomparably greater size and importance.

It might be interesting as a matter of comparison to look at the condition of the colonial empire twenty-five years ago, and see thereby how entirely its expansion is a development of our own times. Fifty years ago such a review would have been practically confined to Canada and the East and West Indies. Now it takes in Australia and New Zealand, South Africa, North West America, and several detached settlements, such as Mauritius and other outposts of the sea. Mr. Hyde Clarke said at the Society of Arts, during the discussion on a paper from which we shall have to quote, that "whether we regarded the population, the extent of area, or the amount of wealth, the empire of England stood second to none in the world. As regarded population, it came only after China; as to area, only after Russia." A yet more perfect conception of the empire will perhaps be

obtained from a passage of the paper itself, where the writer says:—

"We have seen that the colonial empire of Great Britain now embraces an area of 4,562,000 square miles (exclusive of the Hudson's Bay territory), considerably more than the area of Europe. We have seen that this immense range of territory is peopled by 160 millions of men, representing every shade of colour and all extremes of civilization and of barbarism. We have seen that the combined trade of these regions has, in the space of sixteen years, increased fourfold, that is, from 65,000,000*l.* in 1850 to 280,000,000*l.* in 1866. We have seen that, at the beginning of that period, the aggregate of the colonial imports was 33,000,000*l.*, and of exports, 31,000,000*l.*, and that at the end of it these figures had become 137,000,000*l.* and 143,000,000*l.* respectively. But what to my countrymen will be a yet more interesting result, is the fact that the consumption by the colonies of British manufactures has kept pace with the rest of their trade, the imports from the United Kingdom having been, in 1850, 18,000,000*l.*, and in 1866, 61,000,000*l.* The exports from the colonies to the mother country have increased in a yet greater ratio. In 1850 they corresponded with the imports, being 18,000,000*l.*; in 1866 they were 74,000,000*l.* In sixteen years, therefore, the trade of the United Kingdom with her colonies advanced from 37,000,000*l.* to 135,000,000*l.* If we exclude India from the estimate, we find that what may be strictly regarded as the colonial trade of Great Britain, the simple result of Anglo-Saxon colonization during the last twenty-five years —the fruits of the efforts and enterprise of Anglo-Saxon colonists in Australia, Canada, South Africa, and the Indian islands—has advanced from 34,000,000*l.*, in 1850, to 157,000,000*l.*, in 1866."

No other age or country can show figures like these. They represent marvels which surpass the excesses of ancient fable, and achievements which are not rivalled by any passage of the world's history. Fully to realize their significance we must follow the writer a little further, when he says:

"The tables of exports we have so rapidly glanced at are, in themselves, revelations of industrial progress. They tell of mining enterprise deep in the bowels of the earth, employing hundreds of thousands of hands, representing millions of capital expended in labour and machinery, and producing results which seem almost fabulous; of ploughs set to work in remote bush-lands of Australia, upon distant uplands in Africa, amongst the far pine-forests of the Canadas; of flocks and herds spreading over the new pastures of unpeopled lands; of homesteads springing up in regions where barbarism has brooded, and where nature alone has reigned; of multiplying mills, outbranching railways, and thickening traffic in and through countries which but yesterday were untrodden solitudes. To colonists, these figures tell also a further tale, of privations endured, of sacrifices undergone, of disappointments borne—a tale of struggle with stubborn difficulties; of battle with ignorance, inexperience, and novelty; of

contention with nature's baffling forces encountered under new conditions. I suppose that in no colony has any one export been established without a measure of failure and loss on the part of its first promoters, such as can only be understood by persons who have passed through such an ordeal. In the early years of all new settlements agriculture is entirely experimental, and industry is often fruitless. Before a body of colonists can feel confident of what the country of their choice is capable, and how its resources can be most profitably developed, they have to pass through a wearisome probation of trial and of failure. The process is slow and tentative; its results are only attained by constant toil and unabated perseverance."

But in trying to comprehend the extent and conditions of our colonial empire we must look to individual statistics as well as to general results. Let us begin with India, the noblest dependency, perhaps, which any nation has preserved, a land where a vast population, an unfathomable antiquity, and an enormous area, combine with great productive powers and rich natural resources, to constitute one of the most splendid empires that the world has seen. In 1850, just twenty years ago, the import trade of the peninsula amounted to 13,000,000*l.* sterling; in 1866 it had grown to 56,000,000*l.* During the same period the exports increased from 18,000,000*l.* to 68,000,000*l.*, and the value of British manufactured goods consumed by the Indian population from 7,500,000*l.* to 25,000,000*l.* The same country affords us an illustration of the fallacy of the argument that as the colonies advance they become worse customers of the home country In sixteen years the consumption of imported cotton piece-goods advanced from 3,500,000*l.* to nearly 12,000,000*l.* sterling. This progress in productive and consuming capacity is due in the main to the operations of British enterprise attracted to India by the presence of the Queen's Government; and the security imparted by British rule. It is scarcely possible to compare India past with India present, so different is the picture. The most prominent features of commercial activity and intercourse were then unknown. Railways that have absorbed 100,000,000*l.* of British capital; telegraphs; cotton, coffee, opium and tea plantations; education diffused, industry stimulated and encouraged, native prejudices weakened or broken down, are all the outcome of two decades of British rule.

Australia, twenty years ago was, so to speak, nowhere. The entire export trade of that vast antipodean group of territories in 1850 reached little more than 4,500,000*l.* Sixteen years later the aggregate was 31,000,000*l.* The import trade advanced from, say five to thirty-five millions; the two together representing respectively, 10,000,000*l.* in 1850, and 66,000,000*l.* in 1866. It suggests accurate ideas concerning the extreme youth of our

colonial system in many of its parts, to remember that before 1850, New Zealand, Victoria, and Queensland had scarcely a recognised existence of any kind; the last-named colony having in point of fact been part of New South Wales, up to 1860. 30,500,000*l.* of the trade we have specified, or nearly half, was done by the Australians with the United Kingdom. Their territories stretch over an area of 2,582,070 square miles, and their population, almost wholly of European descent, numbers already 1,662,063.

England's great southern empire is in a material sense as independent of the world as the United States are. It is fraught with resources sufficient to meet all the requirements of modern life. Every variety of foodstuff is produced in plenty by one or other of its territories. Its breweries, distilleries, and vineyards yield all the beverages known to civilization. Queensland grows cotton, New Zealand flax, Victoria silk, and the whole country wool. Coal exists in abundance. Copper and other metals are profitably mined. Australian forests yield magnificent timber; while the rocks, the soil, and the shore are endowed with all the precious stones and metals known to man. Valuable as such a country must be as a market for the disposal of British commodities, it is even of yet higher value as the source of so many materials and substances required for European use, or for employment as staples in British manufactories.

In Africa the results achieved by British colonization are more territorial and political than commercial. In 1850 the import trade of our settlements there amounted only to 1,792,790*l.*; in 1861 the aggregate was 3,631,080*l.* Exports advanced from 1,702,261*l.* in 1850 to 3,254,093*l.* in 1866. These figures of course look small by the vaster realizations of other and wealthier colonies, but it is to be remarked that the influence of the English name and government is supreme in that country almost up to the Zambesi, and that the effects of that influence upon the destiny of a country so thickly peopled by muscular barbarians must be visible hereafter in the history of the world. In South Africa alone we find the natives of that continent rendering voluntarily their own free labour, on their own soil, to the white settlers around them. Nowhere else do we find so happily exemplified the peaceful civilization of the savage. There may be room upon the vast pasture lands and richer coast lands of that country for a host of English settlers, but Africa is chiefly interesting just now on account of the relations we see existing there betwixt the white and the black races.

In her West Indian settlements this country possesses some of earth's fairest gems. Counting the colonies in the mainland there were in 1867 eighteen distinct governments under the

British flag in the Spanish main—as that retired section of the Atlantic continues to be called. Lately certain judicious changes have led to the amalgamation of some of the more tiny administrations, and to the consequent reduction of several oppressive establishments. It is the custom to regard these colonies as suffering from chronic decline :—

"It is satisfactory," says the foregoing writer, "to find that, in spite of all their drawbacks, and the lack of that energizing influence which the labours of European colonists confer, the producing powers of the West Indian settlements have, in the aggregate, made considerable advances. In 1850, the sum total of their exports was 4,194,000*l.*; in 1866 it was 7,359,000*l.*"

Canada, at once the oldest and the nearest of England's colonies, is the best fitted to assume independence, should circumstances make that step desirable. The distribution and progress of trade amongst the six divisions of this transatlantic empire, have been summed up thus :—

"Canada proper, in 1850, could speak of barely 3,500,000*l.* worth of imports, but, in 1866, she absorbed 11,000,000*l.*, her wants having trebled in that period. New Brunswick advanced from 815,000*l.* to 2,000,000*l.*; Nova Scotia, from 1,000,000*l.* to nearly 3,000,000*l.*; Prince Edward Island, from 123,000*l.* to 444,000*l.*; and Newfoundland, from 867,000*l.* to 1,200,000*l.* British Columbia appears for the first time in the returns for 1860, when that colony took 282,000*l.* worth of imports. During the following year that amount was doubled; but in 1866, the year's total was 298,000*l.* The neighbouring settlement of Vancouver's Island, in 1861, did an import trade worth 416,000*l.*; here also, there was a rapid rise and a subsequent decline, the imports for 1866 being 594,000*l.* Turning to the exports of these vast territories, we find that Canada during the sixteen years advanced from 2,500,000*l.* to more than 11,500,000*l.*, her producing capabilities having kept pace and in line with her consuming powers. New Brunswick passed on from 658,000*l.* to 1,333,000*l.* Nova Scotia sent abroad 1,500,000*l.* instead of 671,000*l.* Prince Edward Island, starting with 60,000*l.*, in 1866, reached a limit of 246,000*l.* Newfoundland made less progress than her sister colonies, the increase being only from 975,000*l.* to 1,186,000*l.* British Columbian exports for 1860 were 11,000*l.*, and for 1866, 43,983*l.*; those from Vancouver were, in 1863, 39,000*l.*; and in 1866, 120,000*l.* In both these cases, however, gold is excluded, a rather important omission, seeing that, in 1860, the shipment of gold from British Columbia was estimated at 600,000*l.*, and that from Vancouver, in 1865, at 426,000*l.*"

To British America has now to be added the Hudson's Bay territory, a vast tract of country almost wholly unpopulated, but yet well fitted for the abode of industrious and hardy men. Without, however, reckoning that late accession, the Queen still

holds rule in North America over an area of 632,000 square miles, and a European population of 4,000,000, which is four times larger than it was in 1850. This community carries on a foreign trade of 32,000,000*l.*, which, we are told, is threefold what it was sixteen years ago. A colony which is also in debt to European fundholders to the tune of 15,000,000*l.*, has at any rate a claim upon the respect of the mother country—herself so large a public debtor.

To people these lands, to occupy these wildernesses, to create this trade, to produce these staples, our countrymen have gone forth year by year, carrying with them strong English energies, moved by a spirit of English enterprise, and firm in the belief that they were bearing to their new homes all the rights and guarantees of English citizenship. Men do not lightly change their nationality. Of what force would be the time-honoured sentiment of patriotism if men could so freely cast aside the citizenship they are born unto, as would be the case did British colonists not carry with them the conviction that they were but moving from one part of the empire to another. The Scotch are among the most frequent colonizers, but no countryman is so tenacious of his nationality as the Scot. It is not affirming too much to say that the success of British colonization has been largely due to the fact that it *is* British. Why should people go to distant, savage, or obscure lands, instead of to America, unless they were loth to lose their citizenship as Englishmen? It is this natural instinct which has led so many of our migrating fellow subjects to choose rather the alternative of having to battle with life's hard conditions under all the strange circumstances of a new land, than part with what they have been accustomed to consider their birthright.

England has thus without any set plan or purpose gained for herself an empire more varied and world-wide than any previously acquired by any other power. Rome conquered and colonized systematically, and sent her armies forth with the avowed object of spreading her dominion. But even her possessions, vast and splendid as they were, could not compare in their influence on the world at large with those of this country. The command of South Africa, Australasia, and the Falkland Islands, with Mauritius and St. Helena, makes England practically the mistress of the southern seas. India secures her dominance in Southern and Eastern Asia. Almost the whole of North America belongs to men sprung from her loins and speaking her tongue, and secures Anglo-Saxon supremacy on both the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. Nor has the impress of British rule been confined merely to the proofs of British dominion. The countries subdued have taken an entirely

British character, in society, in industry, in institutions, and in domestic order. England's colonies have not merely been Anglicized by the presence of her military and the sway of her proconsuls. They have been formed and made English by her own sons and daughters. England's relation towards all her colonies, except India, is not that which she held towards the Ionian Islands, or which Rome held towards ancient Britain. In these cases the only claim which the ruling power had upon the population under it, was the claim of might. When the Eagles quitted the shores of Albion, and the Union Jack was hauled down at Corfu, no wrong was done the inhabitants. They ceased to be Roman or English subjects, but they remained as much as ever English and Ionian. Were England to withdraw herself from Canada, South Africa, and Australia, the colonists of these countries—in other words the inhabitants —who were born British subjects like their fathers before them, would find themselves abruptly denationalized, and left to build up for themselves a new name and an alien citizenship. Roman citizens did not emigrate *en masse* to Britain, nor did English colonists settle largely in Corfu. Had either done so there would have been some analogy between their case and that of the British-born men who are now threatened with the doom of Imperial abandonment.

There is neither extravagance nor impropriety in realizing for a moment the splendour of the empire which thus has come, unsought and self-created, into the grasp of England. It does, as the working-men of this country lately declared, constitute "a national inheritance," to which history presents no parallel. It contains corn lands vast enough to feed mankind through ages that are yet remote. Its stores of coal, gold, and iron, no man dare estimate. It embraces varieties of race so numerous and so great that no shade of colour is wanting, nor is any type of man absent from the motley ranks of the Queen's subjects. It prevails on the shores of every ocean, and covers these seas with the richest commerce of the world. It holds out to every struggling citizen at home, worn down by want, or pressed hard by the hot forces of competition, the chance of a wider sphere for his energies and a bettered position for his offspring, in lands that are still under the British flag. It has had a penetrating though imperceptible influence in every department of Anglo-Saxon life, and during the last thirty years the society, trade, and enterprise of the United Kingdom have been modified by its conditions and expanded by its wants.

Why should an empire so fraught with elements of glory to our nation suffer dismemberment? In plain words, why should the colonies be given up? Two pleas only can be assigned.

Tho first is that the retention of these colonies adds to the military and naval expenditure of the mother country. The second is that they involve her in irksome and undue national responsibilities.

In considering this question we have to do with the present, not the past. It is idle to inquire what the colonial military expenditure of Great Britain has been; we have only to take it as it is. Owing to the defectiveness of statistical information in this country it is no easy matter to ascertain, exactly, what is the naval and military expenditure incurred by the Imperial Government on account of colonies. As regards the first we believe it would be impossible to set down any exact figures, but it is enough for our purpose to take the military expenditure. Were we to accept implicitly what we read and what we hear, we should conclude that a large proportion of the cost of the army was imposed upon this country by her colonies. When so many people still believe that England bears the cost of governing her dependencies, and pays the salaries of their governors, it is not strange that a yet larger number should imagine the expense of defending those countries to be much larger than it is. As a fair specimen of the way in which usually well-informed journals speak of this question, and unintentionally mislead their readers concerning it, let us quote the following passage from the leading article of a moderate and influential weekly:—"It is certainly not required by equity—nor in our judgment by sound policy—that the British workman should be mulcted of a portion of his hard earnings, in order that the much more prosperous and hopeful colonist should escape the pecuniary pressure which adverse circumstances may chance to throw upon him."

These words are but an echo of innumerable others that from time to time are uttered through the pages of newspapers and pamphlets. They hint darkly but directly enough at an oppressive expenditure borne mostly by suffering workmen at home for the sake and benefit of flourishing colonists abroad. They embody the sum of the whole argument of those who maintain that the colonies cost more than they are worth. Nothing can in point of fact be more fallacious than this reasoning. The British workman is no more mulcted of his earnings than any other class. The expenditure falls upon the general revenue, and as such is a burden borne by all classes of the community. The workman is mulcted no more than the great absentee proprietor, investor in colonial stocks, or shipper of goods to colonial clients, who while they benefit largely by the openings for profitable investment afforded by the colonies, do not directly contribute to the cost of the Government of those ter-

ritories. The tables might with great justice be turned, and the thousands of persons in this country who make money out of colonies asked, whether it is equitable that they should benefit so largely by the existence of those colonies, and yet take so little part in the maintenance of their institutions. But so far as the "British workman," is concerned the best and most decisive answer to these objections is found in the now celebrated "petition of the unemployed," where the working men of England declare that they look upon the colonies as a great national inheritance, where they or their children may find opportunities of advancement from which they are rigorously excluded here. And this is in truth the case. The bulk of the settlers in the colonies have sprung from the "workmen" class, and there is yet scope for the formation of countless homes under conditions utterly unattainable by the same class in the Old World.

Upon another point much misconception prevails. Colonists are popularly spoken of as though they were, each and all, men of ease and wealth, and therefore better able to bear taxation than their fellow citizens in England. In the first place they are much more heavily taxed than are the people of this country. The average rate of taxation borne by the people of the United Kingdom is, say 2*l.* 5*s.* per head. Throughout the colonies the average is from 4*l.* to 5*l.* per head. And in the second place it is a mistake to suppose that their position in a tax-bearing point of view is so superior to that of the average of their home countrymen. This is what a colonist says upon this subject:—

"It may seem that the progress of trade, as set forth by figures, indicates unbounded prosperity, and an ease of production which entails inappreciable effort. If such an impression be conveyed, it is a false one. The prosperity of the colonies is by no means exceptional, nor are colonists, as a rule, wealthy people. Their produce, though abundant, is not always remunerative, and is often only marketable at rates which leave but a slight margin of profit to the producer. Labour, in many cases, is not only exceedingly scarce, but unduly dear. Transport is always an oppressive charge. Colonies are mostly lands of magnificent distances and of indifferent roads, and, even where railways are established, there are usually special taxes required which have to be reckoned against profits. In some countries there are risks of loss from fire, drought, flood, or other special causes, for which provision and allowance have to be made. The rapid increase in production has a direct tendency to reduce prices, although there may be no corresponding reduction in the expenses of production. Out of the 143,000,000*l.* worth of raw materials exported to other countries from the colonies, I believe it to be more than probable that foreign dealers and manufacturers make a far

larger proportion of gain than do the actual producers. It must not, therefore, be assumed that, because the trade of the colonies has exhibited such rapid expansion, and now has attained to such vast amounts, the colonists themselves are, as individuals, proportionately opulent or inordinately prosperous. That many of them have made and are making fortunes, is probably the case, as it is with persons in other parts of the world; but as to colonists in general, the advantage of their condition rests rather in greater independence than in superior wealth."

Let us come to figures, however. What is this vast expenditure, the weight of which is enough to overbear all considerations of national greatness and imperial dominion? According to the statement made by Mr. Cardwell in introducing the Army Estimates last year, the entire amount spent for military service in colonies and dependencies in 1868 was 2,237,816*l*. From this, however, has to be deducted the cost of garrisoning Malta, Bermuda, Halifax, China, and Gibraltar; and excluding those stations from the calculation, the amount estimated for military expenditure in all the other colonies during 1869 was 1,070,735*l*. One million sterling may be roughly set down as the cost of maintaining the Queen's supremacy and land defences in the Colonies of North America, the West Indies, South Africa, and Australasia.

This question of military defence, in its practical bearings, affects only two groups of colonies. Passing by Canada, whose circumstances are altogether exceptional, there is urgent need for military aid only in South Africa and New Zealand. There alone are in existence elements of danger which local resources may be unable to meet. In the other colonies a well-organized local police, which the colonists could easily afford to sustain, would probably suffice for every protective requirement. But in the two other cases, the presence of a warlike aboriginal population renders the visible sustainment of the Queen's authority by the Queen's troops desirable for the preservation of peace and order. We are not now going to enter upon the well-worn New Zealand question, nor do we challenge controversy by saying whether, in our judgment, the colonists are responsible or not for the troubles that have arisen. We merely take the positive assurance of those best able to pronounce an opinion on the subject, that the presence of a certain number of the Queen's troops is an indispensable condition of peaceful rule. In South Africa, where responsible government has never existed, and native affairs have been managed by the Queen's nominees, there can be no question as to the obligation of the Home Government to maintain a garrison there. The same remark applies to the West Coast Settlements.

Her colonial empire, therefore, costs England 1,000,000*l.* per annum, or about 9*d.* yearly per head of the population of the United Kingdom. This, then, is the point at issue—this is the actual and positive financial interest which this country has at stake in the matter. The fact cannot be too plainly stated, or too generally understood. But let us ask whether, were the amount ten times what it is, the Crown would not be bound to support itself by garrisons of its own troops, if need be, in all parts of the Empire? For we presume the colonies are parts of the Empire as much as is Ireland or the Isle of Wight. The mere fact of distance surely cannot weaken the claim of any one part of the Empire to equal consideration and equal protection with the rest. Let us suppose that Ireland were a thousand miles, instead of sixty miles, distant from England, would the Government of Great Britain therefore feel less bound to guard it from invasion, or to do justice to its suffering people? Does not the very idea of empire imply the obligation incumbent upon the ruling power to protect its possessions from encroachment—the capacity to hold its own at every point of its dominions? In all ages of the world, and under Roman supremacy more particularly, the defence of distant extremities has been esteemed of equal importance in the maintenance of empire, with the protection of centres. England's present policy is just the reverse of this rule. Outlying members are left helpless to take care of themselves, and the resources of the Empire are concentrated upon the parent-islands.

When we come to analyse yet more severely the distribution of the military forces of Great Britain, the fallacy and the unfairness of the statements and arguments used by anti-colonial philosophers become surprisingly transparent. We have already given the broad cost of military expenditure in the colonies, and have excluded from the calculation the garrisons at Malta, Bermuda, Gibraltar, Halifax, and China. These stations are all necessary to a nation which claims still to be the leading maritime power—whose merchant shipping still dominates the sea, and whose commerce continues to be the largest, richest, and most flourishing in the world. The possession of such fortified and garrisoned ports of call and bases of action in all seas is obviously essential to the security of such a trade. Where would the shipping trade of England be, in the event of war with a naval power, had she not safe havens of her own at Gibraltar, Malta, Bermuda, Halifax, the West Indies, Ascension, St. Helena, Sierra Leone, Cape Coast Castle, Simons Bay, Cape Town, Mauritius, Aden, Singapore, Ceylon, Hong Kong, the Falkland Islands, and the Australasian harbours? This list is a long one, but it only gives a partial idea, after all, of the vast girdle of insular and

coast settlements by means of which, it is not saying too much to affirm, the trade of Great Britain is what it is. Had the United States, during its civil war, possessed like England harbours and naval stations in every sea and on every shore, it would have been out of the power of an *Alabama* to drive her shipping from the seas, and ruin her trade for almost a generation.

These stations, however, are not colonies in the strict sense of the term, and we do not include them in our calculation. There is one way of arriving at a tolerably accurate estimate of imperial expenditure accessible by everybody—we mean by reference to the list of places where the Queen's regiments are stationed. If our readers will consult the latest army list, they will find that in South Africa, New Zealand, and Australia—the colonies chiefly in question—there are not at this moment six regiments stationed. These regiments, therefore, with a small accompaniment of men from the Artillery and Engineers' Corps, constitute all the garrisons in colonies that are properly so called, Canada being excepted for special reasons. When from these we make further allowance for the garrisons which, under any circumstances, the Home Government would probably be desirous to maintain at Cape Town and Mauritius, we shall find that the actual cost of military service for the colonies is much less than the amount nominally set down in Mr. Cardwell's estimate.

There is in reality substantial need of military aid in New Zealand, South Africa, and the West Coast settlements only. In all these settlements, we believe that the presence of a certain number of the Queen's troops is indispensable, not so much for the active use they might be as for the influence their presence exerts. To quote the words of a colonial writer :—

"We lately pointed out that the Imperial Government was, so far as Natal was concerned, under a legal and expressed obligation to maintain a force here, so long as the colony was unable to defend itself. That period has not yet arrived. The colony has yet neither means nor organization. We are but 17,000 Europeans amongst nearly a million barbarians, over whom, happily for us, the British Government has acquired a moral influence and prestige, which for the time are better than the largest army. But that influence and prestige are sustained by the belief deeply implanted in the native mind, that they could be enforced if need be by the exercise of illimitable resources. On more than one occasion the natives have seen starting, as it were, from the sea, in an incredibly short period, large and well-armed forces of trained troops. They look upon the small garrison stationed here as the symbol of vaster forces out of sight. They know that the great English Sovereign lives not in Africa, but in a far distant country, where, surrounded by countless hosts, she holds rule over world-wide realms.

"If the troops be withdrawn from South Africa, as they are being so ruthlessly from New Zealand, all this prestige must perish, and its repressive effects will disappear with it. In the eyes of the natives, the Queen will have abandoned us, and British rule will, in fact, cease to be. It cannot be otherwise, and we beg most distinctly to bring the alternative before the notice of all concerned. Does England wish to withdraw from South Africa as she has withdrawn from New Zealand? Does she wish all the blood and treasure she has spent in asserting her supremacy in these territories, and in bringing the natives under submission to her higher civilization, to go for naught? Does she wish to leave other and rival powers free to take her place on this southern seaboard?"

Still, although the military requirements of South Africa and New Zealand are so exceptional and urgent, they do not, so far as we can see, necessitate any departure from the principle we have sought to lay down. If Great Britain is bound to defend one of her colonies, she is bound to defend all; if she abandons one on the plea of military expenditure, she must, as a logical necessity, abandon the rest. The empire cannot be dismembered piecemeal. If the vast and glorious structure, raised through so many ages by so much toil and sacrifice, is to fall to pieces, the collapse will be sudden and complete rather than partial and gradual.

One of the chief counts in the indictment against colonies is that their commercial legislation is hostile to the interests of the mother-country. We are told that their tariffs are protective and designedly injurious to home manufactures. It is true that some colonies, for the purpose of encouraging native industry, do impose high rates of duty on articles that are capable of local production, and so far as they do so for that purpose we are unable to approve their policy, although we admit the colonists are so circumstanced as to be very strongly tempted to adopt it. Their high tariffs may, however, be defended on other grounds by reasons, the force of which, we believe, will be generally recognised. Colonies stand in peculiar need of railways and all manner of public works. The taxable population is scanty and poor, and taxable commodities are extremely rare. How is revenue to be obtained to pay for these works and to sustain the colonial government, except a customs department be created? Customs dues are universally admitted to be one of the fairest, easiest, and most equal forms of taxation; and it should be borne in mind that the fruits of the tariff do not come directly out of the pockets of people at home: the evils incident to a high tariff are mainly endured by the colonists themselves, while the mother-country derives a certain though indefinite benefit from the results of its expenditure in the maintenance of law and order,

the construction of public works, and the payment of interest on loans obtained from home investors.

We must confess too, that if the colonists liked to retort, they could do so with greater reason than their assailants, by a reference to the different sugar duties—a far more unjust fiscal system than anything attempted in any colony. In scarcely any instance is an export duty imposed upon the raw material sent home in such abundance to supply the mills and factories, where so many millions of England's toilers find employment, and so many thousands of Engand's citizens find wealth. What if Australia, India, the West Indies, and South Africa were to be left free to follow in the footsteps of the United States—to impose prohibitive duties on imported commodities, or by similar fiscal charges to crush the export of raw staples? Suppose that the import of wool from Australia, of cotton from India, of raw sugar from the Mauritius and the West Indies, ceased, what would become of the spinning, weaving, and refining interests of Great Britain? It is quite a mistake to imagine that the United Kingdom would do as much trade with the colonies, were they separated, as it does now. Most of the oldest mercantile houses in these colonies are the fruit of British enterprise, and would never have been established had the British ensign not waved over the lands in which their operations are carried on. We are pointed to America; we are shown how capital and population flow in from these shores into that country, notwithstanding the independence of its Government and the rivalship of its flag. But it must not be forgotten that the United States are nothing more than the extreme outcome of our colonial system; that their enterprise, and progress, and capital, and power spring from Anglo-Saxon energy, and are shaped on the Anglo-Saxon model, and that, had it not been for the colonizing and aggressive instincts of Anglo-Saxon emigrants, that great source of wealth and activity to this country would have had no compact existence. Nor can we refrain from repeating the oft told truism, that were America still within the arms of the empire, England would be free from her darkest menace, and her trade delivered from the keenest rivalry. Have the representatives of our shipping and manufacturing interests ever seriously considered what their position, and the position of this whole country would be, were the colonial possessions of Great Britain in the hands of independent or alien powers at war with us? In such a case the boasted commerce of Great Britain—the only thing, according to some amongst us, worth considering or maintaining—would stand in greater danger than it did after the Trent affair, and be liable to even more terrible disasters than were inflicted by one Confederate privateer upon the commerce of the United States.

The colonies are worth keeping on account of the trade we do with them and they with us. This trade year by year increases in an advancing ratio. In 1851 India and the colonies consumed twenty millions' worth of British goods, or one-fourth of our whole exports. In 1866 this amount had increased threefold, and out of an export return of 188,000,000*l*., 61,000,000*l*. went to our dependencies. We are told that in 1858 the colonies did as much business with us as the United States, France, Germany, Turkey, and Belgium united. Nor is the growth in our importations from the colonies less remarkable. In 1851, out of 142,000,000*l*. imported in the shape of produce and merchandize, 20,000,000*l*. were colonial shipments. In 1866 this country's importations were estimated at 295,000,000*l*., of which 74,000,000*l*. came from the colonies. In the course of fifteen years, therefore, the proportion of our colonial imports to the whole has moved on from one-seventh to one-fourth. Upon this point the following remarks may be quoted:—

"But even of greater consequence in a national point of view than her export business is the import trade of the kingdom. The commodities she gets from her colonies are mostly raw materials, which give employment, in so many countless forms, to the labouring millions of her population and the vast capital of her manufacturers. British colonization benefits the mother-country in two ways; it opens out new fields for the energy and industry of her sons, for the enterprise and wealth of her capitalists; but it also, by the extended production of raw staples, which that energy and that capital stimulate, quickens the industry of her toilers, and gives fresh and continuous vitality to her own manufacturing interests. How many hands are employed, how much capital and machinery is engaged in converting into marketable commodities the cotton, wool, flax, jute, sugar, timber, hides, spices, and other staples sent to the ports of the United Kingdom from her colonial possessions. These materials are the life-blood of British commerce, and are pouring in year by year in a gradually dilating stream. In 1851 the total imports of Great Britain amounted to 142,000,000*l*., of which only 20,000,000*l*. came from her colonies. In 1866 this country's importations were estimated at 295,000,000*l*., and of this amount 74,000,000*l*. were colonial shipments. In fifteen years, therefore, England's importations from her colonies, as compared with the aggregate of her imports, have advanced from one-seventh to one-fourth. England, therefore, benefits commercially by her colonies thus:—They give, in the first place, fresh and wider fields for the reproductive outlay of her superfluous industry and capital. They open out boundless sources, whence the manufacturing and industrial needs of the mother-country may be supplied with these raw materials, without which her commercial system would be paralysed; they keep at work those endless manufactures upon which so many millions depend for their subsistence; they increase the production of marketable commodities, and thereby give additional vitality and vigour to trade; they give employment yearly to British shipping (vessels, that

is, belonging solely to owners in this country), which represent a tonnage of more than 20,000,000, that being, in round numbers, the aggregate tonnage for 1866 of British vessels entered and cleared at colonial ports; and then they themselves become, in their turn, customers of the mother-country for the manufactured products, whose raw materials they supplied to the extent of more than a third of her whole export trade."

It is said that the colonies would do as much trade with us as they do now were they free. This, too, is a fallacy not warranted by the experience of the world. Were this the case, the island of Mauritius after its capture, and the Cape Colony after its conquest, ought still to have traded chiefly with their parent states—France and Holland. The fact is, that their commercial connexions with those countries are very partial when compared with the trade they do with the United Kingdom. Look at the growing tendency of American trade to confine itself to American limits and to cultivate continental markets. Now that European manufacturers are running our own manufacturers so close, and in many cases turning out articles of equal quality at lower rates, it is worth considering whether, on economical grounds, it is well to alienate communities whose chief market both for purchase and sale is Britain, and who in the nature of things will retain that preference for this country so long as they share its citizenship and boast the protection of its flag.

Then there is the very numerous class of investors to whom colonial securities and colonial bonds offer more remunerative investments than they can obtain here. Four years ago no less a sum than 145,000,000*l.* sterling represented the funded debt of India and the colonies. By this time very probably the aggregate has reached 200,000,000*l.*, all of which has been advanced by bondholders in this country, and upon which interest varying from five to six per cent. is regularly paid. As every colony with advancing age goes deeper into debt for the purpose of providing itself with necessary public works, this aggregate is likely to increase year by year. So long as the colonies remain British dependencies the security for these bonds is excellent, especially as, in most cases, provision is made in the shape of a sinking fund for the extinguishment of the debt. In addition to these governmental loans many millions more are invested by persons and institutions at home in colonial mortgages and other private securities; in colonial banks and other financial institutions; in mining and other industrial enterprises. Would the confidence which these investors have in colonial securities and investments exist were the colonies forced to become small and petty republics, the scenes of party warfare and political anarchy, for the prey of some rapacious and unscrupulous foreign power? If

American bonds are unpopular in the monetary circles of England, what position would be held by those of States struggling prematurely with the responsibilities of self-government, possessed as yet of no fixed and settled principles of political action, in point of population and revenue less influential than one of the United States, and driven perhaps by stress of circumstances, unsought by them, to repudiate their obligations and to destroy their credit? It is without question the fact that our colonies are under the British flag that leads the people and investors of this country to make such large use of colonial securities. The colonies are the outlet for the savings of the British people.

Having thus as briefly as we could glanced at the leading aspects of this question, let us categorically and concisely set forth the probable consequences of the abandonment by Great Britain of her colonies. They may be stated thus:—

Curtailment of trade, and subsequent loss of employment for the toilers of the nation.

Diminution of supplies of raw staples for manufacture.

Shutting up of safe securities for the profitable investment of superfluous wealth and redundant capital.

Loss of suitable fields for outgoing enterprise and languishing industry.

Diminution of the population of the Empire, seeing that in every outgoing emigrant a subject of the Crown and a citizen of the State would be lost.

Deprivation of ports of refuge in case of war. Now all the world may be said to be open to British cruisers. Without her colonies England might find her ships shelterless on the high seas.

Loss of national prestige. England is now respected by other nations because her ships sweep every sea; because her flag floats over free communities in every zone; because under her flag men of all nationalities and colours enjoy equal rights and share a common citizenship; because her race and language, more than any other, pervade the world.

Loss of nationality by all outgoing English people. Men compelled to emigrate by the pressure of circumstances, the want of employment, or the lack of opportunity in this overcrowded island, if they wish to exercise any rights of citizenship must become aliens and foreigners.

Loss of territories where the army can by frequent change and constant exercise be kept well fitted for active service, and inured to the hardships and vicissitudes of actual warfare. In the words of a most competent authority, Sir George Grey:—"That man would be a bold one who would say that it was not this training

which enabled them [*i.e.*, British troops] to discharge their duties in a manner which they could not have done if they had been simply trained in garrison towns at home. Our troops were distributed throughout the world in such a manner as to enable a force to be at once collected at any threatened point."

Loss of openings where the youth of England can find ample scope for their business aptitudes, social aspirations, or political ambition.

The sacrifice of lands which the "unemployed" have styled the "national inheritance," by the help of which they and others like them may help to better their condition.

Transference of what now constitutes the strength and the glory of this country to independent or rival powers. Should America, Prussia, or any other rising power take a helpless but abandoned colony under its protection, England's loss will be the other nation's gain.

The narrowing and debasement of national aspirations; the recognition of a low standard of patriotism; the measuring of State duties by a money-test; the sacrifice of national honour and good faith to a false and fatal economy.

And finally, as regards the colonies themselves, the imposition on them of distasteful and burdensome responsibilities; the infliction on them of confused and anarchic conditions; the withdrawal of that supreme controlling power by which their political destinies are shaped and influenced; the exposure of some of them to bloody outbreaks and servile disturbances; and the implanting amongst them of embittered and hostile feelings towards the land of their fathers.

Surely this is an array of evils dire enough to deter any reasonable government from a policy which might entail such a heritage of disaster. Nor do we think that when once the statesmen and people of this country come fairly to look upon the question in all its aspects, and to comprehend more clearly its practical issues, they will fail any longer to see that it will be far, far better to reconstruct and consolidate than to dismember and disown the empire which is the outcome of so many sacrifices and the theme of so much laudation.

How then can these evils be averted? What escape is there from the consequences of the present policy? We believe that it will be the earnest desire of every man who has fully considered the matter that there shall be given to these questions an answer befitting the national dignity and consistent with the integrity of the Empire. Home writers are wrong in imagining that the present agitation is merely metropolitan in its extent. It reflects a movement throughout the whole of our colonial dominions. Speaking from an acquaintance with the whole

colonial press, we are in a position to say that in Canada as well as in Australia, in South Africa as well as in England, the local journals give ample evidence that the question is being discussed with an earnestness which shows how vital are deemed its issues. We find in these discussions very few indications of a desire on the part of the colonists to claim or to acquire their independence. There is no more striking feature of our colonial system than the loyalty with which the colonists cling to their allegiance and this citizenship. Doubtless the consciousness of non-interference with their affairs by the home government contributes much to their fidelity. There it is, however, a strong, real, hearty, and healthy sentiment, in strange contrast with the cold, unsympathetic, unregardful tone, assumed by certain spokesmen of the mother country.

The colonists generally seem agreed that if all Imperial protection is to be withdrawn from their shores under the present state of things, independence must follow as a logical and a practical necessity. But they also seem to think that a middle course might be followed. Why should the supreme responsible control of colonial affairs, they ask, continue to be vested in a minister whose knowledge and experience have not specially fitted him for their administration? Why should not the relations of the central government and its dependencies be so modified that with increased responsibilities towards each other, a closer connexion, a more complete interdependence should be established. The idea of a federal union between the colonies and the mother-country is a very popular one, and opinions only differ as to how such an arrangement can be brought about. Two plans are proposed. One has a wider and loftier scope and purpose than the other, and takes the form of a Council of Empire in which the United Kingdom, India, and the colonies should be represented in proportion to their area and population. With this body would rest the issues of peace or war, and the levying of taxes for the maintenance of imperial defences. The other plan is that a Colonial Council should be created, composed of representatives sent by the different colonies, and that this body, presided over by the Secretary of State for the time being, should be invested with control over such subjects as the appointment of governors and other officers who may have to be nominated at home; the regulation of tariffs; the conduct of emigration; and the appropriation of unoccupied waste lands. Such a council would be an extension of the India Board, only it must necessarily, in order that it shall possess the confidence of the colonists, partake of a representative character. Canada would have to send five members, one for each of her principal divisions; Australia, five; New Zealand, two; the West Indies, four;

Cape Colony, Natal, West Coast, Ceylon, Mauritius, and the Eastern Islands, one each. The Secretary and Under Secretary of State would represent home interests in this assembly. The duties of the Council would of necessity be largely executive; and in dealing with measures relating to particular colonies, the minister would be materially and chiefly guided by the advice of the representative of that particular dependency, while, in all general questions and administrative acts, he would act in concert with the whole body.

Were such a council in existence, it is more than probable that the colonies would gladly consent to pay a certain contribution, to be fixed by such a body, towards the naval and military expenditure of the Empire. New Zealand and South Africa, as we have pointed out, are the only colonies where it is necessary to maintain a standing garrison of any consequence. But in regard to naval expenditure, all the colonies have an equal interest in it. It is through that branch of outlay alone that they could expect to be protected from invasion or attack should England be at war with a naval power. It is but just that a reasonable contribution towards the national outlay in this service should be made. The combined revenues of the colonies amount now to about 20,000,000*l.* sterling; a charge of 5 per cent. on that, the most equitable way of assessing the contribution, would yield 1,000,000*l.*, or about the present gross amount of military expenditure in our self-governed dependencies. A like charge on the Indian revenue, which in 1866 was about 50,000,000*l.*, would yield 2,500,000*l.*, making a very just and generous contribution towards the maintenance of our navy. The colonies, we believe, would not object to such a charge. Were they independent they would have to keep up some kind of naval defences at probably a much higher cost; and the presence of their representatives at headquarters would be an assurance that their wants would be intelligently understood, and practically attended to. Under the present system the geography of our colonies is so imperfectly understood at the War Office that stations in different colonies, separated by hundreds of miles of savage country, are sometimes referred to, and dealt with, as being in one and the same locality.

We do not put forward these suggestions as being absolutely the only plan that might be proposed, or as being the best mode of meeting the difficulty. It is probable that when the constructive genius of our statesmen is brought to bear upon this truly Imperial question, a better system may be devised. Our only object is to show that it is possible to establish such a union as of late has often been hinted at, but never specifically described. The same suggestions are being made, the same

framework of a central government proposed, in the colonies themselves. Before an idea can be condemned as impracticable, it must be definitely stated, and if there are insuperable difficulties in the way of the scheme, let us hear them. We must frankly confess that as yet we have heard none.

This plan more especially commends itself, because under it Great Britain could afford to grant to her colonies the utmost powers of internal self-government, while the colonies could afford, if need be, to sacrifice in certain matters a certain portion of their right to act independently. It admits of honourable concession on both sides. It would be the policy and the interest equally of the mother-country and the colonies to keep on good terms with each other. The home taxpayer could no longer reproach the colonist with being a burden; the colonist could no longer charge the home government with the ignorant exercise of power. It would be then no less than now the true policy of England to accustom her dependencies to the exercise of responsibility in the management of their own affairs, and to free herself from all accountability for interference in any of their domestic concerns. But it would also be far less the interest and object of England to force upon young and incapable States the weighty responsibilities of self-government, and to turn adrift into the turbid waters of Republicanism infant communities with imperfect social organizations and inadequate political vigour.

If England is unable, as Rome did, to send her legions forth for the protection of all quarters of the Empire, she can at any rate help her citizens in those distant districts to defend themselves. Under an efficient and practical colonial administration at home, much that is now impracticable might be done in this direction. Military settlements of discharged soldiers might be formed in particular districts. The right to form one in such settlements might be held out to the army as a reward for good service. A plan based upon this principle was submitted last year to the Society of Arts by Colonel Maude, V.C., and there can be little doubt that it presents an admirably feasible mode of providing for the defensive needs of the colonies, and of promoting the efficiency of the army. Trained instructors might be sent out for the improvement of colonial forces; these forces might be affiliated with the home troops, and Imperial rank assigned to them; Imperial guns and munitions of war might be supplied on favourable terms, and every effort made to make service in colonial corps attractive and honourable. After all, the doing these things is but the ordinary duty of an Imperial and a paternal Government. If our colonies are to become in all but name independent, it ought to be both our pride and pleasure to

fit them to hold their own against the world, and to make them worthy offshoots of the parent-tree.

The action of a Colonial Council would not only compass all these matters, but it would also tend to have an expanding and invigorating influence upon the political condition of this nation. It would help us to keep pace with the age—this wonderful age, so marked by the rapidity of improvement; so stirred by the stirrings of social and political development. To the popular mind it may seem a ridiculous idea that thirty or forty colonists gathered from all parts of the world, many of them sent from lands only just rescued from the wilderness, should have any sensible influence upon the civilization of this old and lordly nation. But those who know what changes are worked by Anglo-Saxon colonization will see no absurdity in the supposition. Colonists are accustomed to disregard or to scrutinize very narrowly every species of conventionalism. Prescriptive rights they know not. Carvers out themselves of new social orders, constructors of new political systems, they look at questions with less timidity of mind and greater fertility of purpose than men who are fettered by usage and clogged by precedent. It must be that when the personal influence and co-operation of such men are brought to bear in the councils of the nation, when the eager progressiveness of the colonist is associated with the calmer impulses of the home citizen, an effect more or less potent will be produced.

But the chief value of such an organization to this country would lie in its utility as a means of promoting emigration on a large and systematic scale. The past apathy of our Government, and indeed of the nation generally, upon this question is one of the anomalies of our history. Year by year, for half a century, Englishmen and Englishwomen have left our shores to form new homes in distant lands without any recognition of the outgoing tendency by the State. Year by year the numbers of English paupers have multiplied, and the poor-rates paid by English citizens have waxed heavier, without an effort being made on the part of the Government or of the parochial authorities to mitigate these evils by the transplanting of our surplus population to these remote possessions. The increase of pauperism in a country of such set limits, and under such a system of land tenure as ours, has been a physical and social necessity. Given a population increasing in a certain ratio, living in a small island where the soil is owned by large proprietors, and the outgrowth of pauperism becomes almost a mathematical certainty. Parochial statistics bear melancholy proof that it is so. According to Mr. Preston's interesting pamphlet 10,303,000*l*. were paid for poor-rates in 1867, and 11,061,000*l*. in 1868, showing an increase of 757,000*l*. Pauperism costs us eleven millions sterling yearly already, and

the annual increase is at the rate of three quarters of a million! This is almost the cost of our national army. And yet not a finger has been lifted in order to establish some system by which the country might be relieved from such a frightful incubus of misery—from such a quick-growing fungus of taxation.

English statesmen write voluminous despatches to show that the colonies must defend themselves, and by so doing run the risk of severing those colonies from the Empire. English statesmen see pauperism and poor-rates together blighting and burdening the land; and yet the cost of military defence for the colonies is but a million, an eleventh part of what we pay for the maintenance in mendicancy of our poor. And in those colonies there is room enough and to spare for the comfortable location, under changed and hopeful circumstances, of all the unemployed of Britain for generations yet.

We ask a question which is now being often put in one or other of the colonies. Why cannot these poor-rates be employed in transporting to and maintaining for a limited period in Canada, Australia, or Africa the destitute persons for whose relief so much now has to be paid? Under the present system pauperism increases, and poor-rates grow, without any apparent prospect of the diminution of either. There is no compensating element in the system. It is bad because it leads people to look for, or depend on, parochial relief in times of scarcity. It is bad because it is alike unproductive and unprofitable. Were a certain portion of these poor-rates spent in locating industriously disposed "unemployed" in our colonies, poor-rates would be attacked at their source, and the burden they inflict would correspondingly diminish. Persons who are now the consumers at the public cost of food raised by others would become the producers of food and the employers of labour, pauperism would decline, and production would advance.

Our colonies are willing enough to supply the land required for the location of these suffering people, but the sparseness of their numbers and the many calls upon them for expenditure under other necessary heads, debars them from doing more. It would be, however, for the State and the parishes together to do the rest. The one could furnish means of transport in the shape of vessels that could not be better employed, as proposed by Captain Bedford Pim, the other could supply funds for the maintenance of the emigrants during the first year of their settlement The mere cost of conveyance would be far from enough, as our colonies would not thank us for shiploads of destitute people, unprovided with the means of subsistence until their own crops grew. This class of emigrants would have to be provided at the outset with rations, implements, and shelter. They might be, if

deemed desirable, required to repay within a certain period some of the cost of this assistance, but we doubt the expediency of exacting such a stipulation. In India as much as 300*l.* per man has been paid for the housing of European soldiers. For how very much less a sum might we place in a position of comfort for life men who are now the menace of order and the incipient germs of revolution, but who might be converted into an industrial army, whereby wild lands would be tamed and fertilized, and new realms conquered to Christianity and civilization.

There are unfortunately strong interests adverse to any movement whereby emigration as a cure for pauperism should be made a national question. There are those who look upon a chronic percentage of "unemployed" as a happy regulator of the cost of labour. Emigration will draw off the unemployed, and leave the masters at the mercy of those that remain, say these opponents. You have no right to deprive England of her bone and sinew—of her labouring power—of that which has constituted her glory and her strength. But all the time while this appeal to national selfishness is being made the cries of pauperism wax louder and louder, and the burden of poor-rates gets heavier and yet heavier. Where is it to end, if some remedial movement be not made? Will relief come from agriculture, when the rural labourer is declared to be the worst paid species of operative, and when the value of land and the employment of machinery increase yearly? Will relief come from increased manufacturing enterprise, when Continental competitors are every year pressing our own manufacturers more closely? Will relief come from the diminished increase of population, so long as destitution and misery keep the lower classes ignorant of their duties as citizens, and reckless of their interests as men? It seems to us, in common with many others, that the efforts which are now being made by certain philanthropic bodies and individuals to promote the emigration of the unemployed might, if our statesmen are not blind to the tendencies of the time and the exigencies of our society, result in making emigration the charge of a new and a distinct department of the State.

For if the ideas we have attempted to sketch, and the proposals we have ventured to put forth, be worth anything, the answer to all objections will be found in the response, that in removing the unemployed from England to the colonies we are but shifting our citizens from one part of the Empire to another. They will be no less subjects of the Queen—members of the Anglo-Saxon body politic—in Australia or in Africa than in Lancashire or in Dorset. The only difference will be that there they will add directly to the strength and prosperity of the Empire, while here they will be but a burden and a stigma upon it. There they will

produce staples which will feed or employ their countrymen at home and elsewhere. Here they only consume without producing. There society will gladden under their presence, and earth will bloom beneath their labours. Here society is darkened by their existence, and earth is burdened by their woes.

We have thus sought, as well as we can, to place before our readers certain aspects of this question most deserving, as it seems to us, of consideration. The subject in its entirety is so large and fruitful that volumes might be written upon it. Yet there are a few more salient points, which it would be well for the home public to have clearly in mind ere any judgment be formed. In a preceding page we have summarized certain consequences which would probably follow the abandonment by England of her colonies. Let us now set forth some of the advantages likely to accrue from the reconstruction and consolidation of the Empire—namely :—

Trade will be retained and extended, instead of being diverted to other countries, as surely it would be were the colonies to become independent, with reasons for ill-will against this country, or were they to pass under the protection of other powers.

England would still possess lands where for long ages yet the overflowings of her population might find healthful homes and remunerative work.

England will still have at command safe investments for her fast increasing savings and redundant capital. Nine millions sterling are now paid by India and the colonies yearly upon the funds advanced by British investors on their bonds and debentures. Every year adds to the amount borrowed, the recognition of British rule being the main element of security.

There will continue to be within the bounds of the British Empire opportunities of honourable advancement, of social and political distinction, open to young men of every grade. This is an age when the spread of education produces a proportionately large number of men who aspire to a superior station in life than they were born in, and who long for the chance of public activity. Within the vast sphere of our colonial dominion the laudable ambition of our youth may find a fit and ample arena.

Such a confederation of English-speaking peoples, bound together by common interests, and compacted in an elastic political union, could hardly fail to have a pacifying influence in the world, and would enable England, in the strength of her unity and the vastness of her dominions, to bring her neutrality to bear in the arbitration of international quarrels, and become once more "an umpire among European Powers."

By sharing the burden of her naval and military expenditure with communities which become every year richer and more

populous, England would in course of time find that her own liabilities under these heads would gradually get less and less.

There would be secured to the national genius a finer field for its energies, and nobler objects for its attainment. The narrowness bred by insularity would give place to greater breadth of view, catholicity of spirit, nobleness of purpose; patriotism would be less marred by national selfishness; little by little the individuality of our race would take a higher form and receive a wider signification. To be an Anglo-Saxon would mean all that to be a Roman meant in the grandeur of territorial sway, but far more than that phrase meant in the rights of citizenship, in the co-ordination of Imperial supremacy, civil liberty, and personal responsibility.

This is a time of political strife, moral struggle, and social change. How fit that England—the cradle of modern freedom, the type of modern order—should be found lengthening her cords and strengthening her stakes, rather than flying to pieces beneath the disruptive influence of one false economical idea! Were her colonies to drift away from England the cause of liberty would sustain incalculable damage; for the basis of well-ordered liberty is power and prestige, and of these attributes none of these young colonial communities can yet make boast. They need British rule in order that their immature political constitutions may gain strength, firmness, and maturity; they need it to save them from anarchy, confusion, and possibly from despotism; they need it to give them breathing time ere they are called upon to discharge the onerous responsibilities of supreme power.

The long annals of the world are but a record of the rise and fall of successive empires. "Assyria, Greece, Rome, Carthage, where are they?" Is the British Empire now, ere scarce its limits are understood, to be numbered with the things that were but are not? Is England to part with her possessions, and become once more a second-rate power, with interests bounded by the seas that wash her shores? This is the question which now has to be answered, and which her statesmen are called upon to consider.

Art. V.—Shelley.

The Poetical Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley. A revised Text, with Notes and a Memoir. By W. M. Rossetti. 2 vols. Moxon and Co. 1870.

THE connexion of Mr. W. M. Rossetti's name with a Memoir of Shelley and an edition of his works, is a sufficient guarantee of the impartiality and thoroughness with which these tasks have been respectively accomplished. There was ample scope for Mr. Rossetti's labours in both departments; indeed, it is not too much to say that it has been reserved for him to make the first serious attempt either at a complete biography or a correct text. This is in itself no slight distinction; the intelligence, ingenuity, and industry he has displayed in it are more commendable still; but the spirit of affectionate enthusiasm in which he has wrought is best of all, and will insure him the sincere sympathy of all admirers of Shelley, independently of any estimate which may be formed of the actual value of his work.

All biographies of Shelley have hitherto been of a fragmentary character, either from their partial and limited scope, as those of Trelawny, Hogg, and Peacock; or from their desultoriness, as the Shelley Memorials; or from imperfect information, as the narratives of Medwin and Middleton. Of the latter it is not necessary to say much. Medwin's incredible heedlessness and blundering have destroyed the authenticity, and consequently the value of excellent materials. Mr. Middleton's work is written in an admirable spirit; but in all other respects what Medwin's is to a good book it is to Medwin's. The Shelley Memorials contain many documents of the highest interest and much intelligent literary criticism. They answered their purpose, more could not be required. Mr. Peacock's notes also, we suppose, answered their purpose, together with another not contemplated by the writer—that of demonstrating his entire incapacity to understand the man in whose intimacy he had spent so many years. Notwithstanding, however, the cold and uninviting character of Mr. Peacock's reminiscences, and the serious misrepresentations which they have been shown to contain, he deserves our thanks for having preserved some interesting particulars which would otherwise have been forgotten, and the precision of his style offers some amends for his singular deficiency in graphic power. We may dwell somewhat more fully on the works of Mr. Jefferson Hogg and Captain Trelawny, as it is to these that we at least are indebted for our most vivid impres-

sions of the poet's personality. Mr. Hogg, besides his unquestionable power as a *raconteur*, was well fitted for his task from his college friendship with Shelley, and the intimacy he continued to maintain with him until his final departure from England. We therefore carry away from the perusal of his book, in which he dwells with infinite gusto on the minute traits of his immortal friend, a lively picture of the wild yet gracious figure of the poet in his youth. Yet whatever our enjoyment of the sparkle of anecdote and humour, whose quaint brilliancy imparts such a charm to these pages, we cannot help thinking that Mr. Hogg mistook one matter of essential importance—the style and manner in which it became him to write of such a man as Shelley. His keen appreciation of the ludicrous was evidently too strong a temptation to be resisted, and has thrown an air of grotesqueness over his entire work. Another point on which the world has found it difficult to sympathize with him, is his palpably honest conviction that the life of Thomas Jefferson Hogg was only second, if second, in importance to that of Percy Bysshe Shelley himself. It is almost ungracious to quarrel with irrelevancies which have afforded us such hearty amusement; but we must repeat that amusement, although a good thing in itself, is, when intruded into a biography of Shelley, a good thing out of its proper place. We believe, however, that his fault was not a want of love but a lack of imaginative power and keen insight, which misled him to fasten on the momentary and accidental, instead of penetrating into the deep and eternal parts of the poet's nature.

The other work, which is indeed a mere sketch, but to which we are most truly indebted for fresh and graphic delineations of Shelley, is Captain Trelawny's "Recollections of the Last Days of Shelley and Byron," which, unfortunately for all lovers of Shelley, scarcely extends over more than the last six months of the poet's life. But it bears on every page the impress of love and sincerity, and possesses at the same time the rare power of conveying in the simplest language pictures that bear stamped on them the seal of the most unmistakable reality. The description, for example, of his first meeting with Shelley is inimitable in its way; but as Mr. Rossetti has wisely incorporated it in Trelawny's own words into his Memoir, we refrain from quoting it here. But, indeed, the book is full of passages where one catches no less delightful glimpses of the poet's ways, while everywhere, even in the most trifling anecdote, we are kept aware of the fact that we are brought into closer contact with a higher, a truly godlike nature. One cause of Captain Trelawny's superiority as a biographer to Shelley's other friends may probably be found in the more favourable circumstances under which he

approached him in the first instance. Mr. Hogg and Mr. Peacock made Shelley's acquaintance when he was young and undistinguished; they associated with him on a footing of entire equality, had obviously no conception of his superiority, and spent the rest of their lives in finding it out, if indeed they ever attained to this knowledge at all. Captain Trelawny tells us that he was led to seek Shelley's acquaintance by the report of his genius, his adventurous history, and his unlikeness to the mass of men.

Availing himself of all these scattered materials, as well as of a number of new and interesting particulars obtained from independent sources of information, Mr. Rossetti has for the first time combined them into a symmetrical whole. And great praise indeed is due to him for the clear and methodical arrangement and the straightforward manly tone of his Memoir, which, far from being a mere compilation, is a substantial and independent work, bearing the clear impress of the writer's powerful individuality. In order, however, to form a correct estimate of Mr. Rossetti's Memoir, we should make it clear to ourselves what task it was he really aimed at accomplishing, and whether he has accomplished this. He states so plainly that the end he had in view was to sift and authenticate the extant mass of material as a *contribution* towards the systematizing of a "Life of Shelley," that it would be a wilful misrepresentation of the whole scope of his work to measure it by a standard at which it never aimed. The condensed scheme on which Mr. Rossetti's Life had necessarily to be written has probably made it impossible for him to enter more deeply into the poet's character; this drawback, however, is partly compensated by the resulting compression of matter and nervousness of style. We confess that in our judgment a more vivid picture of the poet's individuality might have been obtained if the illustrative anecdotes, instead of being all massed together in one section, had been distributed over the whole extent of the Life in the natural order of their occurrence. We think that by these means a certain local colour would have been obtained, and greater life and motion imparted to the flow of the narrative. We question also the desirability, taking of course the necessary brevity of the Memoir into consideration, of devoting so large a portion of the allotted space to Shelley's views on Art, while rather hurrying over his opinions on religion and philosophy, and also perhaps thereby curtailing the writer's own criticism on Shelley's poems.

Our account of Mr. Rossetti's edition would be very incomplete without some notice of what forms, after all, its distinguishing feature, and will always render its appearance an era in the history of Shelley's writings. We allude to its character as the first *critical* edition of the poet's works. Respecting the

need of such a revision there has been but one opinion among the students of Shelley, whose impatience at the frequently marred and mangled condition of the text has borne a tolerably fair proportion to their capacity for the apprehension of its beauties. It will suffice to cite the testimony of the late Professor Craik, of Mr. F. T. Palgrave, and of Mr. Swinburne.

Several partial attempts—among which special recognition is due to the ingenious emendations of Mr. F. G. Fleay—had previously been made to remedy the defects unmistakably indicated; but to Mr. Rossetti belongs the honour of having first grappled with the task as a whole. His task has in the main been exceedingly well performed. His edition is a monument of unwearied assiduity, of vigilant attention to the minutest detail. Such labour is the indispensable condition of correctness; but it needed an interest in his author passing the ordinary love of editors to enable Mr. Rossetti to spare so much time from the brilliant but precarious feats of conjectural emendation for the humbler, but not less essential scrutiny of punctuation and orthography, and the rectification of annoying grammatical negligences. His services in the former department are inestimable, and it is only to be regretted that they must necessarily elude the recognition of all but the most critical readers. The amendment of Shelley's careless grammar is a more delicate matter; but we are disposed to think that Mr. Rossetti has not exceeded the latitude which may be fairly claimed by an editor of clear judgment, and fully exempt from the taint of hypercriticism. As regards the several arrangement of the volumes, we are only disposed to regret (and we cannot help regretting strongly) the dislocation occasioned by the removal of several of the most important poems to the appendix of fragments. Not only is their effectiveness greatly impaired by their juxtaposition with fugitive and imperfect snatches of verse, but the parts of the collection from which they have been removed appear impoverished by their absence. The more we are enabled to regard Shelley's pieces as so many passages of one grand poem—the poetical interpretation of a life—the more we must regret such interruptions of the sequence of his thought.

As an emendator, Mr. Rossetti has two main resources—collation with the original editions and conjecture. The first has assisted him to some admirable corrections; as, for instance, the restoration of the vivid and Shelleian word *ruining*, in a passage of "Alastor," which since the first edition has always been printed "Wave *running* on wave." As a conjectural corrector Mr. Rossetti has not always been equally successful, and we shall be able to show that many of his most plausible suggestions are unfounded; but fortunately these have usually

remained in the state of suggestions, and have not been incorporated with the text. To no man was ever less applicable, indeed, Dryden's shrewd criticism on critics, that they study rather to display themselves than to explain their authors. Mr. Rossetti seldom scruples without some reasonable ground; and if in many instances his scruples are needless, there are many others where they have been called forth by a real corruption, which he has instinctively felt without seeing how to remove it. In other instances his corrections are brilliant and indisputable, as in stanza vi. of the dedication of the "Revolt of Islam," where the lines—

> "Which crushed and withered mine, that could not be
> Aught but a lifeless *clog*, until revived by thee,"

are themselves marvellously "revived" by the simple substitution of *clod*.

We would gladly have dwelt longer on Mr. Rossetti's characteristics as an editor, but we must pass on to the contribution which we are ourselves enabled to offer to the improvement of Shelley's text, a contribution which we can bring forward without misgiving, inasmuch as it is derived from the only infallible source of information, the original MSS. themselves. These documents, as students of Shelley are aware, were examined by Mr. Garnett in 1862, with the result of the discovery of ninety pages of previously unknown matter printed in that gentleman's valuable "Relics of Shelley," as well as not a little more, which now appears for the first time in Mr. Rossetti's edition. From various circumstances, however, the examination was in some respects cursory, and more was done for the enrichment than for the correction of the text, although some very interesting emendations were made, such as "might" and "earth," for "light" and "air" in the first stanza of the lines written at Naples. We must here express how deeply we are indebted to Mr. Garnett, and to the liberality of Shelley's representatives, in now being able to offer the results of a more minute examination made since the publication of the recent edition. A few words must suffice to explain why this examination has proved less productive than might have been hoped. Shelley's MSS. may, from our present point of view, be divided into two classes—those of poems published during his lifetime, and of poems published after his death. The former, although a great part of the "Prometheus" is fortunately an exception, have in general shared the usual fate of MSS. sent to the printer—they have been disregarded, as chrysalis cases for which no man concerns himself after the emergence of their Psyche. The rough drafts of these poems, indeed, are extant in many instances, but except where the printed

text is evidently faulty, it would manifestly be unsafe to unsettle it on their authority. On the other hand, the second-class of MSS., with a few exceptions, such as the "Witch of Atlas," exists solely in the form of rough drafts, usually written three or four times over, and in these instances perpetually at variance with each other. It would be easy to fill pages with such variations, but in all such cases, as it appears to us, the presumption is in favour of the received reading, which probably was not adopted without good authority, perhaps that of some more perfect copy now lost. Thus for example, we should hesitate to substitute "innocent heaven" for "serene heaven," in the "Ode to Naples," although the variation is entitled to great respect from the beautiful condition of the copy, and from this being the only one which contains the two "introductory epodes" as Shelley unclassically styles them—a circumstance of great interest, as it shows that these exquisitely beautiful stanzas were an afterthought. The inspection of two pieces, however, has been fruitful of results, though on opposite accounts—that of the "Letter to Maria Gisborne" from the perfect, that of the "Triumph of Life" from the chaotic character of the original MS. The examination of the "Prometheus" has also led to the correction of several errors which had insinuated themselves from the necessity of entrusting the correction of the proofs to others. Several alterations in the minor poems, generally of much interest, may also be regarded as indisputable, and as such entitled to a place here. Finally, we shall enumerate the instances in which emendations proposed by Mr. Rossetti, or mentioned in his notes, have not been confirmed upon an appeal to the original. Our references are in all cases made to his edition.

Vol. I.

Prometheus Unbound, p. 317, l. 21.—"And gnash beside the streams of fire, and wail Your foodless teeth." The punctuation is faulty. In the original, which is always carefully punctuated, there is a comma after *gnash* and *wail* respectively, but not after *fire*, showing that wail is here not a verb but a substantive. The allusion is to the *two* infernal streams, Phlegethon and Cocytus. P. 327, at bottom, for *silent* footsteps read *killing*. P. 330, stage direction at the beginning of act ii., for *lonely* read *lovely*. P. 333, l. 29, for *morn* read *moon*. P. 337, l. 6, the much queried *lake-surrounded* is correct, though not very intelligible. P. 337, l. 18, "And wakes the destined soft emotion." The sense has hitherto been obscured by the erroneous punctuation. *Destined* ought to be followed by a full stop. L. 21, for *streams* read *steams*. P. 338, l. 15, for *on* read *in*. P. 372, l. 25, "Radiance and *light*," read *life*, avoiding the tautology.

VOL. II.

Letter to Maria Gisborne, p. 245, l. 9, for *philosophic* read *philanthropic*, as already acutely conjectured by Mr. Rossetti. L. 18, "Which fishes found under the utmost crag," read *fishers*, one of the most striking examples conceivable of the wonderful way in which the most trifling modification will sometimes convert nonsense into sense. An almost equally remarkable instance is afforded by the first line on the following page, "Reply to them in lava-cry, halloo," where the sense has been utterly perverted by placing a hyphen instead of a comma between *lava* and *cry*. The earthquake demons do not reply to the gnomes' toast in lava-cries, but in lava itself, a more congenial beverage. Same page, l. 24, for *green* read *queer*. P. 247, four lines from bottom, for *know* read *knew*. P. 248, at top, for *acting* read *citing*. P. 249, l. 12, the celebrated passage on Godwin has been tampered with. It originally read—

> "*That which was* Godwin, greater none than he
> Though fallen and fallen on evil times, to stand."

Consideration for Godwin evidently dictated an alteration which in justice to Shelley should now be revoked. Same page, three lines from bottom, for *said* read *read*. The blanks on p. 251, l. 30, should be filled with the names of Hogg, Peacock, and Smith. That on p. 252, l. 10, is unfortunately irretrievable.

Triumph of Life, p. 397, eight lines from the bottom, pursued or *spurned* the shadows, read *shunned*. Last line, for *wood lawn-interspersed*, read *wood-lawns* interspersed. P. 399, l. 3, for *thunder's* read *thunder*. L. 6, for *meet* read *greet*. P. 400, l. 16, supply *while* before "the shock." P. 401, l. 24, for *sentiment* read *nutriment*. P. 403, eight lines from bottom, fill up the chasm thus:—

> "Even as the deeds of others, not as theirs,
> And then——"

P. 404, l. 8, for *comest* read *camest*. L. 23, for *year's dawn* read *season*. Same page, three lines from bottom, for *her* read *the*. P. 406, first line, "out of the deep cavern, with palms so tender, omit *out*, and insert *and* before *with*. L. 3, omit *the*. L. 17, for *to* read *in*. P. 409, l. 7, "The words of hate and care," for *care* read *awe*, thus negativing the ingenious correction of *words* into *world*, proposed by Mr. Rossetti, which we had regarded as nearly certain, and which still appears to us more beautiful both in sense and music. Same page, l. 18, for *vale* read *isle*. The correction is significant from the fact that these countless swarms of bats are found in the Indian Archipelago, not upon the continent. The idea was probably suggested to

Shelley by Trelawny's narratives of his adventures in these regions. L. 29, for *rode like demons* read *sate like vultures.* P. 410, seven lines from the bottom, for *wrapped* read *wrought.* Mr. Rossetti had divined an error, which he proposed to amend by reading *shaped* or *warped.*

How wonderfully Shelley usually improved on his first drafts is again shown by the commencement of the "Triumph of Life," which originally stood as follows:—

> "Out of the eastern shadow of the earth
> Amid the clouds upon its margin grey,
> Scattered by night to swathe in its bright birth
> In gold and fleecy snow the infant Day,
> The glorious Sun arose, beneath his light
> The earth and all."

As it now stands the Introduction to the "Triumph of Life" is one of the most highly wrought and perfect passages we know in poetry.

Translation from Faust, p. 494, stage direction, Faust dances and sings with a girl. The song is as follows:—

FAUST.

> "I had once a lovely dream
> In which I saw an apple tree,
> Where two fair apples with their gleam
> To climb and taste attracted me."

THE GIRL.

> "She with apples you desired
> From Paradise came long ago:
> With you I feel that if required,
> Such still within my garden grow."

Same page, three lines from the bottom, "Are we so wise, and *is the pond* still haunted?" This is an absurd mistranslation of the original, "Wir sind so klug, und dennoch spukt's *in Tegel,*" the allusion being to the recent apparition of a spectre in the hamlet of Tegel, to the scandal of enlightened persons. The blunder is not, however, attributable to Shelley, who, not knowing what Tegel meant, left a blank in consequence, but to the person who published his MS. in the *Liberal.*

Miscellaneous corrections. Julian and Maddalo, vol. i. p. 290, l. 14. For *dales* read *vales,* the word employed by Milton in the passage referred to—*Lines to Misery,* st. x. l. 2. The rough draft has *lovers* instead of *shadows,* which having been also in Medwin's copy, and being, as Mr. Rossetti justly observes, more uncommon and poetical, should we think be adopted. *Lines to an Indian Air,* vol. ii. p. 210, l. 9, in what is to all appearance the last written of the many drafts of this

divine song, the words "champak odours" are distinctly altered into "odours of my chaplet." The alteration is startling, and we confess our preference for the poem as it stood in the older edition. Although it makes the line agree more formally in metre with the corresponding verses of the other two stanzas, yet it loses that subtle musical charm which it previously possessed.

The Question, p. 225. The line hitherto missing from the second stanza of that exquisite poem is, "Like a child, half in tenderness and mirth." *Mutability*, p. 272, l. 9, for *too* read *how*. *Prince Athanase*, last line, p. 307, for *frame* read *flame*. Otho, p. 309, l. 20, for *buy* read *bring*, instead of *wring*, as ingeniously surmised by Mr. Rossetti. *On Keats*, p. 351, l. 2, for *monthless* read *printless*, omitting *and*. *Evening*, p. 358, l. 8, for *enormous* read *cinereous*. Fragment of an unfinished Drama, p. 358, l. 27, for *spring* read *spray*. *Cyclops*, p. 447, l. 23, insert "to be" after "not," as suggested by Mr. Rossetti. *Epigram from Plato*, p. 457, l. 5, for *does* read *doth*. *Pan and Echo*, p. 458, l. 14, omit *the*.

Besides those already mentioned, the following emendations, proposed by Mr. Rossetti, or adverted to in his notes, are negatived by the evidence of the MS., vol. i. p. 257, l. 10, *there* for *thee*. P. 314, eight lines from bottom, *ghostly* for *ghastly*. P. 327, l. 10, *bestrewn* for *between*. P. 365, l. 3, *obscure* for *obscene*. Vol. ii. p. 210, l. 9, *pine* for *fail*. P. 247, l. 25, *age* for *eye*. P. 449, l. 20, *manœuvre* for *measure*. Dr. Dobbin's ingenious suggestion of "stony" for "strong" in the "Hymn to Mercury," st. viii. l. 1, is confirmed by the MS.

Notwithstanding all that has been effected, the imperfections of Shelley's MSS. still leave a not inconsiderable field open for conjectural emendation, and the following suggestions may perhaps help to elucidate a few obscure readings:—

A well-known passage in "Alastor" (vol. i. p. 107) has occasioned infinite perplexity to Mr. Rossetti and Mr. Swinburne. The latter abandons it as hopeless; the former endeavours to render it intelligible by a change in the punctuation, according to which it reads as follows:—

> "On every side now rose
> Rocks which in unimaginable forms
> Lifted their black and barren pinnacles
> In the light of evening, and (its precipice
> Obscuring) the ravine disclosed above."

"According to my punctuation," says Mr. Rossetti, "the statement is, that there were certain rock-pinnacles which, while they obscured the precipice (or precipitous descent) of the ravine, left the ravine itself visible higher up." If, however, these spires of

rock were less elevated than the walls of the ravine, we cannot understand how they should be "lifted in the light of evening," or how they could with any propriety be termed pinnacles at all. A pinnacle is surely the highest and not the lowest point of the rock. But if for *disclosed* we read *inclosed,* all is plain, and we get a beautiful picture with scarcely any disturbance of the text.

In the "Revolt of Islam" (canto iii. st. 15) is a passage absolutely preposterous as it stands :—

> "The moon was calm and bright,—around that column
> The overhanging sky and circling sea
> Spread forth in silentness profound and solemn,
> The darkness of brief frenzy *cast* on me,
> So that I knew not mine own misery."

This is evidently nonsense ; darkness could not be spread forth by the calm brightness of sky and sea. *Cast* should be altered into *past,* and a colon substituted for the comma at the end of the third line.

In *Prometheus Unbound* (vol. i. p. 351), Ocean says—

> "My streams will flow
> 'Round many peopled continents."

Read many-peopled as a compound epithet. The meaning is not that there will be more continents than heretofore after the liberation of Prometheus; but that, in consequence of their exemption from war and other calamities, these continents will henceforth be more populous.

With these few remarks we must take leave of the biography and textual criticism, and we are indeed sorry that within our limits it is simply impossible to render justice to the thoroughness, the impartiality, the indefatigable labour and genuine love which are Mr. Rossetti's most eminent characteristics as biographer and editor. We cannot, however, refrain from expressing our extreme surprise and disappointment when, on looking over "Queen Mab" in the new edition, we saw the deforming transformation which that poem had undergone. It is true the alterations which Mr. Rossetti has introduced into the text are taken from the "Dæmon of the World," which Shelley purposed to be a modified extract of "Queen Mab," and published in the same volume with "Alastor and other Poems." But we can only infer from this fact that when once the inspiration which went to the shaping of any work of art has totally passed away, a poet may easily mar his own creation by trying to make it better. Though "Queen Mab" may in some respects be a crude production, yet it is so full of the sap and ferment of genius, and bears so unmistakably the stamp of Shelley's peculiar characteristics, that besides the value it possesses for us

as poetry, it has the additional interest of being the earliest production in which we can trace the true workings of the poet's mind. And it appears to us that for this reason, if for no other, the text ought to have been allowed to remain as it originally stood; for with regard to those really juvenile effusions such as the "Wandering Jew" and the "Posthumous Fragments of Margaret Nicholson," which Mr. Rossetti has seen fit to print in the appendix to this edition, it is a pity he has thus rescued them from the oblivion they so richly deserve. But indeed the new readings of "Queen Mab," so far from possessing any greater poetic beauty whether of idea or expression, seem to us invariably a diluted version of the original.

But let the reader judge for himself. We will first quote the lines as they stand in the original "Queen Mab," and place underneath them the alterations in the present edition.

> "The Fairy's frame was slight; yon fibrous cloud
> That catches but the palest tinge of even,
> And which the straining eye can hardly seize
> When melting into eastern twilight's shadow
> Were scarce so thin, so slight, but the fair star
> That gems the glittering coronet of morn,
> Sheds not a light so mild, so powerful,
> As that which bursting from the Fairy's form
> Spread a purpureal halo round the scene,
> Yet with an undulating motion
> Swayed to her outline gracefully."

> "The Fairy's frame was slight; slight as some cloud
> That catches but the palest tinge of day
> When evening yields to night—
> Bright as that fibrous woof when stars indue
> Its transitory robe,
> Her thin and misty form
> Moved with the moving air;
> Such sounds as breathed around like odorous winds
> Of wakening Spring arose,
> Filling the chamber and the midnight sky."

Mark here those changes which, although apparently often trifling, yet alter the whole delicate texture of this exquisite passage: instead of the original and *most* apt epithet applied to the cloud, "fibrous," we get nothing at all in the later version, and we are indeed at an utter loss to account for the alteration. Thus, for the simple expression "palest tinge of even," we find this awkward way of saying the identical thing, "palest tinge of day, when evening yields to night," &c.; but far worse, the truly lovely line, "the fair star that gems the glittering coronet of morn," is omitted altogether, swallowed up, annihilated.

The limits of our essay will not allow us to give any further

examples, but we could cite passage after passage where the original beautiful text has been equally marred. And we must be allowed here to express the earnest hope, which we can hardly doubt will be echoed by all lovers of Shelley, that in any future edition "Queen Mab" may be restored to its original form.

Let us now, however, turn our attention to the criticism of the works themselves; and as it is Mr. Rossetti's evident disposition to lay the chief stress on the technical execution of Shelley's poems, touching but slightly on their subject-matter and general design, we may perhaps be justified in dwelling somewhat more fully on the latter point, thus endeavouring to supplement a deficiency highly characteristic of certain tendencies predominant in contemporary art and poetry. For while on the one hand there is in our age a propensity to depreciate the important functions of the Beautiful, thus robbing the speculative faculties of an ally that would impart form and colour to their abstractions, we have on the other hand the no less mischievous error of giving an undue prominence to workmanship and execution, and looking on form and colour, not as the temple where the image of the god stands enshrined, but as the very deity itself. By these fatal demarcations and barriers erected in the mental territories, where one realm is assigned to the Beautiful, another to the True, and a third to the Good, we impoverish each one of these three great forces, and in the mistaken conviction of thereby strengthening their respective activities we obstruct that interchange of influences which should vivify the Æsthetics, Ethics, and Science of a nation. Let us for one moment stay to consider what would become of the Beautiful, if, securely dammed up against the influx of moral convictions and the speculations and discoveries of the reasoning faculties, it were subsisting in proud isolation only on and through itself. Assuredly epics such as the "Divina Commedia" and "Paradise Lost," revolving the mighty problems "concerning God, free will, and destiny," struck and wound their roots inextricably round the deepest philosophic and religious thought of their time, while the very structure of tragedy, consisting as it does, not in the blind and insensate conflict of passion hurtling on passion (else the commotion of waves and winds would be an equally tragic spectacle), but of passion lashing in mutinous revolt the iron front of the moral law, has its foundations laid in the ethical convictions of mankind.

What then, we may well inquire, is to become of poetry if cut off from influences of such vital importance to its two great divisions—the Epos and the Drama. It is evident that the form and manner, from the imperative necessity of which, however, we would be the last to detract, would thus truly comprise the

Alpha and Omega of a work of Art. And thus the same care would be lavished on the polishing of a pebble or a diamond, the polishing and setting being considered the chief things needful. This total misapprehension of its divine mission necessarily produces that blight of all true poetry—namely, mannerism. Far otherwise indeed was Shelley's conception of poetry. Both in theory and practice he would have extended its limits to an almost incredible extent, enclosing both science and philosophy within its domain. In his "Defence of Poetry," he goes even so far as to say that the distinction between poets and prose writers is a vulgar error, and that not only Plato and Bacon, but "all the authors of revolution in opinion are not only necessarily poets as they are inventors, nor even as their words unveil the permanent analogy of things by images which participate in the life of truth, but as their periods are rounded and rhythmical, and contain in themselves the elements of verse, being the echo of the eternal music."

Considering how marked was Shelley's bias towards this view, we think Mr. Rossetti somewhat apt to undervalue what constitutes the true centre of gravity of all the poet's divine creations, when, as for example, in speaking of "Alastor" with reference to "Queen Mab" (of which, in our judgment, he speaks too irreverently when he thinks it necessary to state that it is not *unmitigated* rubbish), he remarks that in the former we have at last "the genuine, the immortal Shelley." With all due deference to Mr. Rossetti's opinion, we must yet dissent from this assertion; and while admitting the wonderful advance in the perfection of form, in the exquisiteness of the language, and greater musical subtlety in the rhythm of the blank verse, still we think that in many respects "the genuine, the immortal Shelley" can more truly be traced in "Queen Mab" than even in "Alastor," as it palpitates with that intense faith in progress, that fiery love of liberty, that impetuous passion for reforming the world, which are, after all, the distinguishing features of Shelley, and which were brought out in their full glory in his "Revolt of Islam," and "Prometheus Unbound." Shelley indeed, when he launched that *enfant terrible* of a poem into the world, fully believed in his power of making a breach in the solid rampart of custom, so as to take by storm and overnight, as it were, that great stronghold in which theology, monarchy, and matrimony have hitherto braved even the sap of Time and Change. It is with an emotion wavering between a smile and a tear that we think of this frail, gentle, pure, and lofty being who, with "weak hands though mighty heart," dared that triple-headed power which rules the world. It is doubtless by the violent recoil of hopes forced back upon his own mind, and debarred

their natural fiery action on the nation at large, that we must interpret the sad and solemn harmonies of "Alastor." These spring from the revulsion of those impassioned aspirations to which "Queen Mab" owed its being, and the despair that broods over them is but the shadow cast by the sun of hope itself. It is therefore a total misapprehension of the dominant quality of Shelley's mind, if, as is so often the case, those poems which express, in however beautiful and inimitable a manner, his melancholy or despondent moods, are considered as his most representative poems; on the contrary, *they* are but the expressions of that dominion which the momentary and the casual must exercise over every mind still subject to the varying influences of life; but that which indeed constitutes "the intense, the deep, the imperishable" Shelley, which will exercise a constraining influence over the centuries, is the aspiration after goodness no dejection could quench—the faith in humanity which doubts might assail, but never shake; the love which year after year of the short life in which he met with so much persecution and bitter hate, rounded to a fuller and more resplendent orb.

Let us, however, now turn our attention to the poem next in chronological sequence, "The Revolt of Islam," which Mr. Rossetti has despatched in a few words, and which appears to us to be a mine of inexhausted thought. The vast scope, gorgeous imagination, and enchantment of rhythm and language which mark this work are so widely known, that we proceed at once to point out what appears to us to constitute its fundamental idea, and one which hitherto has been overlooked. This is the completely changed aspect in which the relation of the sexes is regarded. Hitherto all poets creating ideals of woman, however pure or lofty these might be, had depicted her invariably in her relation as either wife or mistress, mother or daughter—that is, as a supplement to man's nature, or, as Milton plainly expresses it—

"He for God only, she for God in him;"

or, in other words, he raised to the contemplation of an infinite; she condemned to that of his finite nature.

To Shelley belongs the honour of being the first poet who has embodied, in a shape of the loftiest loveliness, the most momentous of all our modern ideas—that of the emancipation of women from this subjection to men. He is thus the poetic forerunner of John Stuart Mill, and has achieved in the world of the ideal that which is now being realized practically by the man of science. For by making his verse the receptacle of his bold and lofty speculations on that subject, and by impregnating with them the highest and most sensitive minds of the generation that

succeeded his own, he has doubtless opened one of the paths which have led to the present widespread movement regarding this question.

In Cythna we hail a new female type, and one indeed which hitherto has been repugnant to poets, who, if they approached at all that side of woman's character which she represents, approached it either to distort its features or to soften them down to the more accepted standard. But Shelley, with his usual fearlessness, bates not one jot of the idea. He holds that woman, just as man, is or should be a being whose sympathies are too vast—whose thoughts too multiform to converge to the one focus of personal love, and that in the self-same way it is at once her right and her duty to take an active share in the general concerns of humanity, and to influence them, not only indirectly through others, but directly by her own thoughts and actions. Thus Cythna, prophet, reformer, and martyr—invested with all the glow and glory which the poet's imagination could bestow on her—is a creation unique in the whole range of fiction.

The poet, with deep insight, indicates in canto ii. that the task of the regeneration of woman can only be brought about by woman herself; that it is she who must rouse man's interest, and kindle his enthusiasm in her cause, for, as Laon says—

> "This misery was but coldly felt, till she
> Became my only friend, who had indued
> My purpose with a wider sympathy;
> Thus, Cythna mourned with me the servitude
> In which the half of humankind were mewed,
> Victims of lust and hate, the slave of slaves;
> She mourned that grace and power were thrown as food
> To the hyæna lust, who, among graves
> Over his loathed meal, laughing in agony, raves.
>
> And I still gazing on that glorious child,
> Even as these thoughts flushed o'er her :—'Cythna, sweet,
> Well with the world art thou unreconciled;
> Never will peace and human nature meet,
> Till free and equal man and woman greet
> Domestic peace; and ere this power can make
> In human hearts its calm and holy seat,
> This slavery must be broken.'"

Such an exalted ideal of woman necessarily produced a conception and expression of love which is simply supreme. The sensuous and susceptible temperament which usually underlies poetic genius has almost inevitably the tendency of stimulating the passions too strongly in one direction, and from this point of view Plato had doubtless a fair excuse for his verdict against the poets as elements of disturbance and fiery insurrection in

the serene atmosphere of his model state. Shelley, however, forms in this respect a marvellous exception. His love, indeed, would almost require the baptism of some new name to distinguish it from the lower and lesser passion which currently goes by that appellation, for it "transcends the senses infinitely as heaven does earth." Unrivalled in this respect is the sixth canto of the "Revolt of Islam," where the poet, secure in the "golden purity" of his nature, has fearlessly penetrated into the fiery depths of human passion, blending it in strains of labyrinthine music with the subtlest ecstasy which emanates from the spirit. Between such a conception, embracing the whole circumference of love, and that of Keats, for example, who describes it much in the same spirit of childlike sensuousness with which he descants on "lucent syrops" and other "spiced dainties," or of Byron, to whom in some of his most powerful flights it revealed no deeper aspect than that of being "youth's madness," what an immeasurable distance! These remarks naturally lead us to Epipsychidion, where Shelley, apparently bursting the last link of "dull mortality," has not only sustained the inspiration of his subject at a dizzy height, but, soaring ever higher in miraculous ascent, lands us ultimately in the Empyrean of love itself. We indeed cannot comprehend how Mr. Rossetti, after some just remarks descriptive of the beauty of its poetry, could actually bring himself to say of this most exquisitely lovely production, "I may confess, however, to doubting whether it is quite a justifiable poem to write. Its very mood tends towards the intangible, and its framework of imagery and symbol remains to this day an enigma to students of the poetry and the life of Shelley;" to which our only answer is that, to put such a question with regard to *such* a poem is in our opinion equivalent to asking whether the "Symposium" or the "Vita Nuova," or any work, in short, where that most delicate bloom of the emotions, necessarily the rare attribute of a "sacred few," finds its peculiar expression, was a justifiable production. If Mr. Rossetti had not shown in his criticism on Walt Whitman a remarkable power of appreciating qualities of genius the most opposite to what constitutes the sculpturesque or the pictorial in poetry, we might probably have inferred that his intimate appreciation of the sister art of painting had had an influence in diminishing his appreciation of works whose subject-matter belonging essentially to the inward and incommensurable life of thought, necessitated a mode of treatment which, adapting itself to this quality, occasionally verges on the border-land of mysticism; but this would evidently have been a wrong inference, and we are therefore at a loss to account for Mr. Rossetti's estimate of Epipsychidion.

Of the "Prometheus Unbound," that greatest production of

Shelley, Mr. Rossetti has given us such a powerful and correct estimate, that nothing further remains to be said of it in a narrow compass; it is, indeed, such a noble specimen both of his style and criticism that we cannot abstain from quoting it as it stands—

"There is, I suppose, no poem comparable in the fair sense of that word to 'Prometheus Unbound.' The immense scale and boundless scope of the conception; the marble majesty and extra-mundane passion of the personages; the sublimity of ethical aspiration; the radiance of ideal and poetic beauty, which saturates every phase of the subject, and almost (as it were) wraps it from sight, as it were, and transforms it out of sense into spirit; the rolling river of great sound and lyrical rapture, form a combination not to be matched elsewhere, and scarcely to encounter competition. There is another source of greatness in this poem neither to be foolishly lauded nor (still less) undervalued. It is this—that *Prometheus Unbound,* however remote the foundation of its subject-matter and unactual its executive treatment, does in reality express the most modern of conceptions, the utmost reach of speculation of a mind which burst up all crusts of custom and prescription like a volcano, and imaged forth a future wherein man should be indeed the autocrat and renovated renovator of his planet. This it is, I apprehend, which places *Prometheus* clearly, instead of disputably, at the summit of all latter poetry; the fact that it embodies in forms of truly ecstatic beauty, the dominant passion of the dominant intellects of the age, and especially of one of the extremest and highest among them all, the author himself. It is the ideal poem of perpetual and triumphant progression—the Atlantis of Man Emancipated."

Owing to the necessary limits of our essay, we must pass over the "Cenci," that drama which is the most magnificent refutation of the charge often brought against the poet, that he was unable to conceive and embody any character out of himself, or portray the dark and malignant passions of human nature, and content ourselves with a few remarks on "Adonais" and "Hellas," the poet's last complete compositions, and which doubtless contain the best and maturest expression of his philosophical thought. Indeed, we think Mr. Rossetti's section on the religion and philosophy of Shelley necessarily defective from his scanty recognition of these two poems, and from his not rendering sufficient justice to the intense earnestness on these matters, which so essentially characterizes Shelley, as, for example, when he says, "The general tenor of 'Adonais' may seem to amount to the expression of a positive belief in the immortality of Keats, as a separate individual soul; but we must be on our guard against poetic abstractions and (not to use the word disrespectfully) poetic machinery." One of the stanzas from which Mr. Rossetti would draw such an inference, where it is said—

> "He is made one with Nature: there is heard
> His voice in all her music, from the moan
> Of thunder to the song of night's sweet bird;
> He is a presence to be felt and known
> In darkness and in light, from herb and stone
> Spreading itself where'er that Power may move
> Which has withdrawn his being to its own;
> Which wields the world with never wearied love,
> Sustains it from beneath, and kindles it above—"

justifies, in our opinion, the direct opposite of this conclusion—namely, that Shelley appears, first, to have held that death was the cessation of the separate insulated consciousness of the individual, and the redistribution of the atoms that build up his existence into the general universe of things; secondly, that whatever form of ultimate development this separate entity had attained, during its transit through life, reacted again on passing thence on the general universe—

> "Compelling there
> All new successions to the forms they wear."

Any attempt, however, to range the swift and subtle spirit of Shelley into a distinct school of philosophy, would, in our opinion, be an undertaking as ill-judged as assuredly futile: for, as he primarily looks at the world with the eyes of the poet, he arrives at his deepest convictions concerning it less through any sustained chain of systematic reasoning, than through flashes of intuitive perception, born of his intense absorption into, and passionate worship of, the great Cosmos. As it is fabled that Pygmalion was consumed by so potent a passion for the marble image that, clasping it, he mastered the cold repose of the stone itself, and won a response from its locked lips, even thus every true poet stands in his relation to Nature, and besieges her with prayers, tears, and entreaties, weary watches, and devouring aspirations, till he feels at last the throb in the stony veins, hears the murmur of the muffled voice, till, from the sun and the sea, the trees and beasts, yea, the very stones, there burst awful manifestations, opening glimpses, strange and sudden, into the vast dumb mystery. To have cast the brilliant net of his language over these divine but too fugitive moments of spiritual experience, and thus for ever to have retained them in song, is one of the highest of the many achievements of this transcendent genius. But although we are thus convinced that Shelley's philosophy cannot, in the strict sense of that word, be classed under any existing system of metaphysics, yet we think it evident that the bent of his mind impelled him strongly towards an idealistic conception of the universe; and it is curious to note that, even

in his days of rampant materialism, when saturated with the study of Hume and the French encylopædists, he sought a vehicle for those views in "Queen Mab," he ever and anon, when wrought up to a pitch of high lyrical exaltation, bursts into expressions that are the direct contrary of his professed opinions, as when he says, for example, "Soul is the only element." This of course by no means implies that Shelley's thought was stationary, but merely that his mind possessed an original bias towards transcendentalism; and there can be little doubt that his positive assertions of atheism spring in great part, as is well illustrated by an anecdote told in Mr. Rossetti's Memoir, from the deep conviction that every advance towards truth must be painfully impeded, till the obstacles which an intolerant faith opposed to it had been fairly demolished. Many of his assertions therefore should be considered relatively rather as missiles used by a fearless combatant, than statements of an actual conviction. It is evident however that, although there are passages in "Queen Mab" which certainly seem very much in harmony with "Hellas" and "Adonais," yet the main philosophical conception is in fact widely different, and we recognise the clearest expression of this difference in the address to the "Spirit of Nature" ("Queen Mab," p. 39). In this fine piece of declamation, the Spirit of Nature is represented as insensible to all moral distinctions, and by a necessary consequence, as devoid of moral beauty. It is therefore no object of adoration, love, or even admiration: it is a mere machine, and what is still worse, the human beings produced and controlled by it must be as little the objects of affection or admiration. The spirit so gloriously described in "Adonais" is something widely different. "Its smile kindles the universe;" "it wields the world with never-wearied love." It is compared to a fire, reflected with an infinite variety of intensity by an infinite multitude of mirrors; if the reflection is imperfect, the fault is in the mirror, not in the fire. In a word, the spirit of "Queen Mab" is Necessity, and is addressed as such; the spirit of "Adonais" is Love, and is addressed as such. By so much higher as the idea of love is than the idea of necessity, by so much better as the poetry of "Adonais" is than the poetry of "Queen Mab," by so much higher and better are Shelley's last thoughts than his first. There is another noteworthy distinction. In "Queen Mab" the operation of the spirit is limited to the visible universe; it is expressly said to be "contained" by Nature. In "Adonais," on the other hand, it *contains* Nature; it not merely *pervades* but invests the universe—"Sustains it from beneath and kindles it above." The same idea is still more forcibly expressed in the prologue to "Hellas"—

> "Deem not thy worlds
> Are more than furnace-sparks or rainbow-drops
> Before the Power that wields and kindles them."

Briefly, the spirit in "Queen Mab" is contemplated as merely immanent in the universe. In "Adonais" and "Hellas" it is immanent still, but also transcendent. In this latter poem, indeed, we find that the immaterialism of Shelley had reached its culminating point, and it is a significant fact that he was studying Kant in September, 1821, and actually translating Spinoza in November of the same year, at the time when "Hellas" was completed. How intently his mind must have been engaged on these metaphysical speculations is evident from the fact that he represents the Sultan in the midst of insurrection, whilst his throne totters on the verge of ruin, as actually listening during an interview with Ahasuerus to the most profound exposition on the non-existence of matter. This is certainly carrying the love of philosophizing to an incredible extent. But the passage itself soars to such sublime heights of thought, and is moreover such a complete *résumé* of Shelley's last convictions on these subjects, that we are fain to crown these few inadequate remarks with its surpassing splendour—

> "Sultan! talk no more
> Of thee and me, the future and the past;
> But look on that which cannot change—the One,
> The Unborn, and the undying. Earth and ocean,
> Space, and the isles of life or light that gem
> The sapphire floods of interstellar air,
> This firmament pavilioned upon chaos,
> With all its cressets of immortal fire,
> Whose outwall, bastioned impregnably
> Against the escape of boldest thoughts, repels them
> As Calpe the Atlantic clouds—this whole
> Of suns and worlds, and men and beasts and flowers,
> With all the silent or tempestuous workings
> By which they have been, are, or cease to be,
> Is but a vision;—all that it inherits
> Are motes of a sick eye, bubbles and dreams;
> Thought is its cradle and its grave, nor less
> The future and the past are idle shadows
> Of thought's eternal flight—they have no being;
> Nought is but that it feels itself to be."

Is there not a strange significance in this fact, that the last work of importance on which this restless inquirer was engaged should have been cut off abruptly at this point of interrogation, "Then what is Life?" Bewildered cry cast into space whose mournful reverberations were straightway muffled in death! Evidently projected on a colossal scale, and wrapped in an

atmosphere of supernatural mystery, where dream is superimposed on dream, there is in the "Triumph of Life" a weird labyrinth of gloom and glare, and amid the cloudy whirl of grey, half-ghastly phantoms, gleams of a celestial radiance which almost recal to us the visions of the Apocalypse. Its allegory is still indeed, and we fear must in part probably remain, a magnificent riddle; we nevertheless entertain the hope that a minute comparison with passages both in the poetry and prose might help us to discover coincidences of symbol and imagery which should throw a ray of light on the dark intricacy. There can be no doubt that "the shape all light" which is described as appearing to Rousseau gliding out of the deep cavern along the river—

> "With palms so tender
> Their tread broke not the mirror of its billow,"

is the Urania of which it is said in "Adonais"—

> "Out of her secret paradise she sped
> Through camp and cities rough with stone and steel,
> And human hearts which to her aery tread
> Yielding, not wounded, the invisible
> Palms of her tender feet where'er they fell."

On the other hand, the New Vision of the Car, wherein sits a hooded figure crouching in the shadow of the tomb, represents Life, and the Janus-visaged shadow who guides it with bandaged eyes may be identified with

> "The world's eyeless charioteer—
> Destiny,"

spoken of in "Hellas." The excessive glare which is described as proceeding from that chariot dims the fair shape, as hurrying on with solemn speed it whirls the loud million triumphantly along with it. This probably means that all but a chosen few are seized and preyed upon by the multitudinous passions of the world, whose fiercer fires extinguish the celestial flame or aspiration after perfection. Rousseau himself is a type of those men of genius who, having allowed the impure breath of earth to alloy the spark with which their spirit had been kindled, have thus in part subjected themselves to corruption. It also appears probable that "The Fable," printed in the "Relics of Shelley," and itself a remarkable fragment, written about the same time as "Epipsychidion," affords a clue to that perplexing allegory of the phantoms near the end of the poem. It is there said that by the counsel of Life, Love left man in a savage place with only the company of shrouded figures, of whom it is said, "None can expound whether these figures were the spectres of

his own dead thoughts, or the shadows of the living thoughts of Love." The latter solution is out of the question in the "Triumph of Life," but the former seems applicable. We should say that the "shadows sent forth incessantly" by "each one in that great crowd" were no other than the fears, loves, and hatreds, the actions and sufferings emitted from the ever-busy brain of man, until as rain poured from clouds, or heat and light radiated from a fire, it is utterly exhausted. This seems the more probable, as we are told that those masques fell

"Soonest from whose forms most shadows passed,"

i.e., the more passionate natures are the soonest worn out by their own intensity.

Of Shelley's minor poetical works we have no room left us to speak; and, indeed, what could we say of such poems as the "Witch of Atlas,"—that carnival of the fancy where "quips and cranks and wanton wiles," with a thousand fantastic whims of the nimble-witted brain, sport through the lucid flow of the verse "like motes that people the sunbeam?" What of odes like those addressed to "Liberty" and to "Naples," that "Elysian city, metropolis of a ruined Paradise," in which there is an elevation and sweep of idea, a breadth of conception, an Orphic roll and thunder of music, illumined by such flashes of swift piercing thoughts as places them foremost among the rare masterworks of the highest lyrical style? What of minor poems like the "Skylark?" where the song of that bird, from the quick notes of shrill delight that are like steps on which it mounts on high to the long, full, blissful bursts of melody, as if every now and then it rested and revelled in the consciousness of its aërial ascent, is rendered in the rhythm with a startling truth, as if the soul of the lark had entered the poet's body, so that we might be refreshed for ever with this "embodied joy;" and last, not least, what of the "Ode to the West Wind"?—that archangelic trumpet-blast of the liberative idea, which Mr. Rossetti justly rates as the "finest piece of work—creation and fashioning combined, which Shelley," and, we would venture to add, the lyric Muse of England, ever produced. This prayer, wrung from a heart whose renovating power equalled that of the elemental force to which it appealed, was not made in vain. The thoughts that fell, as though still-born at the time, leaving cold and unkindled the minds of their generation, are even now being scattered "as from an unextinguished hearth ashes and sparks," to all quarters of the civilized world. Slowly but surely the mind of Shelley is absorbed into the general mind of mankind, quickening there a new birth.

If we would now have some idea of Shelley's position with regard to other great poets, it should be borne in mind that from

the remotest ages to the present time there have been two distinct manifestations of the poetic faculty. Poets may be broadly classed (for in entering more in detail into the question one would see, as everywhere else in nature, that there are nowhere sharply-cut boundaries, but that one kind or genus shades off by imperceptible degrees into another)—may, then, in a rough way be ranged into the two great divisions of witnesses and interpreters. Whereas the former, to use a striking illustration which a distinguished English critic applied to Shakspeare, "seem to turn the globe round for their amusement, and survey the generations of men and the individuals as they pass with their different concerns, passions, follies, vices, virtues, actions, and motives," the latter seek alone in communion with nature to penetrate into the burden of the mystery, the heavy and the weary weight of all this unintelligible world. The internal workings of the human mind, the mighty questions of religion, of the development of humanity, of the hidden laws of nature, sway their thoughts and throb audibly through their solemn rhythms. It will not be difficult to decide to which of these two divisions of poets Shelley belongs. Not his the genius mirroring back "like the wave's intenser day," the actual forms of nature in their infinite inexhaustible variety. No; he is the standard-bearer of the idea in the vanguard of the battle of life, lifting high the sacred banner, on which are emblazoned, like stars, the characters of justice, liberty, and truth. He is a lamp of vestal fire, whose radiant light beckons to those who are tossed this way and that on the agitated sea of fierce and conflicting passions. To finish, he is as the electric telegraph of thought flashing its fiery spark through the dull dense world of sense.

Art. VI.—Colonial and American Pauperism.

1. *Pauperism of New South Wales.* Being a Paper read by Alfred Robinson, M.D. December 9th, 1868.
2. *The Sixteenth Annual Report of the Directors of the Society for the Relief of Destitute Children.* Sydney. 1868.
3. *The Eighteenth Annual Report of the Committee of Management of the Benevolent Asylum.* Melbourne. 1868.
4. *The Fifteenth Annual Report of the Immigrants' Aid Society of Victoria.* Melbourne. 1868.
5. *The Tenth Annual Report of the Committee of Management of the Ballarat Benevolent Asylum.* Ballarat. 1868.
6. *The Annual Statement of the Guardians for the Relief and Employment of the Poor of the City of Philadelphia.* Philadelphia. 1869.
7. *The Ninth Annual Report of the Committee of Public Charities' Aid Correction.* New York. For the year 1868.
8. *Reports of the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor.*

THE generality of people now-a-days have a notion that English pauperism is due, principally if not exclusively, to the pressure upon the means of subsistence consequent upon the large increase of population. It is a sort of deformity, they imagine, which is an outcome of our prosperity as well as of our high scale of civilization. It is true that this view of the case is not derived from the conclusions of history, and that it seems to be difficult of maintenance in the face of the statistics of pauperism of half a century ago. But this apparent blow to the theory is generally explained away upon the ground that the causes of the pauperism were in the two cases widely different. That of former times being due to mal-administration, while that of to-day is to be attributed to the increase of real want. Doubtless this is in the main a true statement of the case. At the same time, the very reason here assigned as accounting for the comparatively large returns of pauperism at a time when the population was scanty, is in itself a clear admission of the fact that the amount of pauperism in a country is as much dependent upon the modes of the administration of the Poor Laws as upon the pressure of the population on the means of subsistence. Having once admitted this principle, it is difficult to fix the limits of its operation. How far, for instance, is the mal-administration of the Poor Law responsible for the expen-

diture of the 7,000,000*l*. of money annually spent in England on the relief of the poor? How far has the operation of mischievous laws educated the people to pauperism? Assuming the law at present in operation to be wisely and economically administered, how far is the pauperism it deals with referable to the prejudicial effects which are universally conceded to have accompanied the former administration of the law? And further, suppose the present law and its administration to be capable of improvement (which few persons will deny) how far would pauperism be affected by such improvement? And might we, if we dug deep enough and perseveringly enough, root out the whole plant? In a word, How far is pauperism a natural and necessary growth; or how far is it an exotic, which patient weeding out may enable us to get rid of? This last question must not be confused with the larger one as to the present necessity of Poor Laws. The necessity of pauperism is one thing, the necessity of Poor Laws another. Where pauperism exists, Poor Laws of some kind or another are held to be a necessity. There appears, however, to be a very general assumption as to the necessity of pauperism, with which, in degree at least, we cannot concur. Now it is of supreme importance to the arriving at a correct conclusion on the causes of English pauperism that we should not be contented with maintaining bare theories founded upon probability, but should patiently investigate the social conditions in this respect, presented by the inhabitants of other countries, and especially by our own race when somewhat altered in its conditions and settled in new countries. Few persons who have not given careful attention to the matter will be at all prepared to find pauperism in new countries, where population is small and the rate of wages high. In the colonies especially, where we are continually told that the want of labour is so great as actually to prejudice their prosperity, we should expect, at first sight, that the condition of dependence was the very last thing to be met with. And yet unfortunately the seeds of pauperism do exist in such countries, and the plant does here and there crop up in such apparently unfavourable soils, and shows an ugly tendency to spread, notwithstanding all theories which may be held to the contrary. It is in view of this fact, and with the hope that the investigation into the actual condition of affairs might prove of service in arriving at a right understanding as to the causes of the disease of pauperism, and so ultimately in applying suitable cures, that we have thought it well to put together a few rough notes on the general aspect and prospect of pauperism in parts of the Australian colonies, as well as in the two largest cities of the United States. It should be premised that these notes are very fragmentary and incomplete,

and that they do not profess to present an exhaustive treatment of the subject, which would be in truth impracticable for any except those resident in the countries named, and more familiar with their institutions than the present writer can pretend to be.

First, to take the Australian colonies, we should premise that there is not as yet, as far as we are aware, in any one of them an established poor law—that is, provision made by the State to meet a legal right to sustentation on the part of the poor. The various benevolent efforts, however, in the direction of supplying the wants of the poor, are largely supplemented by Government assistance. This assistance is, strange to say, given without Government control—a state of things which certainly cannot last for ever, and the destruction of which will bring into prominence the question of the relations which the State should bear to charity. It is easy to foresee that the establishment of a poor law, built upon the English system of a right of every man to relief, will be mooted in most of the colonies, and will probably—possibly with some modifications—be adopted in some of them. Both in Victoria and in New South Wales the advisability of establishing a poor law system has been constantly urged, and indeed in the former colony it is supposed that a Bill will soon be introduced into the Legislature on the subject. Thus, although in the technical sense of the word pauperism does not, with very trifling exceptions, exist, we find a large number of persons in the condition of dependence, whose wants are provided for by Government funds, aided by charitable efforts, and whose *status* is that of pauperism. The form, moreover, in which charity provides for want bears a very close resemblance to that established by our English Poor Law. There are the same gigantic buildings, standing up equally as monuments of and incentives to dependence. These buildings are called "Benevolent Asylums," and correspond in some measure to our workhouses. Ordinarily a large colonial town presents a group of institutions, which do in a measure the work which the Poor Law does in England. These are a benevolent asylum, a benevolent society, and an industrial school. The benevolent society, generally consisting largely of ladies, distributes alms, and relieves the wants of the poor, and, in some portion of its operations, closely resembles the out-door relief system in England. The industrial school is a Government institution, which does the work both of our workhouse schools and of a reformatory. In addition to these there are often schools for destitute children, approaching nearly to our workhouse schools, societies for assisting educated persons in distress, and institutions for aiding poor immigrants, and for

employing people in labour. A brief account of some of these institutions may be of interest to our readers. And first, we will begin with those at Melbourne.

The Benevolent Asylum at Melbourne has been in existence as a charity for nearly twenty years. The present building is large, and presents very much the appearance of a modern English workhouse. The following particulars are taken from the report of the Committee of Management for two years ago. The asylum contains 494 beds, of which 356 are devoted to men, and 138 to women. The accommodation had then just been increased by 130 beds by the putting up of a new wing. That this increased accommodation, however, was not sufficient to meet the demands upon the charity, is shown by the fact that during the year ending December 31st, 1867, out of the 907 applications for admission to the asylum, no fewer than 506, though conceded to be eligible objects for the charity, were refused for want of room. We paid a visit to this asylum during the past year, and were informed that about half the number of the inmates were admitted on account of old age, and a large proportion of the remainder on account of incurable disease. This appeared to be the case, as far as could be judged from a hasty inspection of the wards. However, the more able-bodied element is also admitted, and we noticed some fifty or sixty persons in the oakum-picking and hair-pulling rooms.

In addition to these kinds of labour, those of the inmates who can work are employed in making clothes, &c., for use in the house. The master of the asylum bore evidence to the rapid increase of the demands made for its shelter, and, regretting that charitable efforts were insufficient to meet these demands, used words to this effect:—"If we could accommodate 2000 people, it (*i.e.*, the asylum) would be full to-morrow." An opinion which was doubtless founded upon practical observations, and the correctness of which those who have studied the results which history shows to have always followed this kind of charitable provision, will be little likely to question. At the same time, it was clear that the benevolent and kindly master was in no way troubled by the speculations or criticisms of political economists as to cause and effect in this matter, but was influenced solely by his desire to see the benefits of the asylum spread amongst those in evident want of its shelter. The Government of Victoria make a grant of 3*l*. for every 1*l*. collected for the benevolent asylum. And I find that of the 14,000*l*. odd received for the charity during the year 1867, nearly 11,000*l*. came from the Government grants.

The Ladies' Benevolent Society in Melbourne distributes a considerable amount of money. The following statement of the

number of cases relieved weekly by the committee for one fortnight, will give an idea of the operations of this society:—

"Individuals relieved, 1573; families, 457; comprising widows, 200; sick and infirm, 105; deserted wives, 48; wives whose husbands were in prison, 8; wives whose husbands were absent, 44; wives whose husbands were partially employed, 9; wives whose husbands were unemployed, 6; aged couples, 13; single women, 21; miscellaneous, 3. Outlay during the fortnight in relief of cases, 162*l.* 11*s.* 9*d.*"

The Immigrants' Aid Society is another institution which is doing in Melbourne the work done in England by the Poor Law. The title of this society is calculated to mislead as to its objects and scope. Having been established to relieve the wants of poor immigrants, "its benefits have been extended to the destitute generally." The Home has been constituted a "refuge for the destitute." "The infirm and sick poor seeking admission to the Benevolent Asylum and Hospitals, as well as the out-door patients of the latter, have here found a home." In addition to the sick and infirm, able-bodied destitute persons are relieved by this institution, and are set to work at stone-breaking, oakum-picking, hair-teasing, and the women at washing.

"Of the character of the inmates during the past year," says the report for 1868, "it may be briefly stated that they were—of females, the newly-arrived immigrant, the deserted wife and her family, the single woman with her infant of unhappy birth, the widow and her children, the aged and the homeless of every condition. Of males—the recently-arrived immigrant, the old and infirm, the chronically diseased, the cripple, the convalescent, the man of education unable to obtain the work for which he is fitted, the homeless of every grade and country.

"The number of inmates of both sexes remaining in the Home on the 1st January, 1867, was as follows:—Males, 128; females, 104; total, 232; and admitted during the year, males, 4756; females, 633; total, 5389; making a grand total of 5621 souls relieved."

Out-door relief is also administered by this charity through the medium of a paid officer. The number of recipients of such relief during the year 1867 was 4381. The funds of the Immigrants' Aid Society appear to be economically administered. The accommodation provided consists of a low line of temporary wooden buildings, not in the best possible state of preservation, and is certainly not of a character to tempt persons to make use of it without cause. The amount of relief given is kept at the lowest figure possible, and the arrangements with regard to it, and to the stone-yard and oakum-picking sheds, are similar to those of our English workhouses. The testimony here given as to the increased number of applications to the charity was precisely similar to that at the Benevolent Asylum.

The Government grant to the Immigrants' Aid Society is

commuted for an annual sum of 3000*l.*; while the donations received from the public amounted, for the year 1867, to less than 700*l.*

Another town in Victoria whose benevolent institutions seem to call for especial notice is Ballarat. Ballarat is the second town in Victoria, and contains, we believe, from 40,000 to 50,000 inhabitants. It is well known as the centre of a gold mining district of considerable wealth. Miners' wages, at the time of my visit to Ballarat, were at 2*l.* 5*s.* and upwards a week. The cost of provisions was as follows:—Beef 2½*d.*, mutton 1½*d.* per pound; bread 7*d.*; while board and lodging for a working man was at 18*s.*, and the rent of a cottage with four or five rooms 4*s.* per week. Situated at something like one thousand feet above the sea level, Ballarat possesses a climate which is unsurpassed for salubrity. Here then are the elements which ought, according to all preconceived notions, to secure an entire absence of pauperism. The population is sparse, wages high, and provisions low. It would seem then that any pauperism which does exist under these conditions must be an unnatural growth, and it therefore becomes exceedingly instructive to trace out the effects of the charities which are in operation at Ballarat, and to inquire how far it is likely that they themselves create the pauperism they relieve. The Benevolent Asylum at Ballarat is a spacious and handsome building of some architectural pretensions. It has all that look of solid wealth and grandeur which, as Dr. Chalmers pointed out long ago, is a most effective stimulant to dependence, causing people to rely in sickness, old age, and emergencies upon its to them unfathomable resources, rather than on their own providence and thrift.

The asylum, to which a new wing had at the date of our visit been just added, affords accommodation to 274 inmates. It relieves the poverty of a considerable district around Ballarat, besides providing for the town itself. The total number of persons housed in the asylum during the year 1867 was 396. Of these 259 were males, 80 females, and 76 children. About one-third of the adult inmates of the asylum are admitted on account of old age, and the major portion of the remainder on account of incurable disease. The managers of the asylum also undertake the functions of a benevolent society, and distribute a large amount of out-door relief. During the year 1867 nearly 1800*l.* was in this way given away. I am not in possession of statistics showing the class of persons among whom this was distributed. The weekly average was 185 adults, and 284 children. In addition to the benevolent asylum is an orphanage, which contains, we were informed, some 400 children, as well as an industrial school containing some 80 more.

The demands upon these charities are, we believe, continually increasing, and that in a direction which merits careful attention, and points an instructive moral. The principal increase in the Benevolent Asylum is in the lying-in department, and in the number of the aged. Desertions of children by their parents are very frequent, and are doubtless in some measure accounted for by the liberal provision which charity here makes for deserted and destitute children.

With regard to the colony of New South Wales, we are enabled to give somewhat fuller information, derived principally from a very interesting and instructive paper read before the Royal Society of New South Wales by Dr. Alfred Robinson, on the 9th of December, 1868. It appears that the "Sydney Benevolent Society" was established in the year 1819. There was, as was to be expected, an increasing demand year by year upon the resources of this society, until "in the year 1863 the establishments under the control of the directors of the Benevolent Asylum had become so much crowded, and the Society dependent upon the Government for such large annual votes of money (11,916*l.*), that a committee of the Legislative Assembly was appointed to inquire into the subject." The result of this inquiry was, "that the Government relieved the directors of the charge of the aged and infirm," taking one of the establishments entirely into their own hands. With regard to the amount of expenditure and to the principles guiding that expenditure, Dr. Robinson says:—

"Up to December, 1862, the total receipts of the society had amounted to 205,113*l.*, of which 44,982*l.* had been received from the military chest, 117,209*l.* from the Colonial Government, and 42,921*l.* from private subscriptions. The total amount expended in out-door relief had been 31,080*l.* If we now turn to the principles upon which this Society has been conducted, we find that while it received these large votes of money as the sole representative of Poor Law relief, it was conducted upon the principle of charity—in other words, the Government handed over, during a period of thirty-nine years, no less a sum than 162,191*l.* as its Poor Law expenditure, to a Society of gentlemen who acted entirely under the influence of charity, and not in accordance with the principles supposed to be required in the administration of Poor Law relief."

A few miles out of Sydney is a large building called the "Destitute Children's Asylum." Of this institution Dr. Robinson remarks, that it "had in December, 1867, after but a few years' existence, the enormous number of 682 inmates, and received from the Government no less a sum than 8689*l.* during the same year." The number of applications for admission into the asylum is, we are told, continually increasing; and we learn from the

report of the directors that arrangements were being made for extending the amount of accommodation so as to provide for the admission of 1000 children. The rules which govern this institution specify the following classes of destitute children as admissible into the asylum—

"1st. Children abandoned by their parents, or left without friends and protection.

"2nd. Children the offspring of parents, either or both of whom may, from profligate habits or conviction of felony, be unable to support and unfit to educate them, and who may voluntarily surrender them to the care of the Society.

"3rd. Children who, coming within any of the classes above enumerated, may, according to any law in force for the time being, be compulsorily placed in the institution.

"4th. Children of any of the above classes who may be received by order of the Government from any benevolent asylum or other public institution, and for whose support provision shall be made by the Legislature."

From these rules a pretty good notion may be formed of the nature of the work of this institution.

The Sydney Infirmary is the next institution which merits notice.

"The infirmary contains," says Dr. Robinson, "200 beds, and there were admitted during the year 1867, 1769 patients. The directors are bound by an agreement with the Government to receive, as qualified applicants for admission, all persons presenting an order from the Colonial Secretary's office; and for such actually admitted the Government pay the institution 1*s.* 10*d.* a day, in addition to other considerable grants, which from 1850 to 1867 amounted to 13,287*l.* This system of the Colonial Secretary's orders is, as might be expected, greatly abused. For instance, I find that during the present year persons have *obtained admission* upon the Colonial Secretary's order upon whom the following sums of money have been found. One patient had 170*l.*, another 193*l.*, another 78*l.*, and another 215*l.*

"Considering the large number who are unable to gain admission, and that many are in the habit of placing their money in safe keeping, to render themselves qualified as applicants, it may be presumed that a great many accept the boon thus so freely offered, and by so doing not only lose that spirit of independence which it should be the ambition of the Legislature to foster, but entail a serious injustice upon their poorer brethren who are necessarily turned away for want of room."

Dr. Robinson gives the following statistical summary of his investigations into the provision made for the poor of New South Wales:—

"The number of persons in all the institutions, charitable, benevolent, and reformatory, which receive whole or partial Government

support, was, upon the 31st December, 1867, 4076, or 1 to every 110 of the population. The number of persons for whom provision was made in the benevolent asylums during the year 1867 was 3277, or 1 to every 137 of the population. The number of children in establishments wholly or principally supported by the Government was at the above date 1269. The total expenditure upon these institutions in New South Wales was, during the same period, 88,139*l.*, or at the rate of 3*s.* 11½*d.* per head of the population."

With regard to the general question of pauperism in New South Wales, Dr. Robinson, after remarking upon the rate of wages and provisions current in the colony, and very rightly combating the idea that it can be necessary to make provision for able-bodied pauperism, goes on to remark that—

"While the advantages enjoyed by the colony undoubtedly tend to the material prosperity of the large proportion of immigrants, the special features of the country unfortunately favour the growth of pauperism and dependence among those possessing impaired health, diminished energy, sensual dispositions, or idle habits. To such the absence of family ties and associations, the uncertain character of their occupations, the gambling nature of the digger's hopes and labour, the dull monotony of the shepherd's life, the uncertainty of the seasons, the heat of the climate, with its accompanying temptations, and the solitude of country life,—all these must and do injuriously affect a certain proportion of average humanity, producing pauperism in its true sense as well as pauperism arising from chronic illness and infirmity.

"On the other hand, it may reasonably be expected that as the colony becomes more settled in its pursuits family ties will be stronger, and the disposition to support aged relations greater. Upon the whole I conclude that the rate of increase of this class has been disproportionately large of late years, and that although the numbers must continue to rise, they will not in future be likely to do so in quite the same large proportion to the population. Somewhat similar reasons appear to have stimulated the numbers of destitute children. It is notorious that during the gold mania the diggings and accompanying excitements induced many men to desert their wives, and many mothers their children; while the readiness with which charity and pity accepted the charge of the infants thus deserted became in its turn an excuse to some in whom parental affection was weak to relieve themselves of the trouble and expense of those whom nature had bestowed upon them to support and caress. It may be hoped therefore that a more settled character of employment, together with the greatest firmness and discrimination on the part of the directors of our industrial schools and reformatories, will ere long diminish the hitherto enormous proportion of destitute children, if not the actual numbers in the establishments."

Dr. Robinson winds up his paper by arriving at the conclusion—

"That the period has arrived when the Government is called upon

to accept the entire responsibility of the administration of Poor Law (for this is the significant expression he uses) relief; and that this should be accomplished with the ultimate view of handing over a good system in efficient working order to local administration and responsibility whenever such a course can be satisfactorily adopted."

A similar view of the subject appears to be taken by many persons in Victoria, and it seems probable that, looking to the large amount of State aid given to the charities, as well as to the anomalous relations at present held towards those charities by the Colonial Governments, and to increasing demands made upon charity, that the Governments may be forced to take the management of the Benevolent Asylums and institutions of a kindred nature into their own hands, and to establish a Poor Law system. That such a result, however inevitable it may be, supplies material for painful contemplation for those of us who are able to trace the disastrous results which were brought about by the introduction of the Poor Law system into this country, cannot be denied. It presents too matter of very grave reflection as to the vaunted industry and independence of the English race, not unmingled with anxiety as to the future prosperity of colonies, which in their youth are thus rapidly falling into the vices of age. There is yet another feature of Australasian life which bears in no small measure upon a branch of the Poor Laws which has of late years attracted a considerable amount of public attention, as it did centuries ago—we allude to the subject of vagrancy. It was to be expected that in countries situated as the Australian colonies and New Zealand are, with their enormous areas of land and very sparse population, persons starting on foot from the centres of population, and seeking work up country, should be at times in great straits for want both of food and shelter. Moreover, where food is cheap and the climate warm, so that the shelter sought is such as may be afforded by a mere shed, it seemed an inhuman act to turn a poor man applying for work, and who had no inn to go to, from your door. Hence arose the custom of entertaining "swaggers," as they are called, or men in search of work, or presumably so, with their "little all" rolled up in a blanket into a sausage-like roll, fastened together by straps at either end, which is called a "swag." The custom of thus giving food and shelter gratuitously to those travelling in search of work is, we believe, universal; and in most stations up country an outbuilding is allotted for this purpose, which is in some places fitted up with sleeping bunks, &c., and forms a sort of amateur casual ward. Whilst several honest wayfarers are thus provided for, it is known that there are "swaggers" who come round without any intention of working, and who will refuse work if it is offered to them.

By going from station to station a man may thus eke out an existence in the same manner that the professional tramp does in England. It is easy to foresee that, as the country becomes more thickly populated, while the original cause of the custom of feeding "swaggers" will no longer exist, the custom will not die out with its creative cause; but that provision will have to be made for a vagrant population who have learned the habits of vagrancy under the system of entertaining "swaggers." It is stated, by persons who acknowledge the evils attendant upon the custom we are reviewing, that it is necessary to pursue the system, for that otherwise injury to property would ensue at the hands of ill-disposed tramps. Here then we have another of the factors present which went to make up the total sum, which ended in the establishment of the Vagrancy and Poor Laws in England.

With regard to American pauperism, we have less information, and little to say which is not at present well known in this country. The system pursued in many of the States approximates closely to our own Poor Law system. There are the huge buildings which are known as almshouses, and which are put to very similar uses to our workhouses. In most of the States—at least in the large towns—there is, we believe, a legal provision for the poor of a more or less defined character. It may, however, be of interest, in view of the problems of metropolitan pauperism, to give some details of the plan of operations pursued in the two principal cities of the United States, New York and Philadelphia. In New York the various State charities are under the superintendence of a public body—viz., "the Commissioners of Public Charity and Correction," answering in a measure to our Poor Law Board. The commissioners issue a carefully-drawn and elaborate report annually. The scope and nature of the work of the commissioners is in some measure indicated by the following enumeration of the institutions under their charge, together with the number of persons maintained in them during the year 1869 :—

In the City Prisons	46,807
„ Penitentiary	2,129
„ Workhouse	16,946
„ Almshouses	4,135
„ Blind Asylum	132
„ Hospital of Incurables	175
„ Bellevue Hospital	7,085
„ Charity Hospital	6,166
„ Small-pox Hospital	213
„ Fever Hospital	174
„ Lunatic Asylum	1,580
„ Epileptic Hospital	133

In the	Paralytic Hospital	140
„	Infant Hospital	1,887
„	Inebriate Asylum	663
„	Randall's Island Nurseries	2,429
„	Randall's Island Hospitals	859
„	Idiot Asylum	109
„	Reformatory School	60
	Total	92,272

With regard to the building called the workhouse, it may be mentioned that this is a sort of vagrant prison, and is fitted up with cells, the vagrants being sent there by the magistrates for short terms of imprisonment. It thus realizes to some extent the original scheme of houses of correction in England.

"The almshouses were formerly," says the report, "the refuge of imbeciles and lunatics, as well as of the old and infirm and of able-bodied vagrants, who through the summer months tramped the country roads, and at the approach of cold sought the warm quarters of the almshouse with the same regularity as the return of winter. The imbeciles and insane have been transferred to the lunatic asylum, and vagrants are sent to the workhouse, where they are required to render a day's work for each day's food and shelter. The almshouses now contain only the old and decrepit."

With regard to out-door relief, the report says:—

"The relief of the poor living in the city is entrusted to Mr. George Kellock, the experienced superintendent of the out-door poor, assisted by eleven officers termed visitors of the poor. It had been the practice before 1867, to appoint at the approach of winter several temporary visitors, without much regard to their qualifications, and dismiss them in the spring. It was found that, from inexperience or indifference, they discharged their duties so imperfectly, that the board resolved to divide the city into six districts, and to appoint a visitor of mature age and sound experience to each district. The change has been so beneficial, both in respect to the relief of the poor and the detection of fraudulent applications, that the city has been redivided into eleven districts, and five additional visitors have been appointed. Besides the duty of visiting the homes of applicants and reporting to the superintendent their condition, and the measure and kind of relief they may need, the visitors are charged with the investigation of the causes of pauperism, sickness, and crime in their respective districts. It will be the aim of the board to obtain, through this organization, such a thorough knowledge of these subjects as will enable them to minister with more intelligent discrimination to the relief of the wretchedness and poverty in the city than has hitherto been practicable."

The relief given is distributed in the form of money or fuel. The total number of persons relieved during the year 1868 was 51,477; of whom 19,263 were adults, and the rest children, the

whole being at a cost of some 23,000*l*. Out-door relief is also administered by the Commissioners of Emigration to emigrants who have not been resident five years in the country. The fund from whence this relief is derived, is taken from the whole body of emigrants, who on their landing pay one dollar a head, and have then a right to relief, if they become destitute during the period mentioned.

With regard to the housing of the homeless poor, it should be mentioned that temporary shelter is provided for such persons at the various police stations in the city. This accommodation is of an inferior description to that supplied in our metropolitan casual wards. The commissioners express their opinion that further provision is necessary for the homeless poor, and they state that in the winter of 1866 a portion of an unoccupied prison was fitted up by them

"As a temporary refuge for the night, to poor but reputable persons who, from various reasons, were deprived of homes. Over 2000 were lodged during the winter. Each applicant was questioned, and gave satisfactory evidence as to the cause of destitution. None were admitted who were intoxicated, and, except in a few instances, none who made application the second time. The shelter supplied a great and palpable defect in the system of charities, but it could not be continued when the prison was required for its original purpose. The commissioners are not insensible to the danger of multiplying the means of living without labour. The inevitable effect of such mistaken charity is to enlarge the vagrant classes, and convert the able-bodied poor, by an easy transition, into idlers and criminals. But, on the other hand, it is proper that, in a great city, there should be provision made against danger to life from exposure, as there is against starvation."

These remarks will be read with some interest by those of our readers who recollect the somewhat similar arguments used in England before the introduction of the "Houseless Poor Act," and who have followed out the results of that Act.

In addition to these State charities there are numerous charitable institutions in New York, amongst which that which seems to be deserving of the highest commendation is a charitable organization called the "Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor." This association has an extensive body of volunteer visitors, and by the highly enlightened tone it assumes, as well as by its complete and minute subdivision of work (each visitor having only from fifteen to twenty poor families who can possibly require assistance allotted to his care), and by its entire co-operation with the various charitable institutions, must be productive of much good, and must tend considerably to ameliorate the condition of the poor.

New York, however, with its large annual influx of European

emigrants, some of whom belong to the very lowest classes of society, is situated under peculiar conditions, and it can hardly be said that its pauperism gives a fair idea of the general condition even of the seaboard cities of the United States in this respect. We pass on therefore to consider the pauperism of Philadelphia. Philadelphia, the Manchester of America, as it has been called, the second city in the Union, contains, we believe, a population of some 700,000 souls. The care of the poor is entrusted to a board of guardians, consisting of twelve members and a president. These are all represented to be men of high standing and position, and are nominated by the mayor, the judiciary and other bodies. In former times they used to be elected by the ratepayers, but alas! for the much boasted advantages of local self-government, it was found that the persons thus elected were of the stamp which is unfortunately not unknown to the local parliaments of this country, and it was consequently deemed advisable that the guardians should be nominated, and no longer dependent upon the direct suffrages of the ratepayers. Each guardian is responsible for a particular district, and has a paid officer under him. The board meets fortnightly, but only for purposes of general business, and not to entertain applications for relief, which are left to be dealt with in each district. Two miles outside the city is an estate, which is under the control of the guardians. There is a very large building upon it, which is called the almshouse. In this building the paupers are housed, and the appearance of things generally in its interior is very similar to that of an English workhouse. There are also on the estate some farm-buildings, which are used for the purpose of out-wards, and for industrial training for able-bodied paupers, who are employed on the farm work.

The following table gives the statistics with regard to the number of paupers in the almshouse for the year 1868:—

Number of Paupers.	Men.	Women.	Children.	Totals.
In the House on Jan. 1, 1868	1667	1583	306	3556
Admitted during the year .	3259	1847	319	5425
Births	...	...	233	233

Making a total of 9214 persons housed in the almshouse during the year. Of this number there were discharged during the course of the year, 3743; 975 eloped; 41 were bound prentice; 737 died; leaving 3718 in the almshouse on the 1st of January, 1869.

With regard to the provision made in Philadelphia for

vagrants, among whom, we imagine, a certain number of emigrants will be included, the report of the guardians states that 10,742 meals were furnished to transient persons "during this year," and 3445 persons were furnished with lodgings.

The number of persons in receipt of out-door relief during the year was 104,542. The total expenditure of the guardians amounted to $422,610, or between 70,000*l.* and 80,000*l.*, the expenses of out-door relief being $60,200, or upwards of 10,000*l.*

With regard to the nature of the pauperism of Philadelphia as disclosed by these figures, it is to be remarked that it is clearly less permanent than English pauperism. For instance, the statistics we have quoted above show that the number of paupers discharged from the almshouse in the year 1868 exceeded the number in the house on the 1st of January. In the same manner, it will be remarked that the statistics of out-door relief, giving, as they do, an expenditure little exceeding half a dollar a head for the whole year, show that each individual must have been in receipt of relief for very short periods. All this reflects very highly upon the care and ability with which the administration of the Philadelphia guardians must be conducted, and it enables us to account in a great measure for the extraordinarily large numbers put down as in receipt of relief. At the same time, it must be acknowledged that after making every allowance there still is a larger amount of pauperism in Philadelphia than most people would, *primâ facie*, have expected to find there. With regard to the result of the operations of the Poor Laws in Philadelphia, we are informed that it is by no means satisfactory. There is there, to some extent, the reliance upon relief and the other vicious tendencies which seem to be inseparable from the establishment of a legal provision for the poor. "Cases of desertion," says the report of the Board for 1868, "are fearfully on the increase." There is undoubtedly in Philadelphia a real pauper and vagrant class. To this fact our own observations can bear testimony. Passing through the lowest parts of the city at dead of night, we were not a little surprised to see many scores of men and women of the lowest class sleeping on the pavement. We were told that a similar number might be seen any night during the summer months.

The above notes have been somewhat hastily thrown together, and are far from presenting a complete or detailed view of the subject. It is hoped nevertheless that they will not be without interest to those who are studying the various problems of pauperism. One moral we would point out which is, we think, to be derived from them, and it is this. Pauperism is not *exclusively* the creature of thickly populated countries, or of countries in which a low rate of wages prevails. It may exist in a new

country, and be unknown in an old one. It may flourish where wages are high, and take no root where they are low. That a low rate of wages, or a high pressure of population, may produce a condition of dependence among the labouring community, and that the growth of these evils would most assuredly increase the amount of existing dependence, is abundantly clear. But at the same time it is also equally clear, that in investigating the causes of pauperism, there is a great tendency to overlook the origin of the disease, and to assign it to causes which have at most but contributed to its spread. It is in this manner that several nostrums have been proposed as a cure for pauperism. One of the most favourite and popular of these, in the present day, is emigration, and we should be sorry to say one word which should cool the ardour of Englishmen in this matter. We know that extended opportunities for emigration will be an immense boon to the working men of this country. It will find for many homes in favoured lands, with higher wages and brighter prospects than in England. Many a man who is struggling on here, and eking out for himself but a bare subsistence, will find himself in the colonies or in America in a position of comparative if not positive affluence. But at the same time it may be doubted whether emigration will, to any appreciable extent, affect the amount of pauperism. Those who imagine that it will do so, argue that England being at present over-populated, the removal of a portion of the surplus population would create a gap in the labour market which would at once be filled up by those who at present go to swell the ranks of pauperism. Unfortunately this latter is an assumption which needs a little more proof than has hitherto been advanced in its support. Doubtless there are industries situated under exceptional circumstances in which the truth of the proposition may be at once conceded; such, for example, is, we apprehend, agricultural labour. The introduction of agricultural machinery and of improved implements of husbandry, the impetus which has been given in various parts of the country to stock farming as against agriculture, and many other causes which need not be mentioned here, have combined to create a relatively smaller demand for field hands than there was half a century ago. There is consequently a surplusage even of skilled agricultural labourers, and it thus happens that some of this class are, through no fault or deficiency of their own, reduced to a condition of dependence. But when this important and other trifling exceptions have been made, we shall find, we think, that the labour market in England is not overstocked, but rather understocked (temporary depressions of trade being excepted) with skilled labourers. The labour market is flooded to excess with unskilled and incompetent labourers. These are as

a rule entirely unable to raise themselves into the ranks of skilled labour. Being in a condition usually both of moral and of physical dependence, they require to be both educated and raised before they will be fitted for occupations which require self-control, perseverance, and skill. Moreover it must be borne in mind that, in the competition with the whole world in which England is at present engaged, the skill of our workmen is one of the most important elements of our commercial success. We hear a great deal of the advances made upon us of late years by foreign countries. A great many causes are assigned for those advances, but it is evident that all centre more or less around the fact of the improved relative skill and industry displayed of late years by foreign workmen. Persons who have recognised this fact, have, in many cases, as it appears to us, gone out of the way in their attempts to prove that the skill and industry of English workmen have declined. It appears, we think, much more probable that the intelligence and skill of the Continental workman have increased than that those of the Englishman have declined.

Moreover, an era of comparative tranquillity, together with the strides made towards constitutional government and political freedom, have combined to stimulate Continental trade. It remains then that the qualities of the English workman have relatively declined, because they have not sufficiently advanced with the age, and that education is the panacea which can alone ease the English nation of the disease of pauperism.

The cry for education in all its forms, and more especially for technical and industrial education, is thus seen to possess a new force and meaning. Those who throw obstacles in the way of the workman in his pursuit of knowledge and acquisition of skill, are doubly guilty. They are making the nation pay the debt it owes to industry with compound interest. It is a melancholy fact that various bodies of workmen in this country are not to be exculpated in this matter. The restrictive rules of trades' unions, which have thrown vexatious obstacles in the way of trade—such rules as those which limit the skill which a workman should exercise in his trade; those which tend to put a premium upon want of skill by demanding that all workmen shall be paid alike, and by discouraging piece-work; those more especially which would prevent the acquisition of knowledge by limiting the number of apprentices to be employed in each trade—have thus all tended to perpetuate, if not to increase, the pauperism of the country. Lastly, it is to the education and advance of public opinion on this question, to increased intelligence in the administration of the Poor Law, to the introduction of a system of industrial training; an improved supervision over the dwell-

ings of out-door paupers; the gradual organization of our charities, and a more enlightened distribution of their funds, and increased intimacy between rich and poor; the growth of habits of temperance, and of small economies among the labouring class; and the increase and promotion of provident institutions, that we must look for a sure and steady decline of pauperism; and even let us hope for the ultimate extirpation of that which is a noxious weed, sown by evil, nurtured by folly, and spreading through neglect, but which cannot, we think, be regarded as a necessary growth of the free soil of England.

INDEPENDENT SECTION.

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

ART. VII.—ROMAN CATHOLICISM: PRESENT AND FUTURE.

A QUESTION of much interest has of late occupied the minds of many persons—that is, What are the general feelings and opinions of the intelligent classes in Italy with regard to the Œcumenical Council now being held at Rome? This inquiry can, we think, be most satisfactorily answered by producing a translation of a lately published and remarkable treatise on this subject from the able pen of Signor Pantaleone, one of the most esteemed writers for the *Nuova Antologia*—the periodical which has the largest circulation among the literati in Italy. It will be found to contain much interesting information on the history of various Popes, and of the use made by them of their temporal power, as well as important reflections on the present state of religious feeling and thought throughout the different Catholic kingdoms. The original essay, a translation of which we now publish, is entitled, "On the Present and Future Condition of Catholicism, suggested by the holding of the Œcumenical Council."

I.

It is hardly thirty or forty years since the most bitter, the most severe accusation one could bring against Catholicism, against the Papacy and the Catholic clergy, was that they were opposed to all progress, civil and political, among the people. The accused cried out against these accusations as insults, as calumnies, on the part of the heterodox, and from bands of irritated Catholics rose up in their defence celebrated writers, clever statisticians, liberal, honest, and sincere men, who in good faith took the part of the Catholic Church, showing it, on the con-

trary, to be the mother of civilization, the secure guide to progress, the author and protector of every human liberty. In times more recent, about twenty years since, on the tranquil commencement of a liberal Pontificate, all Európe appeared to rise up unanimously and sing hosannas in praise of Catholicism and of the Catholic Church, which was about to sanction and sanctify with its great authority the progress of modern civilization. Who then would have dared to cast a doubt upon the liberalism of the Papacy, or deny the civilizing influence of the Catholic Church? Any one would have been regarded as a wretched being who offered a single word in opposition to the unanimous voice of praise and of homage with which all already foretold the reform of the Church, the apotheosis of Papacy, the reconciliation of reason and faith, the harmony between the principles of liberty and those of authority, the indissoluble bonds between religion and science, and even the restoration of the separated creeds to their ancient unity. Those times, alas, are changed! The accusations which were then regarded as calumnies of the heterodox are now issued as doctrines, proclaimed as truths, by that same Roman Court, by that same Papacy, and from the height of the chair of St. Peter. It is useless to try to hide or deny it. It is vain to try to attenuate the signification of the Papal declarations; they are so clear, so frequently renewed, that the most decided determination, the blindest fanaticism, could alone be induced to deny it. In the famous Bull "Quanta Cura," and in the syllabus which, in spite of every equivocation, accompanied it, Pio IX. condemns in the most explicit terms and with the clearest expressions, all modern civilization, all progress in totality, having first anathematized it in detail, repeating the manifold condemnations pronounced at different times against each of those principles which are regarded as fundamental to our institutions, against each of those arguments which are considered the most essential to the existence and development of modern society. Liberty of conscience already condemned by Gregory XVI. in 1832, was anathematized repeatedly by Pius IX. in 1857 and 1864; liberty of thought is a heresy, that of discussion and of the press, a plague not to be sufficiently execrated; political liberty, rights of the people, cardinal errors. Even civil equality is contrary to the Canons; the independence of the civil power an heretical proposition; civil marriage, concubinage. Instruction and education are by right Divine given to the clergy, and the clergy by the same right should therefore direct and govern all civil power. The separation of the Church and State is therefore an anti-Catholic principle, and one cannot tell if even the act of non-intervention is not condemned by Holy Writ. Thus it is evident that all

modern rights, modern society—all that calls itself by the name of progress and civilization—are incompatible with religion, impossible with belief in Holy Writ as it is understood and professed in Rome.

That this is a fact, it is first of all necessary firmly to establish, and to place beyond all possible discussion ; not indeed that there is much trouble in doing so, so often and so openly is it repeated unanimously by Pope, by bulls, allocutions, syllabus, letters, encyclicals, briefs, papers, and reviews of Rome, or those receiving their inspirations from thence. The Liberal Catholic opinions more or less favourable to civilization, expressed at the Congress of Malines, those proclaimed in September, 1863, by the learned Catholics assembled at Munich, are of evil prestige, delusions and errors, as Pius IX. expressly said in a letter to the Bishop of Munich, December 21st, 1863, and as he has not failed to repeat in all the encyclicals and allocutions above mentioned. The only doctrines, in fact, which are not declared and proclaimed incompatible with the Catholic faith, are those of the entire negation of all free thought, of all freedom of speech and action instigated by human reason, and those which are the most evident contradictions of all legislation, of all institutions, of all the forms of government adopted by the most civilized communities, which notwithstanding profess that same Catholic belief with which the Pope declares them to be incompatible. Finally, it is an undeniable fact that the Head of the Catholic Church and the Roman Court have declared themselves incompatible with modern science, with public and private privileges, with modern legislation, with modern reason, impossible with the institutions now accepted and adopted by those Catholic communities over which, in the meantime, the Pope pretends to exercise the exclusive moral dominion, and the Roman Court the spiritual authority. It is therefore evident that in this manner they drive the people into the dilemma either to deny their civilization, renounce the dictates of reason and of science, rebel against their rulers, against the legislation and institutions that govern them, abjure all their principles, or otherwise renounce being Roman Catholics.

This conclusion, which necessarily follows from the propositions issued by the Roman Court, must appear so enormously and excessively strange to every man of common sense that we have thought it indispensable, even at the risk of frequent repetition, to present it under different forms, under various aspects, from which it may be made clearly evident as an indisputable fact, admitted equally by Rome and by ourselves, and on which we can base our assertions that are to follow without fear of being guilty of inconsiderateness or of falsehood.

II.

How then can it come to pass that the chief of a religion should be found in open dissidence with his followers, that the priesthood should be in opposition with their own congregations? This is an event so strange, and so little in harmony with the events and historical reasonings of the past, that it is really necessary to investigate the cause of it.

Christianity, considered only in its historical and human relations, represents a complete revolution in the life of nations, a new cycle, a new formula of human civilization. The ancient religions had all, more or less, a certain mixture of the instincts, passions, prejudices of uncultivated and uncivilized man. The terror arising from ignorance, from the hatred of tribe against tribe, human instincts often of the lowest kind, created the first Divinities—first peopled heaven and hell. "Primus in orbe Deus fecit timos," and worship was at first the expression of terror, or the exercise of a moral want, or the emanation of a physical instinct. But in the more advanced time of ancient civilization, when all men appeared bound under one common political dominion, the world saw the sudden revelation of a doctrine, founded upon quite different bases, and which, taking its starting-point from opposite principles, condemning human passions, combating the physical instincts of inferior natures, preaching love, universal charity, proclaiming the equality of men of every class and of every nation, urged on the development of all that is the most noble, the most lofty, the most sublime of human nature. Religion was no longer then the product of the senses, the expression of the lowest portions of human nature, the external emanation of form without influence on man or society; but it was the expression of the most sublime thoughts and aspirations, it was the emanation of the spirit and of the reason let loose from the low passions, the emanation of entire humanity that felt itself one, even in its divisions of places, nations, and classes; it was the formula of a sentiment so superior to all that humanity had yet conceived or imagined, that it was really, or at least appeared to all, a direct celestial revelation of Divinity itself. Then for the first time arose in the world the idea of a conscience, and Christianity was the synthesis of all that morality the most pure, or intellect the most elevated, could suggest to humanity.

From this its peculiar nature, Christianity from its origin appeared as a religious formula, differing from all the others under two aspects: the first, the Spirit impressed on it by its Founder, by which Christianity was the religion of the soul and of the conscience; the second, virtually and logically

springing from the first, but more particularly explained by the Apostle Paul in opposition to the Apostle Peter, is the universality that Christianity assumes, by which it becomes the religion of the universal human race, and not of a mere Jewish sect.

This original character constituted from the beginning an opposition between Christianity and all other worships, and caused it to war against the passions, vices, and material enjoyments, but reconciled it at the same time to all men of the purest character and most elevated nature, who in this new belief found a fresh civilization, good and happy tidings for man. The Church and the clergy might therefore, on account of this peculiar character of Christianity, have found themselves in opposition to the populations devoted to the old religions and to the old failing civilization; but they did not for this reason find themselves opposed to their own followers, to the upholders of the new civilization of which Christianity was even the presage and apostle.

The second characteristic, although it had regard rather to the external development than to the intimate nature of Christianity, was however destined afterwards to have a much greater influence on its future and ultimate fate; for, by means of this quality of universality, it suddenly found itself represented not by the clergy of one country alone, by one nation or race only, but by its followers, who, arriving from all parts to the Œcumenical reunions, carried thither the contributions of the sentiments and opinions of all the populations of the world.

It is this most important and peculiar quality of Christianity which Roman Catholicism claims to have alone preserved, and which gives her the just and exclusive right to this latter name. All the religions of the ancient world, all the other Christian Churches, are more or less national. Thus when these latter Churches maintain their constitutions and their clergy independent of the government of their respective countries, it is a fact that the members of those clergy belong to the country, live in it, have their superiors and chiefs there; therefore they have the same wants, the same instincts, the same passions, and in their ideas and sentiments find themselves necessarily in harmony with their fellow-countrymen. The above observations are true as regards the clergy of the Eastern Church and the Protestant clergy. It is true that as regards the first, a certain respect and nominal supremacy exists still for the Patriarch of Constantinople, though each national group has its own separate Church, its own chiefs, its own synod, its own language, and its own independence. The same may be said for

the Churches in Scotland, in England, in America, in Germany, which have kept themselves independent and separate from the Governments of their countries. They are not less national because the clergy which represent them, the chiefs which direct them, belong to and reside in the same country itself. It is therefore easily to be understood that the causes from whence arise the commotions and contradictions between the Catholic priesthood and the followers of that religion, the opposition between the Church and State, between the clergy and civilization, as they were impossible in the ancient religions, are impossible also at present in all other Christian Churches except the Roman Catholic one.

In fact, the Roman Catholic Church has this peculiarity in its constitution, that while it belongs to various nations, and not all even of the Latin race, still everywhere it professes the same doctrines, the same principles; everywhere its clergy form part of one and the same body, greater and more extensive than the nation itself. It can therefore pass from one nation to another in the exercise of its ministry, has everywhere the same ritual or liturgical language, which is not that of the nation, and everywhere is bound to the same common centre, to the same foreign head which more or less openly directs and governs its clergy. This foreign head, living far from all those different nationalities, not belonging—at least morally—to any of them, is out of reach of the influence of the wants, of the instincts, of the necessities, to which at various times these different Catholic populations directed by him are subject; and therefore may find, and certainly often does find, himself inspired by different ideas, animated by different intentions, guided by different convictions and principles from those which exist among one, or several, or even all of the Catholic nations. Such is the consequence of the external constitution of the Roman Catholic Church dependent, by its nature, on the universal one—a consequence which arose only from a series of changes during many ages. In fact, in its first days, each diocese, each province, made itself independent, although recognising morally a certain supremacy in the Church at Rome; moreover, the powerful unity of the Roman Empire, beside that of the Church, not only constituted an efficacious counterpoise to the supremacy of the latter, but was often itself on the point of disputing even its legitimate authority, throwing impediments in the way of its extending its power, oppressing and tyrannizing over it. But when the invasion of the barbarians took place, there was brought about a great change in the circumstances not alone of the civil society, but also of the Church.

The influence exercised by the barbaric invasion on the Church was of two kinds: at the circumference, so to speak, in the con-

dition of all the bishops; at the centre, in the condition of the Roman episcopacy, or of the Pope.

The Roman Empire having first destroyed every element of liberty, of spontaneity, of choice, except the "Defensor Civitatis," all the vitality of the populations was centred in the Christian Church, where the system of election was held as a fundamental law in the appointment of the bishops and other members of the clergy, where Christianity with its doctrines of spirituality, of spontaneity, and of equality, attracted all that still remained of great and noble of the ancient and now decaying civilization, all the force and power that still existed amidst those populations exhausted by despotism and destroyed by the barbarous institution of slavery. For this reason, the importance of the episcopacy increased considerably under the Empire. It was doubled by the invasion of the barbarians. For at first all connexion with the central power being broken off by this invasion, the bishop, who by the system of election represented, and often was the true "Defensor Civitatis," remained the only indigenous element to represent the conquered in the presence of conquerors; and as all that still remained of civilization in the world was in the traditions, the bishops, who were the depositories of these, by necessity became the chiefs, often the arbiters also, and judges of the conquered; thus representatives before the conquerors, and finally the guardians of the remaining civilization. From which it appears clearly what advantages their authority over people acquired, how at one and the same time they found themselves not alone the priests, but also the administrators, the leaders, the judges, the representatives of the conquered, and the guardians of their civilization. But with the many invasions, with the various tribes that occupied the several regions of the Empire, the Roman unity was broken, and germs of new nationalities were sown. In the midst of these, however, remained the unity of the Church, which lived in the Papacy, in the Bishop of Rome, become not only the centre, but the head of the Church itself, its representative in the world; and this head was truly the father of the people, their defender, the apostle of justice, of morality; the depository of the civilization and science that still remained after the slaughter and invasion by the barbarians. To him the people had recourse; to him the bishops of all Christendom applied for advice and for aid. In reading those magnificent letters of Gregory the Great, one sees how noble, generous, humane, and tolerant the Papacy then was; how active the bishops then were in the cause of the people; and how beneficent, spontaneous, and truly legitimate was the power the bishops exercised in their dioceses, and the Pope in the Christian world. Power

that—great and legitimate in its nature—corresponded to the necessities and wants of the people; therefore they spontaneously were eager for its defence and its increase, and willingly put themselves under its supremacy. Such was then the true state of the Papacy at those times in which the people as voluntarily invoked the protection of the Church, as the Church eagerly came to the assistance of the people; and Rome above all, situated in the midst of them, possessing a numerous population and large territories in different countries, could more easily provide, with the riches of the provinces left intact, for the urgent wants of those who had been more fiercely despoiled.

III.

The power therefore of the Pope and of the bishops was much greater after the invasion of the barbarians—thanks to the liberal institution of the Church itself, because the bishop, as we have already said, had his origin in the principle of election, and in this election at first all the followers of the Church and the clergy took part; of this the precious letters of Gregory the Great, addressed particularly as they then were, at times to the clergy and the people, at times to the clergy, to the orders, and to the people, according as the municipal institutions had disappeared or still existed in spite of the invasion, give ample proofs. It was then a fundamental principle of the Church, that she should never impose upon the populations any prelate or authority whatsoever, unless such was chosen by themselves, or spontaneously acknowledged by them. Councils, bulls, briefs of the Popes, maintained and confirmed this principle a hundred times over, and repeated it for centuries; moreover, they threatened maledictions, anathemas, and excommunications against those who dared to oppose the liberty and free choice in the elections of bishops, who were thus not only virtually but really the chosen representatives of the people. They necessarily chose the man, the citizen, the ecclesiastic who was the most perfect, the wisest, the most virtuous, the most prudent among those who had shown themselves the most active, zealous, and generous for the public good. The bishops always lived in their diocese, amidst the people, sharing in all their necessities, in all their sufferings, in their desires, instincts, and progress. How then could any disagreement or strife take place between the clergy and people, between the Church and her believers, between the bishops and civilization? The Bishop of Rome, the Pope himself, was chosen by the popular voice and by that of the clergy; and his authority over the other bishops was only the influence of advice freely asked and freely accepted. All serious questions, whether

of dogma, of discipline, or of ecclesiastical constitution, were decided in council, and in these councils sat all the bishops, all the abbots—that is to say, the chosen deputies and emissaries of the Christian populations. Nor had the Pope any other authority beyond that of presiding over these councils, either in person or by his legates, and of proclaiming and insuring the execution of their decision. Certainly no government ever existed more free, no constitution larger or more democratic, at the same time wiser or more to be admired than that of the then Catholic Church. Such a system might be compared to a pyramid with a most extensive base formed of all the different nations, upon which rose up a narrow step, representing the clergy, then another and still narrower representing the bishops, from the union of which proceeded the council. On the top above the bishops the Pope formed the summit of the pyramid, but Pope, bishops, and clergy all equally chosen by the people, and therefore emanating directly from these their believers. Hence is a fact to be especially remarked, and which is confirmed by history, that notwithstanding all that is said of the great influence and power of the Pope over the people in the early days of the Middle Ages, the contrary proposition (as far as regards the Church at least) is proved—viz., the great power which the Christian population exercised over the Church, the Papacy, and Rome by means of their bishops. Moreover if even it appears that at any time the Popes exercised a predominating influence, it was only where they took on themselves the cause of the people, and therefore made themselves virtually their representatives, their advisers, their chiefs. Besides, it is but justice to remark that in those days this influence was always exercised to uphold morality and liberty.

From these observations upon the constitution of the Church, such as it existed in the early times up to the half of the Middle Ages, one fact is made evident—viz., that its dogmas, canons, institutions, and doctrines were the reflection and true expression of the convictions of all the Christian populations; and if by chance any one nation found at any time, in the universal and Catholic conception of the Church, any idea contradictory to their own individual and peculiar views, all found in it the cumulative expression of their tendencies, of their sentiments, and the type of universal civilization, from which it is manifest that no serious antithesis, no important difference could arise between the priesthood and the people, between the holy seat of power and the believers; and that painful state of things which we have described at the commencement of this examination was in the true constitution of the Church impossible, so admirable and wise were then her regulations. When the civilization

of a nation commenced to degenerate, it quickly found a remedy and curative assistance in the Œcumenical reunions of the other nations not contaminated with this evil, while at the same time the agreement between the different sections of the priesthood could not be disturbed, any more than that between the priesthood and the people.

How then has arisen the great discordance, the great divergence, of which we have already spoken, between the Holy Father and the Catholic Church, between the centre, so to speak, and the circumference?

It has arisen because, since the times of which we have been speaking, since the days of the true canonical constitution of the Church, such as we have described it, two great events which have changed greatly the condition of things, have occurred. The first is the introduction of a temporal power, of a territorial sovereignty as arrogated by the head of the Catholic Church; the other is the serious change made in the economy of the Church by the alteration in the elections of the bishops, by which has been brought about this revolution in all the relations between the clergy and the people, between the Church and society. To show clearly how these two events have exercised a fatal influence on the Catholic world, how they have thrown the Church into the most miserable condition, we must examine their historical development.

IV.

If all the bishops by the fact of their being chosen by the people were really the chiefs of these populations conquered by the barbarians, the Bishop of Rome was certainly doubly so, because of his greater dignity and his more extensive possessions, as well as because the people, being so far from their political head, which was transferred to Byzantium, knew not to whom else they should address themselves to demand assistance. Who does not know how the first Bishop of Rome, Leo the Great, that true representative of the people, set out in their defence against the terrible Attila? Who does not know the indefatigable zeal shown by Gregory the Great in the cause of the conquered Romans, and against the Longobards? It is a fact that at that period the Bishop of Rome was not only the ecclesiastical, but also the civil representative of the Romans: above all was he so when the weak and failing empire of the East was no longer able to protect them. The heresy of the Iconoclasts followed to divide the belief of the Romans and to destroy their fidelity to the Emperor of Byzantium; and Gregory the Second, then Gregory the Third, who united with the nobles and the municipality, were the first Pontiffs who

show us a kind of Roman Republic which was carried on under the auspices and supremacy of the Bishop of Rome; but no real territorial dominion over Rome was exercised by the Popes before the tenth or eleventh century; and even then it was more or less contested, more or less divided with the patricians of Rome, with some noble and powerful families which then sprang up, assisted at times by a German party, at times by one from Spoleto; and here we must, to be just, declare that never during the existence of the world has there been witnessed more baseness, more crime, more atrocities or infamous brutalities, than were practised at that time in the cause of the wretched ambition of temporal dominion!

Do we not find a wretched dissolute woman, Theodora, creating and deposing Popes at her will, then placing in the chair of St. Peter her lover John X. Again, a still more wretched woman, Marozia, sister of that other abandonded creature, also called Theodora, electing as Popes, Leo VI. and Stephen VII., both creatures of her own, and finally her own son John XI., born of her incestuous amours with another Pope, Sergius III. These are the glorious offsprings of that temporal power which forsooth we are told has been created by Providence for the necessities of the Church! Were there ever witnessed more vile and disgusting profanations than those of John XII.? And what more wretched creature could be found than that Octavianus, son of the patrician Albericus? What greater or more infamous cruelties than those of John XIII.? What crimes, what dissoluteness to equal those of Benedict IX., taking even the description given of them by the Pope Victor III.?

The present Bishop of Orleans, Mgr. Dupanloup, who has collected together all the most harsh expressions of the clerical vocabulary to stigmatize and anathematize the origin of Italian unity, which he has the pretension to accuse of deceit, falsehood, treason, and even of worse crimes, would, in his defence of the temporal power, have done much better had he employed his talents in examining this period of the history of that power, and in comparing it with that of the revival of the Italian kingdom. Even after repeating all the false and exaggerated accounts which he has been pleased to collect from the wretched and mendacious journals of the reactionary party, we think that the pen would fall from his hands if he attempted to recite the facts of that epoch of Papal history, which was nevertheless the commencement of the temporal power. We have not indeed the courage to stir up still further the filth of such hideous crimes, but that we may not appear to have exaggerated or misrepresented them, we give in a note the opinion of them written by one of the ardent apologists of the Papacy—Cardinal

Baronio—whose authority Mgr. Dupanloup will certainly not dare to contest.*

In the meantime, these horrors of Papal ambition for a miserable worldly possession brought the Church into the complete power of the Empire: of this we shall have to speak later. We must here still examine the extension of the domination of the temporal sovereignty of the Popes, which, in the beginning of the fifteenth century, no longer limited itself to Rome and to the patrimony of the Comtesse Matilde, called the patrimony of St. Peter, but extended itself to the Marches, to the Romagna, and even still further. And here we discover a fresh cycle of crimes, of atrocities, of treasons, of treachery, committed often under cover of the religion of those Popes who, it appears, it is now wished to declare infallible, and all through ambition for that temporal power which its supporters dare to declare not alone useful, but necessary to the Catholic Church.

Space would fail us even to try to enumerate all the events which led on the Popes to the conquests of these new provinces; but it is worth while to mention the sacrilegious assassination by the conspiracy of the Pazzi, perpetrated under the auspices of Sixtus IV., his nephew Cardinal Riario, and the Archbishop Saviati, being accomplices and conniving at it. It is sufficient to recal to memory the deeds of Cæsar Borgia, worthy son of that distinguished Pope Alexander VI.; the treasons and infamous acts of Clement VII., to put on the Papal throne his bastard Alexander; the vile doings of Pier Luigi Farnese, under cover of a sacrilegious brief of Paul III. Besides, no one is ignorant of the conquests of Valentino, who, assisted and defended by the arms of Julius II., gave the Marches and the Romagna to the Pope; and for which provinces, now that they are taken back, the cry of sacrilege is raised, though the inhabitants, tired of that wretched yoke wished to free themselves from it. Yet, after all this, we still find apologists of the Popes as kings, partisans of Papal Infallibility, ready to apotheosize those monsters who under the tiara be-

* Cardinal Baronio expresses himself as follows:—"Qua tunc facies sancta Ecclesia et Romana, cum Romæ dominantur potentissimæ ac sordidissimæ meretrices? Quarum arbitrio mutantur sedes darentur Episcopi, et quod auditu horrendum et infandum est, intruderentur in Sedem Petri earum aurati pseudopontifices, qui non sunt, nisi ad consignanda tantum tempora, in catalogo Romanorum pontificum scripti. Quis enim à scortis hujusmodi intrusos sine lege, legitimos dicere possit Romanos fuisse Pontifices? Nusquam cleri eligentis vel postea consentientis aliqua mentio: canones omnes pressi silentio, decreta Pontificum suffocata, proscripta antiquæ traditiones cæterasque in eligendo summo pontifice consuetudines sacrique ritus et pristinus usus prorsus extincti. Sic vendicaverunt omnia sibi *libido sæculari potentia freta insaniens æstro percita dominandi.*"

soiled the Papacy, Italy, and civilization. But it is more important to put before the world, in a satisfactory manner, the changes which this wretched territorial possession brought about in the condition of the Church; and this we will do, with historical proofs, without party spirit, and with no other object than to declare the truth.

It appears then that there were three principal changes which this constitution of the temporal power brought upon the Church, upon the Papacy, and all its relations, either with the Catholic world or with civilized society.

When once this territorial possession was established in Italy, it was considered necessary, if not by law, at least as a logical consequence, that for the future the Pope should always be an Italian. We will not inquire how far this decision is compatible with the belief that attributes to the Holy Spirit the choice of the Popes; but we will state, as this is an historical fact, that by this change the Papacy, whose seat is in the centre of Italy, exposed to all the events of Italian politics—living an Italian life actuated by Italian civilization—lost entirely its cosmopolitan character of Catholic and universal. The Pontiff abjured, at least in principle, that character which Roman Catholicism alone had known how to preserve—that of being independent of every national and local contingency; of representing the ideal of the universal reason and civilization of all the Catholic populations; of being the highest model, the purest expression of the sentiments of humanity.

Instead of that, the Pope incarnated himself in Italy, identified himself with the Italian civilization; and as it unfortunately, towards the close of the fifteenth century and the commencement of the sixteenth, entered on that period of semi-Paganism, semi-Christianism—of the fairest, though at the same time the deepest and most destructive moral corruption, the Roman Court was totally invaded, absorbed, and infected by it, and thus the reigns of Sixtus IV., Alexander VI., Julius II., Leo X., Clement VII., though marking the period most brilliant in art and literature, were still at the same time those of the freest and basest immorality. And this corruption, which certainly neither the Italian people, nor the other Latin races that aspired to the Italian civilization, were ashamed of, appeared an intolerable plague-spot to the people of the north and west of Europe, who, tired of crying in vain for reform, for a Council, finally rebelled from the Papacy, which thereby lost about a third of its believers.

But we will leave the apologists of the temporal power of the Popes to sing hosannas in praise of the Pope-King, since the first fruits of this temporal dominion was the Reformation and the terrible schism of the sixteenth century.

The Papacy thus made itself of Italian nationality, and was not ashamed (though the contradiction of terms was evident) to call itself at one and the same time Catholic and Roman. But the temporal power not only made it Italian, but also partly laical, or at least, introduced into the Church foreign elements, which corrupted and spoiled its admirable regulations. In fact, the body of prelates—the cardinals—who represented the disciples of Christ, were no longer furnished, for the greater part, from among the ministers of the Church, but from the high dignitaries and officers of the State; and one saw, as one can still see, the Apostles represented, the Church directed, and the Popes chosen by and from among men whose only merit was to have administered the policy of the little Roman State—to have commanded its army, or directed its treasury and finances. How it is that so many ecclesiastics who have the courage to call themselves upholders of this power are not scandalized at these profanations, is a fact we are not able to understand or explain!

But the necessities of the temporal power did not limit itself to these profanations. The resources of the small territory were not sufficient, for the Popes now become chiefs, or for their importance. Necessitated by the smallness of the revenues and by their great undertakings, either from personal vanity or from worldly love for their families, the Popes commenced to sell the employments, offices, and dignities of the State; they sold the cardinalships; they sold even the indulgences: and it is known to all how this last excess was the one that drove the proud Monk of Wittenberg to raise up the standard of separation. How was it possible then when the Pope-Kings took part in all the wars—in all the temporal events, in all the strifes of ambition—taking advantage, without scruple, of all the worldly power of their pontifical authority, that they should be allowed by the emperors to have free exercise of an authority which they so unworthily abused for their temporal profit? All the powers then armed themselves (and this was the third change produced by the temporal power) against the Church, with all possible restrictions; and it is (as Ranke observes) an indubitable fact that, in proportion as the temporal power of the Popes was extended, so much greater was the resistance they met with in the exercise of their spiritual authority. An argument, as all must feel, powerful indeed wherewith to defend the temporal dominion of the Church of God!

And how, in truth, could it be otherwise? The Pope himself now become a prince, sacrificed thousands of times the most sacred interests of the Church to some unworthy ambitious project. We could fill volumes with examples of this, but one example will be sufficient. Pope Clement VII., with the

sole object of his princely interests, makes a league in 1526 against Charles V. and Ferdinand of Austria, who had assembled the Diet at Spires against the Protestants, and who, being attacked near Milan by the Pope, were obliged to make peace with the former; and the Concordat of Spires was the first act which recognised the legal existence of the Protestants. Later that volatile and unstable Pontiff, having again made an alliance with Francis I., and by this means indirectly allied with the Protestants of the North, obliged Ferdinand to make the peace of Kadan, and thus secured the definitive triumph of Protestantism in Germany. It was really the destiny of this temporal power to destroy the Catholic Church.

Clement VII., ally for the first time with Francis I. of France, endeavoured to induce Henry VIII. of England to join them, holding out hopes (though he never made an actual promise) of granting him a divorce from Catherine; later he threw himself, by the treaty of Barcelona, into the arms of Charles V. (1528), who was the nephew of Catherine, and refused the divorce to Henry VIII. Clement, it is true, secured by this unworthy treaty that the same army, in great part formed of Lutherans who had sacked Rome, should march into his country and restore the possession of it to him; but Henry revolted from the Catholic Church, and thus was lost for ever to Catholicism his fine kingdom and its future colonies. Therefore it is evident and manifest that the first element and cause of dissidence between the Papacy and its followers, was certainly the temporal power assumed by the Popes. In fact, the Papacy, instead of Catholic, made itself local; or at least contingencies, local and foreign to the Church, powerfully intervened in its constitution and in the decisions of Rome. A laical interest invaded, and often dominated it, and induced the Papacy to act precisely in the sense most contrary to the true interests of the Church. A logical opposition thus existing between the principles and actions of the Papacy and of the Church, how can any one be astonished that its consequences should be discord and separation between the Court of Rome and its followers?

V.

But another cause of dissent we find to be the change in the economy—the disturbance of the regulations of the Church. These, in fact, founded at the commencement on popular election, held always to the moral, intellectual, and material interests of the people. The grateful populations came from all parts to enrich, extend, and render powerful the Catholic Church. besides, while so much wealth—so much power—was accumu-

lated in the hands of the bishops, barbarian conquerors and chiefs became in their turn Christians; and, as is natural, endeavoured to possess themselves of the bishoprics, which often, on account of the lands which they occupied, had assumed the nature of fiefs. And here also the lands, the fiefs, as we see with the temporal power of the Pontiffs, became the principal object, and the Church and Christian episcopacy the accessories. Whence arose a complete change in the elections and in the characters of the bishops, who, now chosen by the king or emperors, and by them invested with the fief, assumed a secular and warlike position, far different from the Christian disposition and nature. The Church therefore, and especially that in Germany, was invaded by the feudal and laical power, and by the interference of the sovereigns, the populations lost the exercise of their electoral rights, and the bishops all true independence. The Pontificate itself was invaded by the imperial power which, under the Othos, and afterwards under the first emperors of the Salic dynasty, arrogated to themselves the right not only of approving of, but even of designating the new Pontiff; and this too with the high approval of the most holy bishops: so shameless was the simony—so criminal the abuses—that the temporal power had introduced into the elections of the Popes. Catholicism, the Church, Catholic unity, the Papacy—all would have gone to ruin with this invasion of the Empire had there not arisen that prodigy of a man, that genius, Gregory VII., to redeem the Papacy and the clergy. This great and pious Pontiff proposed two courses—the reformation of the episcopate and of the clergy, and the emancipation of them from the imperial power, which, by controlling their elections, falsified their character. That which two centuries later the feudal monarchs, assisted by the inhabitants of the burghs and communes, achieved by the repression of the baronial abuses, Gregory VII. accomplished for the Church; assisted by the populations and the inferior clergy he put down the simoniacal and wicked episcopacy.

That was not then a strife between the Papacy and the people, but between the populations united with the Papacy, and the corrupt simoniacal bishops united with the Emperor. And this strife, undertaken and conducted by the monk Hildebrand, by the chief of the Church during four Pontificates, and prolonged through his own, was the cause of wars, slaughters, and misfortunes, until in 1222 it was arranged at Worms by the Pragmatic of Calixtus, confirmed by the Lateran Council of 1223, which again solemnly sanctioned the election of the bishops being again made by the people and clergy.

The Church thus again re-ordained, it appeared as though

peace and perfect harmony ought to be re-established with the observance of the canonical dispositions. Unfortunately Clement VII., who had so manfully fought in order to "render to God what belonged to God," did not think of "rendering to Cæsar what belonged to Cæsar," while he put an end to this abusive temporal power, which had already brought the Church to the edge of the precipice. On the other hand, the Pope, conqueror and more powerful after this struggle, retained in his own hands the power of sometimes choosing the bishops, thus deviating from the canonical method of the clergy and of the people, by the famous "riserve," by means of which the Popes, especially those of Avignon, in order to aid their political power, took to falsifying the elections of the bishops. It was Clement V. and John XXII. who endeavoured to take the electoral right from the clergy and the people. Then came times less favourable to popular rights in Europe, times in which the Papacy, for the increase and defence of its temporal power, had need of the assistance of the absolute Kings, as we have already seen above; and then the liberties of the Church, the right of the people to choose their own spiritual chiefs, were the price of the shameful barterings between the Pope and Kings. The concordat between Leo X. and Francis I. at Bologna was the first example, followed quickly in all other places, except (we must particularly call to notice) by the episcopacies of the Rhine, of some parts of the North, and of Switzerland, where if not the people, at least the Chapters, with the Councils of the Fabric, performed the elections. And so far was this vile profanation of the Church carried, this abuse by the Popes and the Kings, that the Schismatic Emperor of Russia chose by agreement the bishops of Poland; and the Protestant King of Holland, before the revolution of 1830, selected the Catholic bishops of Belgium. Such being the present condition of things by the constitution of the episcopacy, it is easy to see what serious changes have been wrought in the Church. She has indeed broken off all direct relation with laymen; she is no more that Church defined in the catechism of Bellarmine as the "union of all the believers," but rather the union of certain individuals chosen by the Catholic and even anti-Catholic Courts, and named by the Pope to fill the offices of bishops over populations who rarely know even the man sent to be their pastor, or frequently know him only to detest his maxims and to oppose his principles. Presented by the Courts, these bishops are no longer the representatives of virtue, science, and morality, but often, especially in these later ages, infected with corruption, are rather the representatives of favouritism, of flattery, if not also of the most deplorable servility and condescension to the shameless disorders of Court life. What

liberty then can these bishops enjoy, what communion of ideas, of sentiments, or of principles with the populations entrusted to their care, who are always seeking to shake off the yoke of despotism and cast to the ground these shameless ignominies? If the Papal power is the most influential in the nomination of bishops, or perhaps arrogates it to itself altogether, what else can they represent except Ultramontanism and Romanism?—maxims and principles which are thus named because they are not in any degree participated in by the Catholic populations. The introduction therefore of the temporal power, and the usurpation of the election of the bishops, made to the detriment of the clergy and people, are certainly the two principal causes of the differences, of the separations, between the Pope and the believers, between the episcopacy, at least in many places, and the Catholic populations, between the ideas of the clergy and the tendencies and principles of the civilization of the people. In the past ages the popular power was so weak, that the people easily accommodated themselves to the absolute powers, and Rome herself was so moderate in her pretensions, that this dissidence, which at first existed in the sentiments only, quietly paved the way for the subversion of the institutions, and never appeared too evidently on the exterior, until fresh revolutions, especially political ones, intervened to exasperate and alter this condition of things.

VI.

Before the great French Revolution the episcopacy and the clergy, although they did not emanate from the people directly, were everywhere inspired more or less by the ideas, sentiments, and principles of the age. Thus, before even the Revolution broke out a party of the clergy showed itself inclined to accept those of its principles which—be it understood—were the most allied to Christianism. Every one knows how the French Revolution burst out into every kind of disorder and horror, and how therefore it was impossible, not only for the clergy, but even for any believer to follow it in its many evolutions. From that epoch commenced a certain contradiction between the principles of the new civilization and the Church, an antipathy more or less open, an antithesis sufficiently evident.

With the restoration of 1815, the clergy loaded with favours and dignities, and the Pope unexpectedly restored to temporal power, made common cause with the reaction, upholding the principles of absolutism, of divine right, of legitimacy, and of all their consequences. These principles were the cause of later revolutions; first, that of July in France, then that of Belgium, that of Poland, and that of the Roman States. The Church

lost nothing by the first, gained largely by the second and third; but after the revolution of the Roman States, Gregory XVI., to save the temporal power, threw himself into the hands of Austria and Russia, and, to oblige these powers, issued the famous letter to the Polish bishops against that fine nation, risen up in arms to emancipate itself and the Church, and published the encyclical letter against the press, religious tolerance, liberty of conscience, and free thought.

But that movement which had agitated France, communicated itself little by little to all the Latin and Catholic nations, which, in all directions, driving away the patrimonial and absolute dynasties, proclaimed liberty. What had the Church and the Papacy to fear from these movements? The regeneration and emancipation of the Latin races, and of Catholicism which was united to their destiny. Instead, it was a degradation of the Latin civilization in comparison with that of Germany, which in the sixteenth century produced the Reformation. What frenzy then could have induced the Papacy to repudiate the Catholic people, to speak ill of them, to continue to unite itself with the old and fallen dynasties? It had a temporal policy to defend, and feared that liberty, civilization, and progress would take it away, or diminish it; for this reason it cursed and excommunicated all civil liberty, denied all progress, which is the immutable human rule granted by God, and consistent with human reason. There was only one power in Italy which was able with its soldiery to keep the people in bounds. With this power the Pope conspired to the detriment of the Italians, and allied himself to Russia and Prussia—both anti-Catholic powers—for the ruin of the Latin nations and that of their institutions. Thus, by the successive evolutions of time, the Papacy has placed itself in open strife with science, with the progress of the Catholic people, with their sentiments, their principles, and their governments. And thus we find explained this profound dissidence, which has been the subject of these observations, and which is, above all, the effect of that fatal temporal dominion—the curse of the Church, and the future abyss of the Papacy.

VII.

By following such a system as this, it is so evident that the ruin of the Catholic Church and faith must result, that we are at a loss to understand how the Roman Court, left to itself, and with the usual moderation of the Italian character, and particularly that of Rome, could have allowed itself to go to these excesses. But the Rome of to-day is no longer that of days gone by; allied to all the fallen dynasties, follower of their ways, it retrograded in every particular, it adopted every device of the most exagge-

rated reaction, and has no longer any real vitality, except such as it gleans from the hopes of legitimacy, from the conspiracies of the absolute party, and from the illusive dreams of restoration. First of all, after the formation of the Italian Kingdom, a crowd of strangers flocked to Rome, and with their funds and by means of subscriptions on the part of the believers of different parts of the world, they maintain the expense of the Papacy, and of that army which is so disproportionate, and out of all harmony with the extent of the present Pontifical dominions, as also with the sacred character of the principality. These persons it is that now defend Rome by their arms, ready, as they have shown by their deeds on many occasions, to shed their blood for her, and use all their influence to aid her; their passions and fanaticism it is which govern and direct Rome and inspire the Roman Court. Rome is no longer the asylum of charity, the centre of religion, of pardon, and of love, the abode of the Pontiff—the humble head of the Church of Christ. Rome is become the rock of absolutism, the fortress of ancient and worn-out doctrines, the nest of all the conspiracies against the liberty of the people and against constitutional governments. At Rome it is no longer a question of Sacraments, but of Zouaves; not of devout processions, but of military reviews; not of charity, but of vengeance; not of proselytes, but of conquest. Of what value is Christian humility and evangelical poverty? Where is there any more the thought for the souls or for the salvation of the people? Ah! indeed, at present they occupy themselves there with very different objects: their occupation is the defence of this last asylum of absolutism and the fallen dynasties; and with the assistance of the clergy, and, if necessary, even at the sacrifice of the Church, to overthrow the modern principles, to upset the liberal governments, subvert the institutions, and thus reproduce the rule of the privileged classes, and of the enthusiasts who flock to Rome to make common cause with the Jesuits, expelled from everywhere else, and of whom probably they themselves were (if not more closely connected) at all events ardent followers.

Such then is Rome of the present day. Unhappily a large number of the Catholic clergy of Europe, and especially in France, are following the same path. The clergy before the Revolution had the privileges of immunity, and formed an important moral body in the State, and therefore found it to their interest to protect the State and its independence of Rome, whence came the Gallicanism which was for so many years the distinctive glory of the clergy of France and was the just cause of its popularity. Unfortunately, the Republic first, and the Empire afterwards, took to depriving the clergy of all their independence, of all liberty, and reduced them to the position of salaried

functionaries. From that time the clergy directed their attention to other countries—to Rome—to have some protection against the government of their country, especially after the fall of the elder branch of the Bourbons. Thus we find an explanation of the exaggerated Ultramontanism which has taken such hold of the clergy of France, especially of the bishops, and which expresses itself in the solemn abjuration of the principles of Gallicanism. Now, especially these bishops, these fanatics of the French clergy, ignorant of their traditions, often not too deeply versed in the true theological doctrines of their creed, with that excitability which characterizes their nation, have morally invaded Rome, and govern and direct it together with those reactionary laymen described above.

Under such auspices then, urged on by the fierceness of the reactionists, after the political triumph attained in France, and that on the battle-field of Mentana, the Roman Court ordained the solemn meeting of a Council to deliberate on the religious and social changes of the present day. What are we to expect will be the result of it? What can we prophesy this extraordinary assembly will decide on?

VIII.

If the Catholic episcopacy was what it ought canonically to be, that is, the result of election by the people and the clergy, every one would agree that the decisions of the Œcumenical Council thus assembled could not be otherwise than the emanation of the sentiments, of the opinions and ideas of all the Catholic populations, the personification of religious reasoning, the result of universal civilization as commonly exercised, and directed to the solution of those problems and of those difficulties which the new political and social conditions have caused in the relations between the Church and the people. We must therefore only congratulate ourselves, and take comfort from the hope that the evil influence of local feeling will be kept within bounds by the judgment of the general world; and that the exaggerated tendencies of Ultramontanism will be corrected by the more temperate and prudent ones of the universal Church; that the ardent, worldly, and warlike passions introduced by the temporal ambition and the unfortunate possession of a principality, will be nullified by Christian charity and by the evangelical principles which condemn riches, worldly possessions, and political domination in the successors of the Apostles.

We have now shown sufficiently how the institutions of the Church have been completely falsified, its intimate structure altogether destroyed; the doctrine of the bishops quite altered;

and thus the entire edifice uprooted from its base. We now have shown what Rome is, and that there the question is no longer a religious but a political one; that there one cannot find reasonable and temperate men, free from the excesses of human passions, with whom to discuss, but the most exaggerated and those the least actuated by Christian feelings that the Catholic reaction possesses. For nearly twenty years now the most fanatical writers of the *Civilta Cattolica* continue to falsify all the soundest and most ancient doctrines of the Church, and still prepare and detail with all those artifices for which the sons of Loyola are so famous, that cumulation of absurdity, to which the common sense and universal reason of all the Catholic nations refuse to give credence. It is not only the *Civilta Cattolica*, though now become an official *Moniteur* of the Papacy and a Catholic institution, that reveals these tendencies. During the last twenty years, under the continual inspiration of the Jesuits, all the bulls, briefs, allocutions, encyclicals, issued from Rome, have been so many steps made in the path of Papal absolutism, so many declarations towards the abjuration and denial of human science and reason, of the progress of the people, of the civilization of the age. After the famous Syllabus, what can be expected from the Roman Court? That Rome should all at once unsay and deny herself, refute all she has till now so solemnly advanced and declared? If even she would wish to do so, it would be impossible, for a like palinode would be fatal to the principles of her authority; and on this principle it is that is based all the influence that she exercises in the world. Therefore such a course would be a moral suicide for the Roman Court. And can we for a moment suppose that it was with this intention that Rome summoned an Œcumenical Council? Such an hypothesis would be absurd: hence it is quite evident for all who do not willingly delude themselves, that the Roman Court hopes by means of the Council to make some still further step in the path already entered on, as it hopes to have the steps it has already taken sanctioned by the patronage and approved of an Œcumenical Council. It is true they have already put forth the proposition not only of having the principles of the Syllabus confirmed, but, to cut short the entire subject, they have ventured even to speak of "Infallibility," or as the Jesuits of the *Civilta Cattolica* please to say of the "Indefectibility" (*Indefettibilita*) of the Pope. This proposition is so serious and contrary to the universal feeling, that we cannot for a moment even imagine it can be received by the Council. We do not intend certainly to discuss here the theological value of such a proposition, but the intention alone manifested by the *Civilta Cattolica*, of presenting it to the Council, reveals to

us what early progress in the path of despotism is being made at Rome. Had the supposition alone of such a proposition been made to our fathers or to our ancestors, even to ourselves thirty years ago, who can doubt how great and unanimous would have been the cry of indignation and reproval raised up throughout the whole of Europe against such profane innovators, who would thus dare to pervert, to exaggerate the Catholic doctrines, and render them hostile to the world and difficult to believe or to defend.

The better to convince ourselves of the gravity and importance of this proposition, let us call to mind what we have already stated regarding the admirable primitive constitution of the Church, when we represented it as a pyramid whose extensive base was formed of all the believing populations, and which mounted up in a gradually decreasing system to its top, represented by the Pope. We see what efforts have been made to falsify this fair structure; but now it is worse. They are endeavouring tacitly to upset, to turn head over heels, the entire pyramid, and with the dexterity of a mountebank (excuse the vulgarity of the expression), to make the pyramid stand on its apex; they are endeavouring to declare that the Church is no longer the union of all the faithful, as the Catechism teaches us, but that the Church is the Pope, with about the same amount of truth as Louis XIV. formerly said, "La France c'est moi." But Louis XIV. pronounced this saying, which has since cost his descendants the throne, in an age in which the world still held to monarchical institutions and unlimited absolutism. But how could the Pontiff, yielding to the counsels of the Jesuits, offer so strange and monstrous a proposition at the present day, when the democratic spirit is in full development in the midst of the triumphs of civil liberty? What we have hitherto said will suffice to prove what are the tendencies and the motives with which the Roman Court has convened the Council, the hopes it has founded thereon, and the benefits it expects to gain thereby. What probability is there then that these tendencies should be opposed or contradicted by the Fathers who will attend it? or that this Council will tend to a true and wholesome reform of the Church? The moral and intellectual qualities of the bishops who assist at this Council cannot certainly be all similar; the French episcopacy, from its central position in Europe, or from its belonging to the most powerful Catholic nation, as well as from the prominent part taken by France in the late political events of Italy, and particularly in those of Rome, is most likely to hold the most important position. Now what is the attitude that will be taken by the French episcopacy? Unfortunately the

action exercised by it until now leaves us but little illusion on this point. We have found chiefly among its members enthusiastic partisans of the ruin of the Church of God and of the temporal power; we have seen them, forgetful of all dignity and charity, accumulate without limits reproaches, injuries, calumnies, diatribes, often eloquent it is true, but unjust, false, and vulgar, against Italy, against the Italians and their Government. We have seen them not alone the advocates of slaughter, of wars, of vengeance, but forgetting their sacred character become the collectors of recruits, and even lower themselves in the exercise of those practices, to the vile calculations and speculations of commercial men. We have seen them at one time flatterers, and later violent enemies of their own Government according as their private interests urged them. We have seen them abjure all personality, all national character, and remain lost in that Ultramontanism in which they distinguish themselves only by the virulence and violence of their professions. When the Syllabus appeared, what voice was raised up by the episcopacy to declaim against the falseness of its declarations? One alone that we are aware of; the eloquent voice of the Bishop of Orleans, who with the greatest talent undertook to interpret and to explain the most fallacious of the propositions of the Syllabus, to prolong a little its ambiguity and what was difficult to understand, and what after the last clear explanations of Rome, is an immoral deception of the public. There are, it is true, among the French clergy eminent men, learned and temperate, who see and feel what ruin is preparing for the Church with these exaggerations; but mild doctrines, just and equitable ones, are not conformable to the nature of the French people; the remarkable work of the Bishop of Sura, as well as the excellent letter of Padre Giacinto, form an exception, a protest, though of little influence on the march of events.

Therefore we are of opinion that the French episcopacy is more likely to precipitate than to retard Rome in the downward course in which she has placed herself, and at the bottom of which lies complete discord between Rome and the believers, between the Church and the people. We know but little of Spanish episcopacy; and we must confess that an episcopacy chosen under the influence of a "Sor Patrocinio," "Un Padre Claret," and of a Court which was the receptacle of every turpitude, is not calculated to inspire us with much confidence. But this we will maintain in defence of the Spanish episcopate, that it is altogether a national one, and would never separate itself from the interests of its country to please Rome, and we do not think it would easily renounce its own personality in favour of the idol of Ultramontanism. Their colleagues beyond the sea

in Southern America give us less hope, if we are to judge from the acts of the Mexican episcopate, either in the days of Juarez or in those of the unfortunate Maximilian, who certainly went to Mexico at their intercession and in their defence. The letters of Pio IX. to the bishops of the other republics, and the concordats made during this Pontificate, show us the tendencies of those regions. There is no doubt that the Italian episcopacy, by the number of its seats, by the theological knowledge possessed by its members, by the traditions of that temperance and prudence so conformable to the Italian character, would be able even alone to keep head against this exaggerated Ultramontanism; and it gives us pleasure to think that the greater part of the bishops of Italy look with sincere regret on this rupture, this dissidence between the Pope and society, between the Church and State. Unhappily the Italian bishops chosen, often expressly from among the most humble and pacific priests, disturbed also by the political changes which have destroyed the dynasties upon which they depended, have neither the conviction sufficiently strong, nor the character sufficiently ardent, to defend those liberal principles, the study of which the society they live in has certainly never proposed to them as the only ones able to save the Church and the faith in Italy. There remains then, and among the most important, the episcopacy of the Rhine and of Germany, the only one that amidst so much want of spirit and moral prostration, has shown any courage, and at the same time moderation equal to the occasion; the only one that amidst so much ignorance among the other episcopacies, has retained to any extent the theological science and ancient traditions of the Church. But of what use is this opposition, even though it should be able to persuade the Council to adopt the most advanced decisions and opinions. The present condition of the Catholic Church is such that it is no longer a question of an attenuation, of a subterfuge in the decisions of the Council. It must be a complete change in the direction of the Papacy and of the Church, or an inevitable struggle between it and society. What hope can we sincerely entertain that the Council will attempt such a change, when we well know the feelings entertained by the Papacy who convokes it and who presides over it, and when we well know what are the tendencies of the greater part of the bishops who will there deliver their opinions? Can we expect the Papacy to disbelieve—to unsay itself, or that the episcopacy, the greater number of whom are so yielding and subservient to it, will suddenly turn against what they have hitherto not only supported with silent consent, but even have appeared to approve? It is impossible to cherish such illusions, and therefore we can hope for no good from this

Council, which will either leave things as they are, or by giving the weight of its authority to all or part of the enormities for which during the last thirty years, the Papal bulls and allocutions have been so famous, will make them far worse.

IX.

This solemn confirmation given by a Council to the exaggerated opinions of Rome, or taking the more favourable view even, this prolongation of the dissidence between religion and civilization, cannot continue very long without being the cause of serious consequences to the Catholic nations. To form any correct opinion on this question we must examine into its true condition at the present time.

It is an undoubted historical fact, that from about thirty years ago a constant, an irresistible tendency towards the principles of liberty—towards elective and democratic institutions, as well as towards all that is called progress of modern civilization—has manifested itself among the Catholic nations, and especially among those of the Latin race; and it was a most unfortunate circumstance that the dynasties so called legitimate, or of divine or patrimonial right, should have opposed these tendencies; whence have followed those commotions among the Italian race which, instead of taking the peaceful type of well-organized reforms, have been obliged to assume that of revolution. More unfortunate still was it to see the Papacy, and with it the highest dignitaries among the clergy, remain allied to these dynasties, to the ancient principles of absolutism and reaction, and opposed to all the more moderate and generous ideas of the people. Worse still was it when the Roman Court, making itself *solidaire* with the dynasties of divine right and with the retrograde parties, threw religion into a strife altogether political, and opposed it to all the enlightenment of modern reason, to the inevitable progress and development of humanity, against the true interest—material, intellectual, and moral—of humanity. It was a fatal blindness, or rather the unfortunate result to the Papacy of the possession of that wretched temporal dominion. Therefore we see that at present there exists among the Italian nations two opposite currents—one liberal, having its origin in the middle class and people, and which is the result of science, civilization, of intellectual and moral progress among the people themselves; the other foreign to them, sprung from Rome, and conspiring with the privileged class, by means of the bishops and of the clergy, to sustain the old dynasties and the decrepit institutions. To what end has tended this opposition of the Papacy? What advantage has it gained from the war it has waged against

liberty? It is an undeniable fact that in no one place has the opposition of Rome succeeded in preventing the triumph of it. It is a fact that in France, in Spain, in Portugal, in the Southern States of America, in Italy, in Austria, everywhere in fact, the most liberal political principles have triumphed; and that almost everywhere by means of public opinion alone they have passed into the laws and institutions of the country. It is a fact that, in spite of the protests and anathemas of Rome, the principles of equality before the laws, of free and liberal instruction, of civil matrimony, have been adopted; everywhere has been admitted and largely practised, that so much and vainly cursed and imprecated freedom of the press and freedom of discussion; and these principles even form the legal base of the governments of all the Catholic nations. There is a second fact equally undeniable; it is, that all the Catholic nations, in comparison with the non-Catholic ones, and especially with the Protestants, are in a state of the most evident moral as well as political and civil inferiority. Compare, for example, Catholic Ireland with Protestant England; compare the Catholic populations of South America with the Protestant ones of the North and of the United States; Austria with Prussia; the Catholic with the Protestant cantons of Switzerland, and everywhere we find the same result, everywhere the same manifest superiority on one side and inferiority on the other.

It is useless to say that this result arises from the difference of the races that profess Protestantism and those that profess Catholicism; in Switzerland as well as in Germany we have the same race, as well also as those inhabiting under the same meridian; and those now are inferior to Protestants who before the change of religion made this difference between them, were far superior to them.

That the true cause of this inferiority is the repression exercised by the Papacy and the principles inculcated by it, is evident from the fact, that the more the nations show themselves obedient to, and keep themselves subservient to the principles taught by Rome, the lower they fall in morality, science, and civilization. Compare, for instance, the condition of Spain, so devoted hitherto to Rome, with that of France. Take the wretched populations of South America, so obedient and servile to all the dictates of the Roman Court, and compare them with the Portuguese, now more independent, though still Catholics, and we find the same result—viz., the inferiority of those most devoted to Rome. And should one of these nations attempt to raise itself from this state of inferiority to place itself in the path of civilization, it is certain immediately to meet with opposition from Rome, the enmity and anathema of the Roman Court

All the Catholic nations have in their turn experienced it. Piedmont, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Mexico, and finally Austria, twice brought to serious trouble by her fidelity, her devotion to Rome, by her consenting to the principles of the Roman Court, and on both occasions regenerating herself by her alliance with the principles of liberty, progress, and modern civilization. Wherever Rome exercises her influence, wherever her doctrines are received, there we find the same results of corruption, of perdition, of ruin for the populations and nations who submit to her. It is a deplorable and dispiriting fact for Catholics, still it is useless to hide it; on the contrary, it is more profitable to make it the subject of deep study. One must in fact imagine that some pestiferous and deadly principle is concealed in these doctrines, seeing they have such lamentable results. Nor will it certainly occur to any one that the evil must exist in the difference of dogmas and doctrines, for those were in vigour prior even to the sixteenth century, when the Christian nations progressed with equal advances in the path of civilization. It was just at that period of the strife against the Reformation, and as an argument of opposition to it, that Jesuitism had its origin, and with it the fatal principle of passive and blind obedience—a principle which once introduced into the Church quickly invaded and dominated all Catholic society; and difficult would it be to find one more pernicious, corruptive, and ruinous. It is in fact the abnegation of the very principle of liberty and of morality, the repudiation of all conscience, which is one of the fairest fruits of Christianity, and the abandonment of every sentiment of dignity, of grandeur, and even of human personality.

It was the contrary principle, the principle of free examination (in all, at all events, that was within the reach of human reason), the principle of individual responsibility, and therefore of rational and active obedience, that prevailed in Protestantism; and in accordance to it are formed all the institutions, all the governments, society, and civilization of the Protestant populations. And this difference is more than sufficient to explain the different destinies, the different development, intellectual as well as moral, and the different condition of the two civilizations. And truly what other means do the Catholic populations make use of in raising themselves to freedom?—is it not by abjuring the principle of blind obedience, by revendicating the sacred rights of the intellect and of reason in human institutions, in order upon this base to form a new society? But even in this attempt to regenerate themselves the Catholic populations meet with the pernicious action of the principles of the Roman Court and Papacy—we see in fact how from this centre comes forth an opposition, a strife, an adverse current of action, which by

means of the episcopacy, and by religious influence, endeavours to annul and destroy the other strong movement which, originated by the classes of laymen and by the people, urges on society towards liberal institutions and towards progress. By this double influence are all the Catholic populations kept in more or less agitation even now at the time we write; and it can be easily understood how injurious this agitation must be to religion and morality on the one hand, and to liberal institutions and society on the other; so true it is that in almost all Catholic countries we find that the most active, ardent, and generous part of the populations, irritated by this injurious clerical opposition, have abjured religious belief, and now, even those feelings of morality which in Catholic countries are imparted by the clergy, or at least by religious instruction. Another part, and this the weakest, the least energetic of the nations, being kept in dread and fear of shame, and altogether in the hands of the clergy, causes, not by its interventions but by its abstention, so great an injury to the country as to leave it in the power of the greatest adventurers.

A third party, however, has fortunately been formed among the Catholic nations, a party devoted to liberty, to the institutions of the country, and at the same time not opposed to, but often most strongly allied to its religion and to the faith—viz., the party of Catholic Liberals, which have always tried and hoped to conciliate those two principles which in other Christian Churches have been for many ages and still are maintained. But this party, the only one which could have offered a successful solution to the actual difficulties, is the party the most opposed, the most ferociously obstructed by the Roman Court of late years, although it has in France so strenuously fought the cause of the Church, and even that of the temporal power. However, after the Syllabus even this party could not consider itself condemned canonically, since for all the Catholics who have not abjured the true theological traditions, the decrees of Rome have no definitive authority. And now comes the Council, and if this confirms the well-known enormities of the Roman Court, nothing else remains to the Liberal Catholics than either to deny the faith as sanctioned by the Council, or to renounce all liberty—that is, to pass over to one of two extreme parties above-mentioned.

X.

Such then is the true state of the Catholic nations; everywhere the principle of liberty, of progress, and of modern civilization has triumphed in the State and in the Government. Everywhere the head of the Church has condemned these prin-

ciples, and almost everywhere the majority of the bishops more or less openly hold with the Pope, although often more from the effect of the Catholic discipline than from true conviction. The devotion of the clergy to the principles of Rome is certainly much less, and even many of them adhere altogether to the people and to modern civilization.

What then, under such a condition of things, will be the definitive state of Catholicism? What will be the end of this strife between it and society? In a word, what is our opinion on the future of Catholicism?

In order the better to answer such a question, we prefer to pass in review the different solutions which can present themselves, and which in fact are advanced and upheld by one or other party; and then by criticising each to judge more or less of the probable success. And the first that offers itself to our view is the theocratic solution—that patronized by Rome, by the Jesuits, and by all the reactionary party of Europe; this is the conversion, the subjection of the Catholic world to the new decrees, to the new canons, to the famous Syllabus, the return to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. We confess that one would require a very strong faith in some unknown and mystical principles to believe in such a retrogression, one altogether new in human history. Moreover, if we examine more closely the movements of the Catholic nations, we shall always find that if there have been momentary and partial retrogressions, these have not had any other motive than that of considering the progress already made, and thus to take breath afresh to proceed onwards again. Reason over these successive movements, and we shall see that we must suppose a dreadful cataclysm would take place if the laws of humanity were to be inverted in favour of these upholders of reaction. Therefore it is evident that this solution is almost impossible; and we will content ourselves with adding, that if ever the Catholic nations thus retrograde, they will find themselves in that civil, intellectual, and moral inferiority in comparison with Protestant nations of which we have above spoken; and as inferior nations, incomplete (races accursed), they will be, if not physically, at least morally subject to the others.

A second, and not less improbable, and contrary to all belief, is the so-called philosophical solution; this is the opinion of those who say that Christianity has finished its time; that religions and worships are to disappear entirely, and the people to have no other creeds than those of reason, of philosophy. But this second solution appears to us, though from different reasons, to be as far from the truth as the first. No; man will never live without a religion, as he has never, nor

ever will, live without love. All the philosophical reasonings can never destroy the sentiment of love, because it is innate in the human heart, nor eradicate the sentiment of religion, because it is a want of equal necessity. Rites may be changed, old forms may be uprooted, but from the mind of man a belief will always emanate, a belief analogous to his sensations, affiliated to his intellect, and in harmony with his civilization. It is unnecessary to discuss at length this proposition, since even in the opinion of those who are favourable to it, it could not be realized except in times far distant from these in which we live.

But if the Catholic world will not bend either to the right or to the left, is it possible that she can remain in *statu quo*, in that condition in which we have exactly described her? This is the opinion of those who in our days imagine the belief of the world is too dead, too enervated to disturb itself on the subject. It is our opinion that these, however, take an erroneous view of the conditions of our present civilization. There is no doubt that the violent religious passions, intolerance, persecutions, have disappeared—we hope for ever; but in the meantime we cannot fail to remark with what ardour and preference criticism takes to the subject of Christianity. One sees what commotions take place among all the Christian Churches either in one sense or in another, one can therefore understand how great and powerful is still the sentiment of religion. It is true that the pitiful exterior practices, either picturesque or grotesque, which are remnants of the Middle Ages, rapidly disappear before modern civilization; but this is a proof of an intellectual and moral tendency among Catholic nations in the matter of religion. Moreover no great revolution is effected in this world without a great internal change in the feelings of people, and the revolution itself is but the result of this moral transformation in their sentiments. Religion being an innate portion of the human conscience, is the first to feel the effects of any change, and therefore the first to break up old forms, and to adopt others more analogous to the new opinions, to the new feelings which animate our present existence. When therefore we observe the great impulse that now for many years has agitated all nations, but especially the Latin ones, we are obliged to suppose that there exists either a great movement without any cause, or that an analogous commotion is taking place in the ideas, in the religious relations of those nations, and that similar feelings are actuating all of them. If therefore it has not hitherto been in our power to determine all the future contingencies in the revolutions of Catholicism, we believe, however, we can foresee and designate their direction, by reasoning justly from the conduct held by those nations in the other parts of their civilization.

In order therefore that they may not remain stationary and immobile in the religious forms to which they have been up to the present time restricted, we believe that those nations are preparing great transformations; with these we shall do well to occupy ourselves a little, as they will better than all else reveal to us the future of Catholicism.

If we have succeeded in giving any accurate estimate of the conditions and tendencies of modern society, as well as of the true conditions of the Christian Church, we think we can from these antecedents conclude that there are three principal contingencies which will modify the Catholic Church, and give it another form. The first is the principle of the complete separation between Church and State; and if it were allowable to carry still further our previsions, we would say the principle of a free Church and free State, which by degrees is necessarily becoming general in Catholic society. We are well aware that against this doctrine the Roman Court has issued its strongest denunciations; but for all that, it will not cease to be the inevitable result of social wants, and, what is still more curious, the most active agent of the triumph of this principle is the Roman Court itself, which so strongly condemns it.

True it is that the liberty of conscience and equality of all creeds before the laws being once admitted, the State cannot adhere to one more than to the other without contradicting this principle. It would, consequently, be necessary that the State, as in France, should give a stipend to all religions equally; nor would this be enough, for the State would also have to take part in all the theological controversies which might arise between the followers of the different paid Churches, in order to decide which opinion was the correct one, and which was worthy of receiving the stipend, and which was not; and hence a fresh infraction of the rights of the doctrine of true liberty of conscience. This liberty, therefore, cannot exist in reality without a separation between Church and State; but the doctrines, the inconceivable pretensions of Rome, by means of which she has placed herself in complete contradiction with the principles, with all the laws, with all the institutions of the Catholic nations, make this separation still more urgent. It is evident therefore that the Governments, the representatives of these nations, must follow one of these courses; either condemn the canons proclaimed by Rome and persecute those who profess them in opposition to the laws of the State (and this would be a denial of liberty of conscience) or adopt the complete separation of Church and State, and then not occupy themselves in the least with those principles, except when the practice of them produces acts contrary to the laws. To protest against the Catholic bishops who proclaim these prin-

ciples, and still pay them as functionaries of the State against which they declare themselves rebels, is such a contradiction that cannot in our opinion long exist in France, against the inexorable logic of principles and facts which sooner or later must triumph. So true is this that the Roman Court, although protesting with its greatest violence against the principle of separation, has however completely adopted it itself by convoking the Council. We are well aware that Rome, while she pretends that no lay or civil power shall meddle with the affairs of the Church (and in this we perfectly agree), on the other hand maintains that civil society and Catholic governments ought above all things to subject themselves to the dictates of the Pope and the Roman Court. But it is exactly this pretension which proves still more that there remains no other solution for a Catholic government than either the separation of Church and State, or to enter upon an inevitable and interminable strife with it.

Therefore, beyond all doubt, the principle of liberty of conscience infallibly brings about the separation of Church and State among the Catholic nations, or even more, among all civilized and free nations. North America has from its origin adopted this separation, and England also, in its late law passed with regard to the Irish Church, has openly shown how necessary is this separation if we desire liberty of conscience.

Otherwise it is impossible that free nations should any longer support either the burden of paying a priesthood whose ministry one cannot avail oneself of, or allow the Government to occupy itself in the administration of any Church. Therefore we come to the firm opinion that the definitive formula of the separation between Church and State shall be in free civilized countries "a free Church in a free State;" and this fact it is which we believe will be the cause of a most important modification in Catholicism.

The second cause of a different constitution in the Church is that tendency so evident and decided in modern society towards democratic and elective institutions. The Church, therefore, once restored to its entire independence by its separation from the State, it is impossible that she will not be impregnated by that same type of universal civilization, and that she will not model herself in the exterior forms to the sentiments of the populations of whom she is composed. The Church therefore, evidently, instead of tending towards individual absolutism, towards despotic monarchy, to which it appears Rome wishes to bring her, will assume more large and liberal forms; and she will realize the future of Catholicism, not by narrowing and concentrating herself at Rome, but by approaching, and widening herself towards the circumference and towards the believing populations.

We must not think that by this procedure the Catholic Church

will lose its unity, or, in other words, will disappear, since as regards form, this unity is exactly its essential distinction. There are, it is true, many celebrated men who fear that the Church will in the end take as many forms as there are different nations, and that we shall then have only national churches. It has been thought—it has been written even—that the Government of France, foreseeing the extinction of the temporal power of the Pope, is inclined to a separation and the establishing of a national Church in France. We do not believe this to be the case, and if the French Government has this intention it has, in our opinion, very badly interpreted the popular tendencies and the feelings of the French clergy. Never has the French Church in any period of its existence shown itself less national, less French, than it has done of late. She has even spontaneously, and, perhaps, against the wishes of the most prudent of the Roman prelates, abjured Gallicanism, denied all personality, all individuality and nationality, to show herself only Roman and ultramontane, to such a degree as to far outstrip even the most energetic, the most enthusiastic among the Roman courtiers. One sees with what virulence the ancient national liturgy of Lyons has been upset, and how the clergy, after having in every way shown their discontent and disapprobation, submitted themselves humbly to the exigencies of the then bishops, as though they knew they would have the support of the Government. Therefore, to think that the French clergy will separate itself from the Catholic unity to form a national and separate Church, is to think that they will go precisely against the tendencies which they have so openly shown in these last thirty years, and against the tendencies which are the most general in Europe. In fact, every day is made more manifest the desire to break through all restraints on intelligence, all obstacles of narrow nationality and of local prejudice in order to approach the assumed ideal of universal civilization. The many exhibitions of art and of industry, the many international scientific congresses, are evident proof of this; and we see in the English Church men remarkable among the clergy and among the aristocracy turn to Catholicism, although in their principles they are still very far from it, or from Rome at least, only because they there recognise that unity which is the valid argument of the truth, and to which strongly turns at the present time the civil progress of the nations.

Judging therefore from these tendencies of the human mind, and of the Latin civilization in particular, we may conclude that the future of Catholicism will be secured by the breaking off of those bonds which have so inconveniently bound it to the governments; by the entire separation from the State, which will give it an enlarged liberty, both in its principles as well as in the

form of its government, with also a return to the affections of the people and to their interests; without, at the same time, destroying that unity which is its distinction and its prerogative. But this unity will exist rather in the intellectual and moral uniformity of its creed, than in the personality of an individual who obliges all to blindly subject themselves to his decrees.

XI.

The first consequence of this new direction taken by Catholicism will be necessarily the renouncing by the Pope of the temporal power—that unfortunate institution which we see has been so injurious to the Church and to the faith; in fact, there is not even now any greater obstacle to the liberty of the Church, to its separation from the servitude of the State, than the temporal power of the Pope. How, indeed, could any independent State, any civil government, admit the liberty of a Church whose head is a foreign king? How could they do otherwise than impose restrictions, cautions, or other laws, as long as this head can make use of so extensive a spiritual power in the interest of his temporal dominion? For this reason, therefore, we have always seen the independence and ecclesiastical authority of the Pope diminish in proportion with the development and increase of the territorial possessions. Then alone will come the triumph of the liberty of the Church, as by degrees will disappear this monstrous temporal power, which at the present day ignorance alone and prejudice are able to uphold by armed forces.

M. Odillon Barrot (a remarkable man, we must allow), in his defence of the expedition to Rome before the French Legislative Assembly, said, "It is necessary that the two powers should be united at Rome, in order that they may be able in other places to be distinct." It is difficult to imagine an epigram more false in all its terms, and further from the reality of the case. For, first of all, in France and elsewhere the powers are not in any way distinct when the Government elect the bishops, and the prefects of police examine the briefs and the bulls, and the Council of State adjudicates on the mandates of the bishops and interferes in ecclesiastical questions; but what is still more singular, and what is precisely the result of the two powers being confounded together at Rome, is that the spiritual can be made use of to forward the ambitious views of the Government. The indispensable separation of the Church from the State will therefore necessarily cause an equal separation at Rome. And thus, all things work together that the temporal power of the Pope may one day disappear before the necessities of the Church, upon which it has until now been imposed as a curse.

But other reasons besides confirm the impossibility of this power. The civilization of the present day tends, as we have so often said, to that Catholicism, in the true sense of the word, which is the proper element of this Church. Now this excludes necessarily the perpetual "*Italianism*" of the head of the Church. But how can the Pope be otherwise than Italian, if he is in reality an Italian prince, and at all events prince of an Italian territory? Fresh incompatibility, therefore, between Pontiff and King; and this incompatibility appears still greater when we descend to the consideration of the cardinals and prelates. How in a free church could it be allowed that temporal ministers, that actual laymen, should have a part in the administration? How, having everywhere separated the two powers, could the clergy and the episcopacy of the entire Catholicity allow Italian laymen, more or less clever in the administration of a small state, to intervene in the election of the head of the Church, being also at the same time electors, and almost exclusively those eligible to be elected? In fact, the contradictions are so many and so evident, that there is only one thing that can surprise us, and it is this, how men, often remarkable and liberal, in France and elsewhere, can have been, or can still remain, defenders of a power so evidently injurious to the Church, if we did not know that in France the question has been completely falsified, and misrepresented as a mere pretext on the part of Italy, who for her exclusive national interests would put in peril the constitution of the Church by upsetting the temporal power of the Pontiff: in this respect there are two principal errors, one of right, the other of fact. The first, more particularly among the French, who, as it is their natural tendency, have exaggerated the principle of civilization, and thus exalted the Papal power so as to have confided to it the entire destiny of the Church, and thus by degrees changed the position of the temporal power relatively to that of the Church itself. The second is that, not alone Italy, but the principles of modern civilization, those principles which France formerly so boasted of, and which she calls those of 1789, have made all theocracy quite impossible in Europe; so that if really any State must be accused of having caused the fall of the Roman Theocracy it is France, and not Italy, that must be responsible for it, at all events—unless, indeed, we accuse the Papacy itself of having been the cause of it, by obstinately refusing to accommodate itself to the progress of civilization. The temporal Papacy, therefore, falls and dies, as in nature die all old and antiquated forms which no longer answer to the changed times. It will disappear, as the antediluvian form of animals disappeared from the earth, prepared for other culture and other processes.

This fact of the incompatibility of the ecclesiastical *régime* and

temporal power with the exigencies of the times, was solemnly recognised and proclaimed during the two last centuries by all the great statisticians; and even in 1831 a memorandum of the five Great Powers confirmed it, at least by their adoption of institutions to which Rome was decidedly opposed. These events took place thirty years before the rising in Italy, and from that time the temporal power was dead. Italy, therefore, can be the inheritor, if the Romans choose to join with the other Italians; but certainly she has neither the merit nor the demerit of the extinction of that power. Fortunately, the foreign armies which still keep up this wretched dominion, will no more have a pretext for intervention from the day that the separation of Church and State is recognised; as the first will then rule itself, and the last will have no right to meddle in the affairs of the other.

This suppression of the temporal power of the Church will be certainly one of the most grave and important events of the age—not for Italy, but for the Church—because the Papacy, once freed from the obstructions incident to the temporal power, and from the fetters of worldly interest, will, for the sake of spiritual progress, be brought back to the people, to their civilization, renewing thus its ancient alliance with liberty, which will one day cause its true greatness; and liberty, restrained by Christian morality, will make more rapid strides in the path of progress.

We are so perfectly convinced of the immense advantage that the Church and the cause of religion can promise to themselves by the abandonment of that wretched power, that even if the Italians, after having vainly endeavoured by their advice and offers to bring the Roman Court to measures of conciliation and peace, should succeed in overturning it by violence and force of arms, we think that they will have rendered to the Church and to the world an immense service. For the Papacy, freed from extraneous circumstances, from the influence of those fanatics and enthusiasts who now surround it, will itself retake to that path to which now it will be brought back only by the most serious misfortunes of the Church, and by a long series of uncertain events of which we have here endeavoured to fix the general character and direction.

XII.

Having reached this point, let us ask, What will be the position of Italy in this serious crisis, in this metamorphosis which is preparing? What will be its destiny, what its true interests? What part ought she to take in these events, in order that her action may be beneficial, useful, and dignified?

Every one is aware of the intimate relations that exist between Italy and the Papacy and the Church, beyond those of every

other nation. And above all, even in the position of hostility in which the Papacy has unfortunately placed itself with the country, Italians will never forget that, as Catholics, the Catholic Church is a most important portion of their civilization, of their greatness—the glory and position of Italy. They cannot forget that the Papacy has its throne on Italian soil; that Rome, even deprived of all temporal power, will ever remain the chief seat of Catholicism; and that, as will be their destiny—their future, as well as that of other Latin nations—so also will be that of the Church. Catholicism will fall with the prosperity of Italy, and Protestantism will arise in all those lands where German civilization is substituted in place of the Latin. Even still, when the Papacy will have justly lost its exclusive Italian character, it must always conform itself to the genius of Italy as to that of that country which has for so many ages known how to guide and ennoble it by its ability, prudence, and wisdom.

Therefore, the interests, the true interests of the Papacy and of Italy, are not different; but these, certainly, the Papacy does not take means to improve, following that path into which it has been brought by the fanaticism of foreign immigrants, and the crafty ambition and excesses of a sect. Its future, as we have already proved by the most complete evidence, exists in liberty, in progress, in reconciling itself with the people, with science, and civilization. Our first interest, however, would be to endeavour that this Council, instead of enforcing the ideas of absolutism and of hostility, should turn rather to a reform in the direction of liberty and conciliation; and, if that be possible by any means whatever, it is our opinion that nothing should be left undone to accomplish it.

Unfortunately, we cannot flatter ourselves that the event corresponds to these just desires, and the probabilities are that the decisions of the Council will rather aggravate than alleviate the tension and discussion between the Papacy and the believers, between the Church and civilization. If the Council allows itself to approve, even indirectly, the enormities of the syllabus, it is clear that to the Italians nothing remains except either to deny their nationality and common sense, to betray their country, to repudiate all civilization, to renounce all science, to rebel against the institutions of their country, and to abjure all liberty—or to separate themselves from the Fathers of the Council and from the bishops, who inculcate these principles as an object of faith. But we think we may, without any doubt, without ambiguity or hesitation, openly affirm that the genius of the Italian nation is of such a temper that it will never submit itself to the absurdities of the syllabus, or hesitate how to act in the dilemma in which it may be placed as we have shown above.

We know, and it is but just solemnly to recognise the fact, that hardly any of our bishops profess the exaggerated ideas of these foreign fanatics. We believe that the greater number of them sincerely lament the dissensions which have arisen between the Papacy and Italy, and that they, unless they receive the most stringent orders, will abstain from making imprudent declarations, and from urging intemperance of doctrines, as well as from favouring decisions too hostile to the universal opinion of Italy. But at the same time it is useless and impossible to hide from ourselves that from the moment the Council shall approve all, or any one even of the principal propositions of the syllabus, dissensions, schisms, intellectual, moral, and religious, will be fully established between the Italians and Rome, between the Italians and those who will recognise those decisions as valid.

What will be the duty of the Government, of the King, of Parliament, and of the country, in such a contingency? To maintain the laws firm and intact, and liberty of conscience to its full extent. As long as the bishops and upholders of the resolutions adverse to the people only express their opinions, they have full right to do so, and the people have only the duty and right to refute them; but if they pass these limits, and provoke or urge disrespect to the laws, we feel sure the Government of the King will know how to restrain and punish them. For the rest, the field must be left open for opposite discussions, that the country may freely follow that path to which its inclinations, studies, feelings, old or new beliefs, may lead it, nor mix up the action of the Government or of the tribunals in theological questions or religious professions. But unfortunately the Government still finds itself connected with the affairs of the Church; and while we, in words and maxims, proclaim "a free Church in a free State," it still chooses the bishops whom the Pope recommends, and thus unduly retains an illegitimate interference with, and finds itself involved in, the Ecclesiastical question. We say "illegitimate," for by what right does the Government of the King allow itself in a free country to choose the ministers of worship and the chief rulers of a religion, which by the principles of liberty of conscience ought to be without any privileges, and equal to the others? Does the Government perchance allow itself to interfere in the nomination of the rabbins, or in that of the Waldensian pastors? Then with what right does it dare to impose bishops on the Catholics? That which has hitherto been unjust might become now extremely imprudent and embarrassing, as should a difference of opinion rise up among the believers, the Government would find itself drawn into the arena of theological dispute, and have to decide its dogmas by the civil jurisdiction.

Yes, it is most urgent that the Government should free itself from this weight, renounce this interference, and replace the affairs of the Church in that position in which they canonically were, and in which we shall again see them progress.

Ricasoli, during his first ministry, presented to France a project, in which were many propositions forming part of a scheme originated in the time of Cavour, but one most essential feature of it was altogether falsified—viz., that of the election of the bishops. In a plan, which at his request we some time ago sent to Cavour, we treated at large this question, and maintained that the elections ought to be given into the hands of the clergy and people, causing the latter to be represented either by the municipality or by the diocesan congregations, or by the "Chapter." Cavour desired, on the contrary, that these elections should be left altogether in the power of the clergy; but we persisted in our opinion, and refused to sign any act in which this opinion was not admitted: nor from that period to the present have we seen any reason to change, and we still consider that the Government ought to transfer its right of nomination to the people of the creed, and to the clergy. We do not say that by doing thus it would be acting canonically, as it is no affair of ours to meddle in ecclesiastical theories; but we affirm that the Government would thus be evidently conforming its acts to the general attitude the affairs of the Church and civilization have at present taken, and would thus assist to put an end to the dissension which exists between the people and the Papacy—between the State and religion. And in truth, as we have often repeated, and as is known to all, the world is everywhere progressing towards democratic institutions, and hence in all free countries the elective parliament is more or less in vogue, therefore it is evident, where the representatives of the Church and the heads of its administration are chosen by the same people (even though by another method) who choose the members of parliament, there is no possibility of any great differences arising between one and the other, or that this unfortunate contradiction which has been so long, and still is, the cause of the evils which afflict the Catholic nations and Italy, should be any longer continued. But if these elections were given into the hands of the clergy alone, we should not sufficiently obtain that common origin of power which we seek for, nor should we re-attach the clergy to the country and to the nation, as we all desire to do.

Therefore, it is important that the Government should resign the power of naming the bishops, and restore this right to the followers of the religion, to whom it really belongs: to one corporation alone instituted for this purpose should the Government

transfer the power of investiture of those temporalities which belong to the ecclesiastical hierarchy, either for the parishes or for the episcopacies. It is not for the people or for the Government to interfere with the various differences of religious belief, with the discipline, or arrangement of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, in any way whatever; the Government can only regulate the distribution of the temporalities, and by this means exercise an indirect pressure in the direction most favourable to the interests of the country: for the rest it has no power, and should leave full liberty to all religious opinions to regulate themselves as they desire. We have seen how in France the clergy, who are paid, and subordinate to all kinds of restrictions from the civil power, denying all their national traditions, give themselves up to the most exaggerated ultramontanism. It is a great lesson to us not to follow in the same path, and therefore the electoral system, and the independent ordinization which we propose, would give to the Church a new importance, and would bind the clergy to the country and to the nation.

Let us bear in mind, that all liberties rule in their turn, that one is accountable for the other. We desire liberty, and we wish it in all forms, and from this point of view the liberty of the Church is not less interesting than that of commerce, instruction, and of the press. If we sincerely desire liberty we must introduce it everywhere, and the greater the number of independent moral bodies, the better we shall provide for the triumph of liberty. It is precisely from having destroyed all the corporations by the proponderating power of the State, from having subjugated all associations to bureaucratic centralization, that France has not yet been able to effect a definitive arrangement for regulating liberty; and perhaps she will not obtain it until she diminishes that preponderance of the central power which at present annuls all individuality and every free association.

It will appear, perhaps, to some too bold an attempt all at once to entrust the election of the bishops to the clergy and to the people, especially in the present agitated state of public opinion in Italy; but by entrusting at first to the clergy the initiative of the nomination, under the surveillance of the laity, all danger might be avoided. Besides, the Government might proceed gradually, if it thinks well to do so, transferring to the clergy and the people the privilege of naming to the Government the person or persons to be chosen, while reserving to themselves the definitive appointment and approval. Perhaps such a system as this latter would be much the best, because, as by the present agreement, the Government makes the presentation; therefore the Roman Court might, if the appointment did not pass through their hands, more easily find some reason for

opposition. To some it may appear that the remedy proposed by us is a very trifling one for so great an evil. To such we would reply that they have not understood the real conditions of Catholic society, as we have endeavoured so far to show them; for, from these analyses it results that there exist two currents—one liberal, which springs from the people; the other reactionary, which takes its rise from Rome—and both encounter each other in the Catholic Church. Therefore, the giving the elections into the hands of the people signifies the complete upsetting of the reactionary power, the changing the feelings and tendencies of the bishops in the religious societies, making them more congenial to the people, reconducting them to the national interests, and reconciling them to modern civilization.

Would any one desire to see how important and serious is this revolution which we propose? In all Europe the only episcopacy that escaped the usurpation of Rome—the power of the kings—was the episcopacy of the Rhine; the German one which is elected by the clergy, and by the Council of the "Chapter." Moreover, amid so much baseness, so much shameful prostration in the entire episcopacy, the only independent voice (with the rare exception of some individuals) that has been raised in defence of liberty and civilization is that of the Bishops of Fulda; of the bishops elected according to our suggestion. What would have been the fate of the Council if 200 or 300 Italian bishops elected in this manner had presented themselves, or would present themselves there, to defend the same cause? There can be no doubt that the cause of the Catholic reform would at once be gained, and that the Papacy would be replaced in its natural position, which is that desired by the Catholic nations, and especially by Italy, and is that of civilization. That, however, which we cannot now obtain, we shall certainly obtain if, returning to the system of popular election, we draw after us (as we certainly should do) the other Catholic and Latin nations.

As soon as the number of the new bishops is in a majority, the object of our desires will be obtained, because religion will be reconciled with reason, and both will concurrently work together for the progress of humanity.

There is, however, another point on which it is necessary that the action of Government should be brought to bear in a decided and well defined manner; it is not alone that of the separation of the Church and State, but that of "a free Church in a free State." We have spoken sufficiently on this subject already, and it is not necessary again to return to it. It is evident that society is marching towards this result, but for this reason more particularly a provident Government ought to facilitate its progress.

The great Cavour was the first who dared to pronounce from the Ministerial bench this maxim, which is the formula of the future Italian creed, and perhaps that of all civilized people. But from that time to this not only has nothing been done, but we have seen both the Government and Parliament vacillate with uncertainty now in one direction, now in another. Ricasoli and Borgatti on one side passed all limits in the concessions as to the ecclesiastical possessions at the disposition of the Pope at one time, at that of the bishops at another, according to Minghetti. To these pretensions Mancini answered by the ancient Giannonian, Fanuccian, and Leopoldine doctrines, and received the approval, if we mistake not, of Rattazzi. We consider both these opinions equally erroneous; the temporal possessions belong to the country—to the people for whose benefit they were accorded, although in a religious point of view. And even Gregory IV., in the famous question of investiture, did not go to the same excess in his pretensions as did Ricasoli and Borgatti in their concessions, which would in the end have destroyed the pragmatic of Worms. Therefore, the doctrines of restriction are arms of State of ancient date rendered useless partly by the liberty of the press and by the Constitution, and partly by their incompatibility with the principle of religious liberty. They are therefore altogether inacceptable for the future; but at the same time we must not forget that although the Pope is a territorial sovereign, as he pretends to be prince and king, his acts cannot have any force unless recognised and proclaimed by the Italian Government. If in every civilized country no order of merit or other distinction can be accepted without the consent of the Government, how can be permitted bulls, briefs, laws, and ordinances, of a head of the Church who is Pope and King at the same time, as in disregard of all common sense the Pontiff continues to be.

Therefore we think it necessary, or at least most useful, that the Government should be decided on this point; that public opinion also, and public law should be equally so; that the complete liberty of the Church should be proclaimed from the days in which the Pope will be only the venerated head of a religious association which may be equal in extent to the entire world; but the world, and the Church at least, should know that if there does not exist for it a liberty as extensive, as indefinite, as the ancient fathers in their gilded dreams sighed for, it is altogether the fault of the ambition of the Roman prelates, of their desire to preserve a territorial dominion which the people detest, and which religion must abhor. Let the Catholic world know that Italy has solemnly undertaken to give to the Papacy and to the Church such a liberty and independence as they have never yet had, and more ample than any other State could give

them; let the Italian clergy know that if they do not enjoy all those liberties and rights which Italy destines for them, it is the fault of the Roman Court and of the bishops who uphold its dominion.

This is to our mind the duty of the Government; for the rest is in the power of the population, in the power of public opinion, of the religious consciences of the Italians to follow that path which they consider to be the true one. We do not hesitate, and we loudly declare it, to decide which that will be. So great a movement—so profound a change as that which is now taking place in our civilization, is certainly not comprised in the old forms and ancient practice of exterior usage, which has lost all internal correspondence with the feelings and conscience of believers.

We are well aware of the answer that will be made to this, especially by the sectarians: that belief is dead, faith is extinct, and that no one will occupy themselves with the declarations of a Council which does not regard the material interests of the people. In the meantime, let us confess that this appears to us a very false interpretation of the sentiments of the Italians. True it is that the old practices, the ancient superstitions, die off; but that does not prove that true religious feeling is dead. In the fifteenth century religious feelings were not less abandoned than in our time, and satire of the Church and of the ecclesiastics was far more active than at present. Moreover, what violent reaction took place in the beginning and during the sixteenth century with the reformation on one side and Jesuitism on the other? It will be sufficient that the religious doctrine shall be put on a level with the sentiments of the people and of civilization, and then it will be seen whether religious feelings are dead or only latent in the hearts of the faithful. Who forgets the forty days of Pio Nono's reign, now twenty years since? and what enthusiasm of faith burst forth on all sides when it was believed that an apostle of peace and charity had arisen, an angel to announce to men liberty of good feelings. Well do we know that the deception of those moments wrought a dreadful effect on the consciences of the people; but as their innate nature is not easily changed, fresh hopes given with better auspices from the Vatican, would perhaps find them equally disposed to accept and bless them.

Let us finally remark one fact that is very curious in Italian civilization. Three great philosophies, all more or less liberal, have sprung up in the last thirty years in Italy. All are the result of the meditations of three ecclesiastics—Gioberti, Rosamini, Ventura. They all three had many followers among the religious houses and liberal clergy. Will this great movement

on a sudden calm down and remain quiet? What are the events which could produce so extraordinary a change, when even in Italy ideas have on all sides progressed greatly in the last twenty years? Therefore we still continue to think that a new formula will spring up from the midst of the people and the clergy in Italy—a liberal formula of the Catholic religion. We can see a work quietly going on in all directions among the Christian believers in Germany, in England, and in France; and if amongst the Catholics this work appears less active, we must not forget the wonderful discipline that, as in an army, reigns in the Catholic Church. Who of those not connected with it can foretell the discontent that may reign in an army, except on the day on which the revolt breaks out? At all events, it is clear that the world is progressing towards a reform in religion, with a tendency at the same time unanimous and similar. Let the Italian Church but launch itself forth in the paths of liberty, and it will soon be seen that all the others will follow its example; and the day on which those two last remains of the Middle Ages, the temporal power of the Pope, and the bench of bishops in the House of Lords in England, shall at length disappear from the civilized world, that day will not be far away from the day on which we shall see the union of many Christian churches in one only, and that especially among free nations. But it must be kept in mind that these approaches do not take place unless each make advances towards the other, and the only true and durable unions are those which take place spontaneously in the midst of, and by means of, liberty. Such is the future which, it appears to us, is in preparation for the Catholic Church at a period perhaps not very far distant.

Contemporary Literature.

The Foreign Books noticed in the following sections are chiefly supplied by Messrs. Williams & Norgate, *Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, and* Mr. Nutt, 270, *Strand.*

THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY.

According to Dr. Hook, in the Introduction to the "Church and the Age,"[1] the bond of union between the contributors to that volume is "a determination to abide by those principles which have distinguished the English from all other Reformers, from the reign of Henry VIII. to the time of the Revolution, since which time the Church of England has remained stationary" (p. 10). They adopt the principles of these Reformers, as they understand them, and propose to apply them as far as possible to the present demand for a further Church reform. Dr. Hook then insists on an advantage which he asserts Anglicans to possess, as compared with Lutherans and Calvinists, in that the Anglican, as he says, calls no man master, while the Protestants and Reformed of the Continent are silenced by the authority of Luther or Calvin. This assertion is, in fact, groundless enough; but it is easy to "praise the Lacedemonians among the Lacedemonians." For that which by Anglicans themselves is boasted of as exemplifying a distinguishing principle appears to others as an evidence of a lack of all principle. Lutheranism and Calvinism present,

[1] "The Church and the Age: Essays on the Principles and Present Position of the Anglican Church." Edited by Archibald Weir, D.C.L., Vicar of Forty Hill, Enfield, and William Dalrymple Maclagan, M.A., Rector of Newington, Surrey. London: John Murray. 1870. Contents:—Introduction. Anglican Principles. By Walter Farquhar Hook, D.D., F.R.S., Dean of Chichester. Ess. I. The Course and Direction of Modern Religious Thought. By Charles John Ellicott, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. II. The State, the Church, and the Synods of the Future. By William J. Irons, D.D. Oxon., Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Vicar of Brompton. III. The Religious Use of Taste. By Richard St. John Tyrwhitt, Vicar of St. Mary Magdalen with St. George the Martyr, Oxford, formerly student of Christ Church. IV. The Place of the Laity in Church Government. By Montagu Burrows, R.N., M.A., Chichele Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford. V. Private Life and Ministrations of the Parish Priest. By William Waltham How, M.A., Rector of Whittington, Shropshire, Hon. Canon of St. Asaph. VI. English Divines of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. By Arthur West Haddon, B.D., Rector of Barton-on-the-Heath, formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. VII. Liturgies and Ritual. By Michael F. Sadler, M.A., Prebendary of Wells, and Rector of Honiton. VIII. Indian Missions. By Sir Bartle Frere, G.C.S.I., K.C.B., D.C.L. IX. The Church and Education. By Alfred Barry, D.D., Principal of King's College, London, formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. X. The Church and the People. By William Dalrymple Maclagan, M.A., Rector of Newington, Surrey. XI. Conciliation and Comprehension: Charity within the Church and beyond. By Archibald Weir, D.C.L., Vicar of Forty Hill, Enfield.

each of them, a scheme of doctrine consistent with itself; Anglicanism has none—it has no central theological assumption like that of justification by faith in the one case, and of predestination and election in the other, round which all other doctrines are found to revolve. Nor, if by principle Dr. Hook means the foundation on which cardinal doctrine rests, has the Anglican any advantage over others of the Reformed: his appeal to reason and the inner religious sense is timid and incomplete; while, on the other hand, as towards Rome, his reference to authority is halting and inconsistent, and his definition of Catholicity involves a begging of the doctrinal questions which it is invoked to determine. The general drift of this introductory Essay, and of a large portion of the book, which it introduces, is neither more nor less than to vindicate the orthodox doctrine upon the principle of authority, against the heterodoxy produced by the modern "appeal to the rectifying faculty," as Dr. Hook expresses it—verifying faculty, if we recollect right, was the expression used by Dr. Temple. It may be true that there is no one person among the English Reformers whose individual judgment is conclusive with Anglicans—as it has been the fashion to call the members of the Church of England, since they became ashamed of being numbered among English Protestants. But the matter is not at all mended, when Dr. Hook and his friends, instead of the authority of an individual, appeal to a consensus of selected English divines, and ultimately to a consensus of a limited portion of the primitive Church, as sufficient to put the modern inquirers out of court. The question is still one between authority and reason. Indeed, great injustice is done to such men as Luther and Calvin by setting them forth nakedly as authorities, for they appealed to the natural reason and to the inner light, although they were terrified into inconsistency with their ultimate principle by the excesses of the Anabaptists. But the Church of England, whether considered as originally Protestant or Reformed, has almost from the first, and throughout its history, betrayed its principles; or if it be denied that it was founded on any principle properly so called, it has throughout betrayed the compromise or understanding upon which it was set up. If it was anything at its origin it was an anti-Roman foundation, involving therein not only a renunciation of particular Roman errors, but a protest against the principle of authority itself. It seems to have been the work of the hierarchy, and of many of the most influential members of the Church of England throughout its history, to obliterate as much as possible this anti-Roman character. It was a true instinct, justified by the event, which led Puritans to object even to the "decent surplice;" for it has been found to imply Priesthood, Altar, and Sacrifice; and to stigmatize Prelacy as a rag of Popery; for upon the concession of Episcopacy, as an allowable form of Church government, has been built up the fiction of the Apostolic Succession, together with the development of the sacramental superstition. Nor is it correct to say, with Dr. Hook, that since the time of the Revolution "the Church of England has remained stationary" (p. 10); for the extreme episcopal and sacramental developments have been made since that time. The seed was then sown which has since borne its pernicious

fruit. It is sufficient to point out, in illustration, that the addition of the second part of the Catechism of the Church of England took place at the last revision, without which we should hitherto have heard little in this country of the "religious difficulty." From the position of the writer, the first Essay on "Modern Religious Thought" is as worthy of attention as any in the volume: it touches on a variety of topics, but solves nothing. It assumes throughout that free thought is a danger, an evil, a form of "darkness voluntary," an antagonism to the revelation made known in the inspired Scripture and conveyed in the creeds of the Church. Dr. Ellicott is willing to talk about these subjects in a plausible way with those who are in danger of being misled by the spirit of the age; but he discusses nothing on an equal footing. His incapacity for perceiving that the opposition between the modern and the mediæval, or "catholic" spirit, is a radical opposition both in ground principles and in method, may be seen in such a summing up as follows: The complacency, it will be observed, is admirable with which he charges on some mediating modern schools, contradictions in terms for which the Nicene theologians are most notorious; but what would be contradiction in the heterodox, is divine mystery in the orthodox faith.

"On the one hand, as we have seen, there is a steady drift towards a subtle and pervasive Socinianism, a Socinianism willing to acknowledge our dear Lord as our only and great exemplar, and yet inferentially denying the merits of His sacrifice—a Socinianism willing even to admit His resurrection, but prepared to deny His divinity, or to accept it only under reservations that either involve contradictions in terms, or, at any rate, are inconsistent with a true faith in the declarations of Scripture and the fundamental articles of the Nicene faith. On the other hand, we have seen in the awakened feeling for religion, and in the gradual evanescence of the more immoral forms of doubt that presented themselves at the commencement of the period, a clear gravitation towards old truths, *if set forth intelligently*, and placed in their proper relations and connexions."—p. 87.

Among other subjects, feebly enough treated of in this Essay, is that of Eschatology, as to which the author concludes, that although some considerations might appear to preponderate the other way, the balance of the authority of Scripture inclines to preclude hope of restoration hereafter to the wicked.

The second Essay is faithful to the design of the volume to enforce the supernatural claim of the Church as "a Divine Institution with a hidden life;" "the Creed, the Sacraments, the Apostolate, all unchanged and unchangeable," whatever changes in the temporal accidents of the Church of England may be in store for her. The third Essay is somewhat slight, but not without hints of sensible limitations upon the application of Art to religious purposes. "In the view of English Churchmen, it will always be felt both irreverent and inartistic to use painting, or any other art, in order to awaken emotion, either for or against, *on questions of controverted doctrine*," p. 156. The preceding italics are not ours. And again—

"You ought not to permit yourself any attempt at side wind persuasion to saint-worship, by means of feminine St. Johns or large-eyed Madonnas, or

insinuate purgatory by images of torment. The picture of an event or a saint doing something, is in principle, and in fact, a different thing from the lovely figure of the saint standing to be adored or dreamed over."—p. 157.

But the sophistical employment of Art to generate religious beliefs is in principle as fairly chargeable upon representations of the Saviour himself, generally allowed in the Church of England, as upon Romish pictures of the Mediæval saints. The fourth Essay is a somewhat heavy one, and is not directed sufficiently to illustrate any special part of a confused subject. The fifth likewise is harmless, but without particular or practical point. The sixth Essay is one of the best written in the book, Mr. Haddan being one of the ablest maintainers of the middle position of the Church of England. He employs a very happy phrase to describe the process by which various additions have been made to the Church doctrine, which he calls "protective developments"—such as the development of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, as a protection to the doctrine of the Incarnation, and in the English Church itself the development by an extreme Eucharistic school of a consubstantial and material presence of the Body of Christ in the Lord's Supper, as a protection to the doctrine of the real Spiritual Presence. Mr. Haddan, of course, does not even entertain the question whether the doctrines themselves, which he holds to be essential, have not grown up in this very same way of protective development, much less would he be prepared to trace the growth within the compass of the New Testament, both of doctrine and history, according to the same law—as of the Ascension, in order to protect the corporeal Resurrection, and the corporeal Resurrection to protect the belief in the continued and immortal Life of Jesus Christ. The seventh Essay, on Liturgies and Ritual, is also very well drawn up from a high Eucharistic, but not consubstantiational or Romanizing point of view. And in reference to the Communion Service of the Church of England especially, Dr. Sadler maintains that it is essentially different from the service of the pre-Reformation Church, and insists on the rule that silence and omission is equivalent to deliberate and express repeal. Even the Dean of Arches, as he points out, concedes that "a ceremony designedly omitted is, therefore, repealed" (p. 310), though he is not always consistent with himself. Dr. Sadler would not admit that his own supernatural stand-point involves an assumption equally arbitrary with that of the Roman Church. There is considerable interest in some parts of the eighth Essay, on "Indian Missions;" but the author does not seem to us to have taken into account the probability of a reacting influence of Indian religion upon the Christian population of the East. Not that we suppose any such fusion will take place, as is imagined by some leading members of the Brahmo-Somaj, between Christian and Oriental Theism. But some result of this sort will in all probability follow in the minds of the Westerns from further observation, both of the polytheistic or idolatrous Hinduism, and also of modern Theistic movements—namely, (1) that the miraculous parts of Christianity, though not so gross in form, are as untenable scientifically and by reason of defect of evidence as the Hindu legends; (2) that as a native mystical Theism is rising

in India out of the ruins of the old idolatry, so a Theism suited to European modes of thought will in the West survive the abandonment of the traditional and legendary Christianity. In concluding his Essay on the Church and Education, Dr. Barry recommends the Church to persevere for the future, as nearly as may be, in the course heretofore pursued. No doubt the Church of England will, under any coming conditions, still command a very influential machinery in the matter of education. But it does not seem to have occurred to Dr. Barry, that along with the success in a certain sense of the school system of the Church of England, the "National Society," its organ, has been the very means of provoking our present difficulties on the Educational question. To require in elementary schools the teaching of the Catechism, containing, as already noticed, the Sacramental doctrine of the Caroline period, has necessarily occasioned the struggles about a conscience clause, and has implanted a deep-seated distrust of all so-called religious teaching conducted by clergymen in the minds of many persons not irreligious, and not hostile even to an Establishment in itself, throwing them into the ranks of the National Educational League. The last Essay is too superficial and indefinite to call for any notice. And generally it may be remarked, in regard to this volume, that where it is definite it is dogmatical and narrow; where it reads broadly and plausibly, it is vague, indefinite, and unpractical.

The volume entitled "Ecclesia,"[2] for literary merit, learning, and general fair treatment of the opinions of ecclesiastical opponents, may very well take its place beside others of similar form which have appeared of late years. Nonconformist authors are, we think, unnecessarily sensitive to depreciating remarks upon their "English." Certainly the hits which occasionally provoke them are in the worst possible taste; but as they are effectually throwing off some defects, such as a ponderous hammering style, which were formerly characteristic, they might well afford to pass these over in silence. The present volume also shows a considerable advance in breadth of treatment, both of ecclesiastical and theological subjects. As far, indeed, as it may be taken as an indication of the tendencies of modern Congregationalism, the advance is more obvious on the ecclesiastical than upon the theological side. But the movement beginning ecclesiastically, must carry with it important theological modifications of the Calvinism of the earlier Independents. For as the area covered by Congregationalism has enlarged itself, many questions have arisen tending to

---

[2] "Ecclesia: Church Problems considered, in a Series of Essays." Edited by Henry Robert Reynolds, D.D., President of Cheshunt College, Fellow of University College, London. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1870. I. Primitive Ecclesia: its Authoritative Principles and its Modern Representations. By John Stoughton, D.D. II. The Idea of the Church regarded in its Historical Development. By J. Radford Thomson, M.A. III. The "Religious Life" and Christian Society. By J. Baldwin Brown, B.A. IV. The Relation of the Church to the State. By Eustace Rogers Conder, M.A. V. The Forgiveness and Absolution of Sins. By the Editor. VI. The Doctrine of the Real Presence and of the Lord's Supper. By R. W. Dale, M.A. VII. The Worship of the Church. By Henry Allon. VIII. The Congregationalism of the Future. By J. Guinness Rogers, B.A. IX. Modern Missions, and their Results. By Joseph Mullens, D.D.

create doubt in the minds of its leading ministers, as to how far that ecclesiastical enlargement is consistent with fundamental Evangelical principles; or, to put it the other way, how far fundamental Evangelical principles admit of the wide and even "multitudinous" comprehensiveness which Congregationalism is assuming. On this subject we especially direct attention to Mr. Rogers's Essay on the "Congregationalism of the Future."

"It is true," he says, "that all congregational churches have not always been faithful to the true idea of their system, and that in an evil hour, as many deem it, the Congregational Union undertook to prepare a declaration of faith. It would have been wonderful indeed, if Congregationalists had escaped entirely from the influence of an idea which has for years been dominant in the Church, and which is so deeply rooted that even now the majority deem it an incontrovertible axiom, that agreement in doctrinal views is essential to unity of spirit."—p. 510.

He then urges that the Calvinistic creed, strictly so-called, is no longer the creed of the bulk of Congregationalists, but he ends by propitiating the dogmatic principle as follows:—

"It is clear that a Christian Church ought not to include, cannot include, without the abandonment of its own idea and work, every shade of religious opinion. If it was a company of men, the one object of whose association was to engage in the worship of God, it could not include one who should deny that there is a God to be worshipped. So, as it is to consist of men trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ, *worshipping Him as God*, professing love to Him, and seeking to live to His Glory, it can welcome those only whose belief is compatible with such sentiments and professions."—p. 520.

All, however, that we assert is,—that so long as men are prevented from association, by reason of their difference as to such words as we have underlined, it is the dogmatic principle and no other which keeps them apart, whether the dogma be conveyed in such or such terms; whether it be expressed or implied; whether it be tacitly acknowledged or actually subscribed. As Mr. Matthew Arnold puts it:—the Congregationalists may be about to effect a change of front, and to abandon the predestinarian and solifidian dogmas as their doctrinal basis of communion, but they are not prepared to abandon all dogma, or to adopt frankly the moral basis of Christian communion thus expressed by Mr. Arnold himself:—

"The Christian Church is founded, not on a correct speculative knowledge of the ideas of Paul, but on the much surer ground, *Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity;* and holding this to be so, we might change the current strains of theology from one end to the other, without on that account setting up any new Church, or bringing in any new religion." —p. 10.[3]

Moreover, the weaker they feel the basis of predestinarian doctrine now giving way beneath their feet, the more do Congregationalists

---

[3] "St. Paul and Protestantism. With an Introduction on Puritanism and the Church of England." By Matthew Arnold, M.A., LL.D., formerly Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford, and Fellow of Oriel College. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1870.

cling to their special form of Church constitution—as if any form of ecclesiastical association could be of the special essence of the Gospel. They fall thus into the very same faults with extreme Episcopalians and Presbyterians. They assume that if the primitive Church order could be ascertained, it would be of conclusive obligation upon Christians of all times; they force out of the fragmentary records of the Apostolic age a description of a definite Church order, which in actual primitive history never can be proved to have existed; and they trace this form or order to a miraculous outpouring of the Spirit, on the day of Pentecost, an event for which there is only the vaguest possible tradition, but no evidence. Extreme hierarchical pretensions have no doubt enabled congregationalism to avail itself effectually of the democratic force, as if that which contradicts what is bad must necessarily be itself good: nor do its maintainers on Scriptural grounds observe that both in the nature of things and on Scriptural authority the preacher (Koheleth) precedes the congregation; he calls them, if they will come, not they him; "how shall they hear without a preacher?" (Rom. x. 14.) There is nothing to show that Paul contemplated the formation of congregations by aggregation of individuals conscious of the Divine election, which should then proceed to invite a minister. Plato would no doubt have said something of the danger to a crew, which should choose a pilot for themselves, being run upon the rocks. And there are not wanting indications of a growing suspicion among Congregationalists that in their Church order, to use a homely phrase, the cart is set before the horse.

The "Sermons" noted below[4] are worth reading for their own sake, but the peculiarity attached to them consists in the position which their author, Mr. Edger, has been led or driven to assume. Many years ago he was Independent Minister at Abingdon, but his experience there and elsewhere convinced him that it is impossible for a minister to escape from sectarianism so long as he is held in the bonds of a Church organization. He imagined that the experiment he was bent upon trying could only succeed in the free life of the colonies, but he is now convinced that it might also be tried with effect in England. The notion and practice of Independency in this country has hitherto been, that a number of persons who wish a particular set of doctrines and no other to be preached to them, club together, and providing a pulpit and guaranteeing a stipend as long as they are pleased, invite a minister to occupy it. Mr. Edger's experiment, which hitherto has been fairly successful, is, that he (with the help of a few immediate friends, and at his own risk) provides his own hall and pulpit, from which he speaks as an Evangelist, as one having a message of mercy to as many of the world as will receive it. It is obvious with what entire freedom a minister thus altogether unfettered can declare what he believes to be the truth to those who will come to listen.

Mr. Matthew Arnold[5] is occasionally a little too pungent, but the

---

[4] "Sermons Preached at Auckland, New Zealand." By Samuel Edger, B.A. London: Yates and Alexander. 1870.

[5] "St. Paul and Protestantism. With an Introduction on Puritanism and the

truths he tells the Nonconformists in his "Puritanism and the Church of England" may be read by them with great advantage. They are often treated with senseless and merely bigoted abuse, which naturally tends to confirm them in a conceit of their own superiority. Notwithstanding Mr. Arnold's dislike to Dissent as such, and repugnance to the doctrines distinctive of the larger part of Dissenters, there is a breadth in his views such that few can refuse to listen to him:—

"What may be done in our day," he says, "what our generation has the call and the means, if only it has the resolution to bring about, is the union of Protestants. But this union will never be on the basis of the actual *Scriptural Protestantism* of our Puritans; and because, so long as they take this for the Gospel or good news of Christ, they cannot possibly unite on any other basis, the first step towards union is showing them that this is not the Gospel."—p. 62.

We are afraid that a still more effectual barrier against union is presented on the side of Churchmen, who, though calling themselves Protestants, hold the necessity of an Episcopal succession, and superstitious views concerning "Sacraments administered by persons rightly ordained." Mr. Arnold indeed treats such sacerdotal notions as unsound developments, just as the Puritan doctrines of predestination and justification are unsound developments; and he urges that the Church of England does not identify herself with these unsound developments (p. 55), which, as far as the written law of the Church is concerned, may be true. But the written law and formularies lend countenance to them, and give them such a *point d'appui*, that they can hardly be dislodged, while the Congregationalists are not tied as to the future, even by their inconsistent declaration of principles prefixed to their year book, from cancelling or omitting it hereafter in the same irregular manner in which it was originally affixed—that is to say, when Mr. Arnold shall have convinced them that the Puritan doctrines of Original Sin and Election in Christ are not really to be found in St. Paul. Mr. Arnold, as we think, pushes his statement in this respect somewhat too far. Undoubtedly these doctrines do not appear in St. Paul either practically or theoretically as fundamental axioms of the Gospel. But they appear distinctly and harshly enough. For the purposes of argument, Paul laid hold of any fact or citation, allusion or analogy, which served his purpose: as long as it served his purpose he worried and worked it to death: when he had done with it he did not trouble himself with any use to which others might put it, or with the consequences which they might draw from it. Certainly he shows no signs of having anticipated, that his exemplifications and pro-syllogisms would become axiomatic sources of technical divinity. With him it was, *any stick to beat a dog;* when the dog was beaten it mattered little what became of the stick; but the dog must be beaten. He recoiled from no harshness until he had carried, as it seemed to him, his argumentative point. He can exhibit a thoroughly dogmatical spirit, as when he says, "Who art thou, O man, that repliest against God?" (Rom. ix. 20),

---

Church of England. By Matthew Arnold, M.A., LL.D., formerly Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford, and Fellow of Oriel College. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1870.

when the reply had been, not against God, but against Paul's misrepresentation of God. Valuable as it would no doubt be to persuade Puritans, if it were possible, that Paul had no design of laying down a scheme of doctrine like that which is known as Calvinism, it would be of still greater importance to convince them that even if he had, his words are of no binding obligation upon the intellect and conscience: that neither his opinions, nor those of any other writer in the New Testament, must necessarily be received as true absolutely, in order to the salvation of the soul. Nevertheless, even if the Puritans could be so convinced, and the stumbling-block of the predestinarian doctrine be removed, their reunion with the Established Church would not be so easy or so reasonable as Mr. Arnold seems to think:—

"So long as the Puritans thought that the essence of Christianity was their doctrine of predestination or of justification, it was natural that they should stand out at any cost for this essence. That is why, when the Zeit-Geist and the general movement of men's religious ideas is beginning to reveal that the Puritan gospel is not the essence of Christianity, we have been desirous to spread this revelation to the best of our powers, and by all the aids of popular exposition to help it forward. Because, when once it is clear that the essence of Christianity is not Puritan solifidianism, it can hardly long be maintained that the essence of Christianity is Puritan Church order." -p. 27.

And he suggests that the Puritans in their better informed condition might well come into the Church and assist in Protestantizing it. But if Puritan Church order is not of the essence of Christianity, neither is Episcopalian Church order; and Puritans who had become sufficiently "broad" to acknowledge that no Church order is of the essence of Christianity, could hardly be expected to merge themselves in a Church which, though not declaring anything as to Apostolical succession, does treat Episcopacy as a form of government and source of ordination as if it were an essential. Nor can there be any prospect of a reunion of other Protestant bodies with the Church of England, unless as a preliminary the Established Church will frankly recognise them as sister Churches in the form in which they now exist; in the first place, allowing an occasional interchange of pulpits between her own ministers and those of the other Protestant communities, and then, under reasonable regulations, admitting other ministers to officiate regularly and become beneficed in the National Church, on condition of their submitting to its laws and regulations, but without obliging them to be episcopally ordained. And inasmuch as the Church of England is an Establishment, so much as this could be done for it by State enactment, requiring little beyond the repeal of some considerable portions of the Caroline Act of Uniformity.

The Principle of a Liturgy or set Form of Prayer, for partial adoption in public worship, will probably continue to make way among Presbyterian and other non-Episcopalian congregations.[6] It will be difficult, however, to devise anything that will successfully compete with the Church of England Liturgy, notwithstanding its *battologia* and many

[6] "A Book of Common Prayer, containing Liturgies for Morning and Evening Service." By William Miall. London: Elliot Stock. 1870.

flaws. We cannot congratulate Mr. William Miall upon the success of his present attempt.

Type and prophecy can no longer be appealed to as "evidences," or in any way of logical argument, to establish the truth of Christianity; but an illusory rhetorical or sophistical use may be made of them by means of descriptive writing of the scene-painting kind. "The Bible is full of Christ from one end to the other;" but the Bible as here presented to us is the Bible dramatized;[7] and when the Drama takes possession of gods and heroes, faith in them is already on the wane: they are becoming mere "properties" of the stage. Abraham and Elijah, Samson and David, will not much longer serve the purpose of exhibition in a Biblical gallery for juvenile instruction, even when their "uncomely parts" are concealed in the typical drapery.

The "Aryan Mythology" of the Rev. G. W. Cox is distinguished by great learning and research, and also by great acuteness;[8] but we are compelled to say that he appears to us to have carried the application of his hypothesis a great deal too far. He is successful and fair enough in his observations upon the wild theory which Mr. Gladstone developed, according to all appearance, from an orthodox juvenile essay. But the consequences, as Mr. Cox puts them, do not follow upon the destruction of Mr. Gladstone's Biblical theory. In order to do him justice we must make a lengthened extract, giving a summing up of an important part of his work.

"The conclusion, put briefly and nakedly, is this: that if any real facts underlie the narrative of the 'Iliad and Odyssey,' they are so completely buried beneath the mythical overgrowth as to make the task of separation impossible; that the legend of the Trojan war is unhistorical; that we have no grounds for asserting that Agamemnon, Achilleus, or any other of the actors in the tale were real persons; that the story of the return of the Herakleids is as mythical as that of the war of Troy; that the sequence of these myths throws no light on the times of the composition of our 'Iliad and Odyssey;' that no historical knowledge can be gained from the legends of Hellenic colonization in Asia Minor; that the mythical history of Greece exhibits a succession of movements from west to east, and from the east back to the west again; that these movements are for the purpose of recovering a stolen treasure or a rightful inheritance; that this heritage is the bright land where the sun sinks to rest after his journey through the heaven; that the stolen treasure is the light of day carried off by the powers of darkness and brought back again, after a hard battle, in the morning; that the materials of the 'Iliad and Odyssey' are taken from the vast stores of mythical tradition common to all the Aryan nations; that these traditions can be traced back to phrases indicating physical phenomena of whatever kind; that these phrases furnish an inexhaustible supply of themes for epic poetry; that the growth of a vast epical literature was as inevitable as the multiplication of myths, when the original meaning of the phrases which gave birth to them was either in part or wholly forgotten; that the substance of the 'Iliad and the Odyssey' existed from an indefinitely early time."—p. 217.

---

7 "Heroes of Hebrew History." By Samuel Wilberforce, D.D., Lord Bishop of Winchester. London: Strahan and Co. 1870.

8 "The Mythology of the Aryan Nations." By George W. Cox, M.A., late Scholar of Trinity College, Oxford. In Two Volumes. London: Longmans. 1870.

But then—

"No charm which might have attached to the human characters of Helen and Hector, Paris and Achilleus—no pathos which lay in the tale of Sarpêdôn's early death, or of the heart-piercing grief of Priam [why not Priamos?] can equal that infinitely higher charm which takes its place, when we see in these legends the hidden thoughts of our forefathers during those distant ages when they knew nothing of an order of nature, and the fading twilight of every evening marked the death of the toiling and short-lived sun."—p. 218.

No doubt in recent times a flood of light has been thrown by means of researches in Indian antiquity, both upon the origin and affiliation of the languages now generally classed as Aryan, and also upon the classical and Scandinavian mythologies. And as one result it follows that in the Homeric poems the general mythological framework, the divine machinery, modes of natural or supernatural agency, "customary" epithets of the deities, personifications of physical phenomena, and their description in mythological terms, show a very close connexion between the religious ideas of an age already expiring in Greece, and the conceptions of the authors of some of the Vedic hymns. But to our apprehension it is impossible to resolve the epic itself—the whole "tale of Troy divine"—into a mythological enigma. A human action is therein intended to be described; invented it may be, but dramatically and artistically composed, with beginning, middle, and end; founded, if not upon an actual historical event, yet, in Aristotle's sense, more philosophical than history, as representing a chain of events which might very well have occurred at a time when the population of the Mediterranean coasts and islands employed themselves in piracy, thinking it no dishonour to plunder their neighbours' towns and to steal their women. The distinct moral characters (ἤθη) of Achilleus, Agamemnon, Diomedes, Hector, and the rest, are undoubtely lost if the whole action of the Iliad is reduced to a solar myth, but not so if it be acknowledged to be what it really is, neither a myth nor a history, but a poem; and so are preserved also the interest of many truly pathetic incidents and episodes; and the reality remains to the descriptions of the habits of men about the close of the Brazen age, their camp and domestic life, the chase of vigorous youths and hounds, and the like. It is not at all necessary to suppose the larger Homeric poems, or either of them, to have been composed at once as they have come down to us; and it is probable enough that the Iliad terminated originally with the death of Hector, so that the description of the funeral rites of Patroclus, with the immolation of the twelve Trojan youths, may not originally have belonged to it. This slaughter appears to have shocked Mr. Cox greatly as not being by any possibility Greek. Certainly, human sacrifice was not Greek, and yet we have the sacrifice of Iphigenia by her father which was felt by Athenians to be a legitimate source of dramatic interest, entangled as the hero was in the meshes of the divine casting-net. And the sacrifice of the twelve Trojans is not unsuitable dramatically as the culminating atrocity in the madness of the hard-hearted Achilleus. We cannot of course follow in detail such an elaborate work as Mr. Cox's. The principle which appears to have led him astray is the assuming that

similarity or analogy must in all cases imply community of origin. Hence the Bishop of Winchester, in his way of looking at it, supposes the classic Hercules to be a caricature of the Biblical Samson. It might with equal probability be inferred that Samson was derived from a primitive buffoon-Hercules. It is by far most probable that there is no connexion whatever between the two. So Mr. Cox finds in popular tales and stories of various nations traces of the solar myth. And this portion of the work, notwithstanding many curious analogies and approximations, appears to us as fanciful as that which treats of the Homeric poems; robbers and rievers, thieves and shifty lads, are indigenous to all soils; their tricks and achievements become the origin of popular tradition in rude ages, as they do afterwards of a Thieves' Literature, naturally presenting many points of resemblance between stories independent of each other as to origin.

The two principal points which Professor Max Müller specially illustrates in his Introduction to Captain Rogers's Translation of "Buddhagosha's Parables"[9] concern the charges of atheism and nihilism which have been brought against Buddha himself. He is desirous of vindicating Buddha more particularly—from having taught the nihilistic conception of Nirvâna. With him he supposes it to have represented "the entrance of the soul into rest, a subduing of all wishes and desires, indifference to joy and pain, to good and evil, an absorption of the soul in itself, and a freedom from the circle of existences from birth to death, and from death to a new birth."—p. xlv.

There is no immediate prospect of a settlement of this controversy, because of the absence of sufficient evidence to determine it. There is acuteness in the following observation of Professor Max Müller, but it can hardly be admitted to be conclusive:—"I believe we shall be justified in accepting that view as the original one, the one peculiar to Buddha himself, which harmonizes *least* with the later system of orthodox Buddhism."—p. xxxviii. This is confirmed to a certain extent if we assume with the Professor, that the Dhammapada, which he here translates from the Pâli, contains with some probability the utterances of Buddha himself, or if not so, at least what were believed to have been such by the members of the council under Asoka in 246 B.C., and we cannot get nearer to Buddha himself than this. Nevertheless, it can hardly be considered that the passages cited are conclusive, even supposing them to have been uttered by Buddha. It was evidently not possible, as appears amply from the literature of Buddhism, for its teachers, and we may infer for its founder himself, to avoid altogether falling into modes of expression and forms of thought prevailing in the religious and philosophical schools with which they were surrounded. Buddhism presupposed and is built upon the conception of inevitable sequences in worlds to come from the conduct of men in this. In common with Brahminism it taught or assumed that sequences would work themselves out from good and

---

[9] "Buddhagosha's Parables." Translated from Burmese. By Capt. T. Rogers, R.E. With an introduction containing Buddha's Dhammapada, or "Path of Virtue," translated from Pali. By F. Max Müller, M.A., Professor of Comparative Philology at Oxford, Foreign Member of the French Institute, &c. London: Trübner and Co. 1870.

evil antecedents, that they would respectively emerge for ever and ever, moreover that in the highest and happiest condition there would be possibility of lapse. To cut off this possibility for the wise was the aim and supposed achievement of Buddha; to extinguish passion, sense, and perception, and to bring what we should call the moral agent, if not to a state of "Nothing," to a condition of "Know-nothing," in which the entity of the individual once liable to be blown about by every gust of passion and deceived by all illusions, would lose all consciousness and be subject to no change. Whether this may properly be called an utter extinction of a personal being or not, is a purely speculative question, with which it is most probable Buddha did not concern himself, nor is it likely that any one among ourselves who should endeavour to solve it would make much progress in it. Respecting Buddha's acknowledgment or not of a Creator, Professor Max Müller arrives more distinctly at a negative conclusion. He does not think any passage can be produced from the books of the Buddhist Canon known to us, "which in any way presupposes the belief in a personal Creator." The negative character of this judgment will be fairly estimated when we remember on the one hand the existence already before the rise of Buddhism of various philosophical systems in India, and also the indistinctness which belongs among ourselves to the conception of "person," as applied to the Deity. The Parables, translated by Captain Rogers, under the name of "Buddhagosha" (fifth century after Christ), might reasonably, according to Professor Max Müller (pp. xvii. xviii.), be attributed to Mahinda, son of Asoka (third century B.C.). They are extremely curious, illustrating particularly the doctrine of sequences, of which we have spoken, and enforcing morality as understood by the Buddhist much more by the terrors of the Hells than by the prospect of Nirvâna. They confirm the truth, now becoming generally acknowledged, that no religion which has come down to us from antiquity is altogether false or bad, nor any altogether true.

Dr. Muir's purpose in his "Original Sanskrit Texts"[10] is rather to collect material which may be useful to students than to bring out any theory of his own concerning the primitive religion of the Aryas. There is, however, one question which seems to press for an answer as soon as one becomes at all acquainted with the Vedic literature—that is, which was precedent, monotheism or polytheism among the people of this race? For in the hymns themselves are found monotheistic and pantheistic conceptions as well as polytheistic. The minimum date of the Vedic hymns being now admitted by Sanskrit scholars to run up to 1000 years before Christ, it is evident that they must have been the deposit as it were of a very considerable preceding time; and there are no data, so far as we are aware, for fixing the anterior limit of the period within which they were composed. Dr. Muir speaks of

---

[10] "Original Sanskrit Texts on the Origin and History of the People of India, their Religion and Institutions." Collected, Translated, and Illustrated by J. Muir, D.C.L., LL.D., Ph.D. Vol. V. "Contributions to a Knowledge of the Cosmogony, Mythology, Religious Ideas, Life, and Manners of the Indians in the Vedic Age." London: Trübner and Co. 1870.

this moderately as one of several hundred years. It was one during which human society attained a very great degree of complexity, and underwent some important changes, as in the altered relation of the Kshatriyas and Brahmans. The speculative power had ample time meanwhile to develop itself. That the monotheistic conception was the later development during this period is most probable from the far greater preponderance of the hymns in honour of the various deities; and although several of these appear to assume at times the Attribute of Supreme Ruler or Lord, that is explained by the tendency of the particular worshipper to exaggerate the glories of his favourite deity. We must be spared any attempt to give any abstract of this learned and most painstaking collection of texts. With respect to the connexion between the Indian and Greek mythologies, we meet with the following sober and balanced judgment. Upon the whole, the older Indian mythology corresponds more nearly with the Greek than the later Indian. But there are some deities, as of the sea, of war, and of love, met with in the Epics and the Purānas, not known to the oldest Vedic poems which correspond in a general way with Poseidon, Ares, and Aphrodite. Personifications of this kind may arise in part from a later process of imagination or reflection impelling a people to fill up any blanks in their earlier mythology, and causing them to be always adding to and modifying it. "Resemblances of this last description, though they are by no means accidental, are not necessarily anything more than the results of similar processes going on in nations possessing the same general tendencies and characteristics."—p. 3.

Mr. Hunt, in the preface to his history of "Religious Thought in England,"[11] says:—"There are two views of Christianity distinctly traceable in the history of the Church. They exist more or less in all systems, and often in the same mind. The one receives its highest expression in the Roman claim to infallibility, the other in Bishop Temple's theory of the education of the human race."—p. 5. What he means is substantially true, but it is purely silly to talk of "Bishop Temple's theory." Dr. Temple never gave any indication of really understanding the theory so feebly presented in his Essay. If he had ever done so he would hardly have undertaken to withdraw that production, nor would he have reverted, if he has been rightly reported, to the necessity after the "Education" has been carried as far as possible, of a "Revelation" to supply its defects. Mr. Hunt, we think, overrates very considerably the appearance of the rationalizing principle among divines of the Church of England. No doubt Protestantism itself implies that principle; but very few divines, particularly in the English Church, which has always halted between two opinions, have really been led by it—none have dared boldly to avow it, or have undertaken to follow it whithersoever it might lead them. This false estimate of the Church of England as a Church, and the set determination to make it out, give an *ad captandum* air to Mr. Hunt's volume which

---

[11] "Religious Thought in England, from the Reformation to the end of the last Century." A Contribution to the History of Theology. By the Rev. John Hunt, M.A., Author of an "Essay on Pantheism." Vol. I. London: Strahan and Co. 1870.

would not otherwise belong to it. For it is, in fact, very temperate, fair, and well-written. It would have been rendered much more useful if the author had been more particular in the citation of his authorities.

Although French is so generally familiar in this country, we hope a great many will read the translation of Dr. Réville's brief but lucid work on the "Doctrine of the Deity of Jesus Christ," who might not have met with it in the other language.[12] No doubt the battle of the Eagles will gather shortly about this central subject. Dr. Réville himself well observes :—

"The statement that *Jesus is God* was until lately looked upon by every one, except a few Unitarian Protestants, as a proposition to be either accepted or rejected as a whole. It was supposed that no one could be a Christian who did not admit it. Jesus of Nazareth was represented as having claimed for himself the name and attributes of Deity; as having founded his right to be obeyed and believed upon this claim; and as having been the voluntary victim of that affirmation which brought his countrymen to the alternative of either adoring him as the Creator or putting him to death as a blasphemer."—p. viii.

The portion of the work which will prove most interesting is that in which Dr. Réville traces the gradual disintegration of this doctrine from the Reformation to the present time.

Mr. Orr's pamphlet on the "Authenticity of John's Gospel"[13] is worth reading, more particularly because he is not swayed to his conclusion by any desire to infer the Deity of Jesus from the statements in chap. i. and elsewhere. And he points out with great force that these statements from which some have inferred as of necessity the doctrine of the God-Man, are counterbalanced by other expressions in this Gospel more distinctly recognising the pure humanity of Jesus, than are to be met with in any other of the Gospels. "For in John's Gospel, in the very first chapter which speaks of him as an embodiment of the Logos, he is called by one of his own disciples 'Jesus of Nazareth, the *son of Joseph*.' Nor in this Gospel is the miraculous conception once spoken of, though Mary, as 'the mother of Jesus,' is repeatedly introduced."—p. 4. As Mr. Orr writes essentially from the same theological standing-ground as the late Professor J. J. Tayler, a comparison may fairly be instituted between the two arguments.

Mr. Robert Lamb's "School Sermons,"[14] do not profess to enter upon theology strictly so called; they are, however, orthodox; but we note them on account of the evident sincerity and amiability of the author.

---

[12] "History of the Doctrine of the Deity of Jesus Christ." Translated from the French of Albert Réville, Minister of the French Reformed Church, Rotterdam. Authorized Translation. By Ann Swaine. London: Williams and Norgate. 1870.

[13] "The Authority of John's Gospel, deduced from Internal Evidence." With Answers to Objections derived from the Mode of Teaching the Style, the Doctrine of the Logos, and other circumstances. By James Orr. London: Williams and Norgate. 1870.

[14] "School Sermons Preached in St. Paul's Church, Manchester." Vol. I. "The Crisis of Youth." Vol. II. "Early Manhood." By Robert Lamb, M.A., Rector. London: Longmans. 1870.

The "Critical English New Testament,"[15] published by Messrs. Bagster, is not intended apparently to give much aid in the revision of the Authorized Version generally. It is simply intended to point out to the English reader the places where some alteration will be necessary by reason of now acknowledged improvements in the Received Text.

Unlike most interpreters of the Apocalypse, Mr. Desprez has the courage frankly to acknowledge that he believes himself to have been wrong in a very essential point of a previous explanation of that generally puzzling book.[16] He now considers that Babylon is to be interpreted of Romê, not of Jerusalem, which no doubt removes some difficulties. And as to the general principle of explanation which the author adopts, it lies between the hypothesis of a supernatural enigmatical prediction of particular history, and that of a *vaticinatio post eventum:* he supposes the Seer, probably John the Apostle himself, to have anticipated the speedy return of the Messiah to earth to destroy his enemies and to set up the kingdom of the New Jerusalem; an anticipation which was speedily falsified by events.

The half-yearly issue of Messrs. Clark's Ante-Nicene Library consist of the second volume of the "Works of Tertullian,"[17] comprising seven of his treatises, all of considerable interest; also of a volume containing a complete collection of "Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, and Revelations." Messrs. Clark have also published a translation of Ullmann's well-known treatise on "The Sinlessness of Jesus."[18]

Dr. M. Reichel's is an excellent translation of that portion of Dr. Zeller's "Philosophie der Griechen"[19] which treats of the post-Aristotelian philosophy, "which supplied the scientific mould into which Christianity in the early years of its growth was cast, and bearing the shape of which, it has come down to us;" which is true in a considerable measure.

"The Laws of Discursive Thought," by Dr. M'Cosh,[20] will prove a

---

[15] "A Critical English New Testament; Presenting at one view the Authorized Version and the Results of the Criticisms of the Original Text." London: Bagster. 1870.

[16] "John; or, the Apocalypse of the New Testament." By Philip S. Desprez, B.D., Vicar of Alvediston, Wilts. Author of "Daniel; or, the Apocalypse of the Old Testament." London: Longmans. 1870.

[17] "The Writings of Quintus Sept. Flor. Tertullianus." Vol. II. Translated by Peter Holmes, D.D., F.R.A.S., Domestic Chaplain to the Right Hon. the Countess of Rothes. "Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, and Revelations." Translated by Alexander Walker, Esq, one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools for Scotland. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1870.

[18] "The Sinlessness of Jesus." An Evidence for Christianity. By Carl Neumann, D.D. Translated from the Seventh Altered and Enlarged Edition. By Sophia Taylor. Edinburgh: T. T. Clark. 1870.

[19] "The Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics." Translated from the German of E. Zellér, Professor of the University of Heidelberg. By Oswald J. Reichel, B.C.L. and M.A., Vicar of Sparsholt, Vice-Principal of Cuddesden College, and sometime Scholar of Queen's College, Oxford. London: Longmans. 1870.

[20] "The Laws of Discursive Thought: being a Text Book of Formal Logic." By James M'Cosh, LL.D., President of the New Jersey College, Princeton; formerly Professor of Logic and Metaphysics, Queen's College, Belfast. London: Macmillan and Co. 1870.

very useful practical book. He observes that most writers who have recently treated of Logic have dwelt especially on the laws of ratiocination and the rules of syllogism. The Port Royal Logic was famous in its day for its illustration of the operation of the judgment, and for its rules concerning propositions. Dr. M'Cosh points out that most errors in processes of reasoning are in fact traceable to a defect in the first logical operation of the intellect—namely, originate in indistinctness of apprehension. He has, therefore, taken chief pains to investigate the nature of "the notion" or object of apprehension (νόημα).

POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES AND TRAVELS.

WHATEVER may be the exact issue of the present legislative efforts for the reform of the law of tenure of land in Ireland, the speculations on the real political aspects of land to which these efforts are due, or with which they have been accompanied, are likely to be of the most permanent value. We had occasion lately to notice the series of essays on "Systems of Land Tenure" published by the Cobden Club. Another really precious contribution in the same direction is a volume of essays by Professor Cliffe Leslie,[1] on "Land Systems and Industrial Economy of Ireland, England, and Continental Countries." In this work the wholesome lessons which have been so long inculcated in this Review with respect to the true relations of land to social existence and progress are driven home with all the accumulated force of argument, example, statistics, and moral suasion. Professor Cliffe Leslie enforces the doctrine that it is not enough merely to redress the accidental evils of a particular system of land tenure, however vicious. "The system of Irish agricultural tenure (he says) is admitted on all sides to be an intolerable evil, both politically and economically regarded; but it has become so not through its own inherent impolicy and injustice alone, but by reason also of the entire structure of the land system, which gives the occupation of the tenant-farmer an undue predominance in the economy of the island as in the mind of the public. The position of the tenant-farmer cannot indeed be fully understood without reference to the unhealthy and unnatural economy produced by the land system as a whole." It is pointed out clearly that it is an entire misconception to suppose that the towns have not suffered equally with the country, and that even within the last twenty years the degeneration has been very rapid. If a line were drawn from Dublin to the nearest point of Lough Swilly in the north, and another to Bantry Bay in the south, the angle contained by these lines between the capital and the Atlantic, does not include one large and populous city, and hardly includes a town or village the trade and population of which have not decreased in the last twenty years. Absen-

[1] "Land Systems and Industrial Economy of Ireland, England, and Continental Countries." By J. E. Cliffe Leslie, LL.B. London: Longmans. 1870.

teeism is properly denounced as dwarfing all the local custom and industry of the rural neighbourhoods, the peasant having no market for his poultry, eggs, and butter, and the village shopkeeper keeping up a ceaseless struggle with the want of custom and the smallness of profits. Professor Cliffe Leslie again treats the recent customary emigration from Ireland in the only true way a humane and patriotic citizen can treat it. The whole stream of emigration, he says, which flows from imprisoned national wealth, from the legal insecurity of industrial enterprise and improvement, is a current of decline, not of progress; and he alleges it to be among the grave mischiefs of the doctrines so sedulously diffused respecting the advantage of emigration, that it misleads the mind of the public and of the Irish proprietors to look for a cure of the evils of Ireland in one of the results of their perpetuation. The key to the author's whole position, based as it is on the widest experience and the profoundest thought, is that "the system of property, an oligarchic and feudal system of property, is the radical evil, of which the system of tenure is only a single branch. The great aim of Parliament ought to be to diffuse property in land widely throughout the nation; treating all immediate cost incurred for that end in compensating existing proprietors, as incurred, not only for the improvement of Ireland, but also for the security of the Empire.

The Cobden Club have rendered another great service to theoretical and practical political science by the publication of Mr. Cobden's "Speeches on Questions of Public Policy."[2] Mr. Cobden has become in many quarters so mere a name associated with the history of the Free-trade controversy, and with the French commercial treaty, as well perhaps as with certain extreme doctrines on the subject of Peace, that it is high time to re-establish one of the wisest, purest minded, and most patriotic of modern Englishmen in the estimation of his countrymen. These volumes have the advantage of exhibiting in connexion with each other Mr. Cobden's views on a large number of very different topics. The effect is to show at once the clearness and unity of his mind, and also to illustrate a truth now-a-days much forgotten, that the main dogmas of the Liberal creed really hang together in such a way that any sincere and intelligent advocate of one will be an equally sincere and intelligent advocate of all. Mr. Thorold Rogers's preface affords a suitable and worthy introduction to the whole. Mr. Cobden is there described as, in the strictest sense of the words, an extempore speaker. He pretended neither to rhetoric nor to epigram, and the style is described as "homely, conversational, familiar, and even garrulous." He was never unprepared, for he never spoke on any topic with which he was not thoroughly conversant.

"He read up everything which he talked about, hence his facts were as indisputable as his inferences were precise. He was never obliged to repudiate a principle which he had once adopted or announced, for he never accepted a compromise on any question of public policy. Hence he has done more than

[2] "Speeches on Questions of Public Policy," by Richard Cobden, M.P. Edited by John Bright and James E. Thorold Rogers. In two volumes. London: Macmillan. 1870.

any other statesman to make the administration of public affairs an exact science. And for the same reason as he entered into Parliament in the full maturity of his powers, he never had to abandon a single position which he accepted, maintained, and affirmed."

The subjects to which the speeches in these two volumes refer are numerous, and include all the most pressing political topics of the day. They are Free-trade, Finance, War, Foreign Policy, India, Parliamentary Reform, and Education. It is not necessary even to state summarily Mr. Cobden's leading views on all these topics. These views have, in a more or less modified, or rather mutilated form, become part of the general programme of the Liberal party. All that is wanted in order to translate the idea of Mr. Cobden into the actual world of his successors, is consistency, thoroughness, and decision of thought, purity of aim, comprehensiveness of knowledge, and fearlessness in action.

English readers have been surfeited with descriptions of American politics, institutions, habits, and scenery, all more or less varying from even the probable truth, and all coloured in a greater or less degree with the lurid hues imparted by prejudice and love of display and of stimulating composition, if not by something worse, as malevolence or reckless pruriency. It is a sincere pleasure to recal the wondering and staring faculties of Englishmen, who really wish to get some real information about current American facts, to a work which, from the first page to the last, is replete with truth—as large a measure of the truth as the space renders possible, and nothing but the truth. Mr. W. F. Rae's work, entitled "Westward by Rail,"[3] purports to narrate the most salient parts of his experience during a visit he paid last year to the United States, and in the course of which he travelled by the new Pacific railway route to San Francisco, and minutely inspected Salt Lake City. The work is mainly of a descriptive nature, and does not include, except incidentally, Mr. Rae's estimate of the social and political condition of the States; though he refers to a valuable article of his own in the number of this Review for January, 1870, in reference to the conclusions he has come to upon the "problems which cluster round the American claims upon England." The parts of this work which especially demand, and will receive, attention, are the vivid and detailed accounts of the railway journey across the continent, the critical examination of the state and prospects of the Mormon settlement, the pictorial exhibition of the condition of San Francisco and the Californians, and the appreciative and sympathetic account of Boston and Harvard University. There is a quiet and subtle charm as well as a deep and true romantic interest in the story of the railway journey, as "Pullman's Sleeping Cars," with all their hotel appendages, exceeding even the privileges of royalty at home, are swung across the prairie, from city to city; now among retreating or already vanished buffaloes; now among

[3] "Westward by Rail: the New Route to the East." By W. F. Rae. London: Longmans. 1870.

Indians, so "friendly" as to have assumed the revolver as an ornament over and above the bowie-knife; now along a swampy marsh, "going at a snail's pace, and each moment being likely to go to hell's bottom;" now among snow-capped mountains, eight thousand miles above the sea level; now again descending a thousand feet in twenty miles without steam-power, with "brakes tightly screwed down on the locomotive and the cars." The description of the last part of the ascent is very striking:—

"The intense coldness of the air excites general remark. The explanation is simple. We are nearing the highest point of the line. Since leaving Omaha the ascent has been gradual, but continuous. We have ascended nearly eight thousand feet above the sea level, and the height gained is amidst the peaks of the Rocky Mountains, on which snow always lies, and where not a day throughout the year passes without the fall of a larger or smaller quantity of snow. The purity of the air is extreme. Objects many miles distant seem as if they were but as many feet removed from the spectator. With difficulty do the lungs become inflated, so great is the rarity of the air. As mile after mile is traversed the ground is more steep. Cuttings through the rocks have been made to reduce the incline. The strain on the engine becomes greater; the speed of the train is diminished, until the ascent is finally made; and the train halts at Sherman, a railway station of which the elevation exceeds that of any in the world, it being situated 8235 feet above the level of the sea."

The part devoted to the description of the life of the Saints is of very rare value, because there seems to be in Englishmen an almost physical incapacity to look at this subject with judicial coolness yet moral self-possession. Mr. Rae, in his preface, speaks in very strong though justly deserved language of writers, who "without unreservedly expressing personal admiration for the worst Mormon doctrines and customs, leave undoubtedly the impression that polygamy is not such a bad thing after all." Mr. Rae has not added much to the actual facts already known, though the impression he gives, owing to his placing the facts in what is manifestly their true relation to each other, is distinctly less favourable to the character of Mormon institutions than that given by most previous writers. He denounces with vehement though carefully measured indignation, the system of espionage, intolerance, tyranny, and sexual profligacy, accompanied with the most stupid religious fanaticism on which he considers the Mormon church to be built up; but he advocates no other mode of extinguishing that church than a severely just and equal administration of the general law of the United States. There is something very touching in Mr. Rae's concluding notice of Boston, contrasting as it does with what he has to tell of the spurious forms of civilization making way in Utah and California:—

"The Bostonians are in the van of that civilization, which is distinctively American, and of which the mission and the pride consist in demonstrating to a sceptical and sneering world that the most uncompromising and perfect Republicanism tends to elevate rather than to vulgarize; to beautify rather than to tarnish; to quicken the pulse of general self-sacrifice, rather than to repress all the finer feelings of human nature, and enshrines in men's minds,

as the only idols to which homage can be fitly paid, the highest forms of social breeding, and the most finished patterns of mental culture."

This is a book of which a brief and incomplete notice is not less painful, by an act of self-denial to the writer, than it is a loss to a reader who will not betake himself to the pages of the original.

The legitimate province of humour in the treatment of the saddest and most perplexing problems of social and political philosophy is one of the most debateable questions in criticism. It is very easy to decry altogether the admixture of humour on any pretext whatever. It is not difficult to advocate a light and satirical mode of treating all subjects whatever, even the gravest. The true difficulty for the writer and the critic is to see so deeply into the heart of things as never to lose sight of their intrinsic quality, and yet to have such a clear view of surrounding things as to be in no danger of evincing even for a moment any disproportionate or inharmonious attention to one class of ideas at the expense of all others. He who solves this practical problem is the truest and profoundest humorist, and the unknown author of "Ginx's Baby" has made good his claims to be ranked as such.[4] The topics really presented in this marvellous and startling little biography are the darkest and often the most repulsive ones of modern society. Over-population, pauper-dwellings in densely crowded towns, poor-law stolidity, religious bigotry, ignorance, and intolerance, sectarian charity and charitable fanaticism, magisterial and police effeteness, legal and judicial cobweb-weaving, colonial questions, Irish questions, and home government questions,—each of these topics is handled gently but firmly, or rather sketched out in broad and ghastly chalks, coloured after a fashion that no one who comes near can fail to keep staring at them, and those who have once so stared will never forget them. In attempting to carry out so ambitious a project, it is not unnatural that the ludicrous side should sometimes occupy the whole of the picture and the other aspect be for a time almost forgotten. This is an obvious ground for criticism, though the criticism can lead nowhere in a case like this, where everything depends on the real seriousness of the author. To one who knows what he is touching everything may be forgiven, to another who smiles without thinking what he is smiling at, even real drollery is rightly imputed as a charge. The story of this work is simple, though perhaps hardly probable. It is that of an unfortunate child born in the purlieus of Westminster, and which narrowly escapes being drowned by its father who has already had twelve other children. It is rescued from this fate by the bystanders, and soon falls into the hands of some pious Catholics, and then into those of a Protestant Association, from which it finally escapes and, by a feat of literary legerdemain, finds itself brought face to face with the members of a leading political club in Pall Mall. It passes some of its early years in this establishment, and last scene of this story's eventful history, finally commits suicide over Vauxhall Bridge. This is the rude skeleton of the tale. The

[4] "Ginx's Baby: his Birth and other Misfortunes." London: Strahan & Co. 1870.

real living body must be read and pondered over in its own brief, stirring, harrowing, deadly, or life-inspiring characters.

In his treatment of "Difference of Sex as a topic of Jurisprudence and Legislation," Professor Sheldon Amos differs as much from previous writers in his method as in his matter.[5] In the first place, he treats all the "woman's questions" together, regarding them as all depending upon the same principles, and each as illustrating all the rest. In the second place, he commences with describing the ultimate form of society he desires, as considering it the most adequate for the development of all that is in man, and tests existing or possible legislation by little else than its capacity to promote the advent of this state of society. As for the matter, the author differs from almost every one of the leading English writers on the same subject by wishing to intensify to the utmost the differences between the sexes, and by holding the fact of these differences to be the most precious and civilizing agents in promoting the general culture of the human race. But then it is true and not false, natural and not artificial, differences that he wishes to have manifested and developed in every way. The pressing questions are, how to ascertain what are true and natural differences, and how to favour the greatest possible play and interchange of these differences one with another. It is at this point that junction is made with Mr. John Stuart Mill and the general English champions of woman's claims to legal and political equality with man. It is pointed out that all laws which (except for the purpose of ascertaining the fact of marriage and protecting the physically weak) have recognised differences of sex have been simply mischievous, and have seriously retarded civilization. They have confounded the true grounds of opposition between the sexes, they have crystallized the ignorant, tyrannical, and partial conceptions of particular epochs, they have prevented men and women discovering by real experiment and living attempts what is the kind of work to which in the long run they are severally best fitted. Thus the author arrives at the same conclusions on all the main points, as those whom he, at one part of his reasoning, appears to oppose. He is in favour, on grounds carefully stated, of law interposing as few obstacles as possible in the way of divorce, of marriage having no effect whatever on the rights of ownership of the parties to it; of the entire abandonment of all special legislation for women, in the way of specially protecting them or excluding them from occupations and professions; and lastly, of the complete recognition of the equal political capacity of women with men.

Mr. Grant's work[6] on "Home Politics and the Growth of Trade considered in its relation to Labour, Pauperism, and Emigration," is not only of great value in itself, as drawing attention to classes of facts not sufficiently dwelt upon in their mutual connexion with each other, but also as containing a mass of statistics and facts arrayed in a convenient

---

[5] "Difference of Sex as a topic of Jurisprudence and Legislation." By Sheldon Amos, M.A., Professor of Jurisprudence, University College, London. London: Longmans. 1870.

[6] "Home Politics and the Growth of Trade considered in its relation to Labour, Pauperism, and Emigration." By Daniel Grant. Longmans. 1870.

form, and likely to be of the greatest use to social and political reformers. Mr. Grant's general position is that a great, though scarcely noticed, transformation of social conditions is going on in the country which, unless special precautions are taken, is likely to lead to national disasters of the most aggravated kind. The general facts that the trade of this country has of late years been increasing at an enormous rate, that population has been far more than keeping pace with it, and that the people have been becoming more and more dependent upon other countries for the supply of the necessaries of life, are admitted on all sides. The question arises as to what issue these facts tend, and there are many tokens that that issue is anything but a favourable one. In the first place, the excessive growth of trade has been, in a great measure, owing to a series of exceptional causes which Mr. Grant examines with great particularity. Among the causes are, as enumerated by Mr. Grant, the growth of population and civilization all over the world, the influences of emigration in connexion with the discoveries of gold, international exhibitions, the action of war as developing new relations with other countries, the opening of new ports of trade and the reduction of import duties, and the influence of capital. Some of these causes are likely to continue to operate, but not all. Mr. Grant's general conclusion from this part of his investigation is that "we have no right to anticipate a further large development of our future trade." But in the second place, population is not likely to be arrested, or even to maintain its present moderate rate of growth, and the problem of a constantly growing pauperism is presented in all its terrible proportions. It is at this point that Mr. Grant urges the main argument which it is the purpose of his work to insist on. The Colonial Empire and India must be bound together with England in far closer bonds than ever before, in order to provide for the development of the almost untouched resources of the outlying dependencies of England, and also for the sustenance of the superabundant population of this country. Mr. Grant is in favour of making emigration to the colonies a matter of State policy of the most conscious and deliberate kind.

The subject of popular education in this country is gradually approaching the stage at which the main questions involved are clearly ascertained, and the points at which final issue will be joined between opponents are being rapidly reached. Mr. Sproat's work on the "Education of the Rural Poor"[7] is an useful contribution to these ends. It is arranged in a form in which each debateable proposition is brought clearly into view, and it contains valuable statistics and facts as serviceable to one side as to the other. Assuming the fact of the deplorably depressed condition of the agricultural poor in the matter of education, there are (says Mr. Sproat) four sources through which an improved condition of these poor may be looked for. These are—(1) the parents; (2) the clergy; (3) the landed proprietors and

---

[7] "Education of the Rural Poor, with a full Discussion of the Principles and Requirements of Remedial Legislation thereon." By Gilbert Malcolm Sproat. London: Bush. 1870.

resident gentry; and (4) the Government. Each of these classes of persons has its qualifications tested in turn. The parent is, in some parts of the country, seriously hampered by his poverty and by the necessity under which he labours of making use of his child's labour. "Child's labour is useful on farms generally, and it is difficult for the peasant to resist the solicitation of the farmer, together with the attraction of a substantial addition to his own weekly income. In some parts of the country, the inducements to labourers to hire out even their young children to farmers are especially influential, owing to the variety and quick succession of employments suitable for children." The clergy are rightly charged with not having been consistently the poor man's friends against the rich, and with having been habitually seduced from the exercise of their true functions by their "social leanings." The landowners have been obviously interested, from their own point of view, hitherto in resisting popular education; and the present English land system is in a great measure responsible for the abuses so brought about. Accepting then the position that the Government must, in default of other agency, take the initiative, what is called the religious difficulty immediately presents itself. We are certainly not satisfied with Mr. Sproat's well-intentioned compromise of insisting on the "reading in a rate-paid school of the Scriptures, chiefly from the Authorized Version." In a strictly so-called "national school," nothing but the best elements of all learning should be given, and those of the rudest and most mechanical description;—so only can all danger of confounding mere mental training with education in the true sense of the word be averted, and also all risk of offending justifiable and honourable scruples on the part of parents be guarded against. Mr. Sproat quotes with approbation the opinion of Wilhelm von Humboldt on the subject of "compulsion."

It is a great help towards the clearing of a subject in dispute to have all the arguments on one side ably, fairly, and powerfully handled. This service Mr. Dudley Campbell has rendered to the question of "Compulsory Education."[8] Nothing can be added to what he has said, and he has said it all about as well as it could be said. Mr. Campbell's argument is indeed a hard piece of logic which it is very difficult to struggle out of, the more so as he admits that the method he advocates is only a temporary necessity, and in a few years "a new generation, lifted up from the ground where its fathers lie shackled by poverty and ignorance, would need little of constraint or assistance to induce them to afford their offspring the advantages to which they owed their elevation." This is indeed the best or only true defence of the interference of the State in this matter. The argument against such interference generally rests upon universal principles, which only the deepest and most far-seeing of political thinkers can truly apprehend, and yet which are seen to be, when once apprehended, inexorable.

A bold, but only too justly deserved, onslaught is made on the main

---

[8] "Compulsory Education." By the Hon. Dudley Campbell, M.A. London: John Murray. 1870.

vices of our public-school system by M. A. B., in a series of letters which have already appeared in different periodicals.[9] The English public-school system, bound up as it is with the aristocratical habits and associations of the country, linked to the past by many really precious personal recollections, and presenting certain tangible and easily recognisable results of a favourable kind, is very hard to assail successfully. The abuse of athletic sports, the system of organized slavery termed fagging (possibly a necessary part of the whole institution), the extravagance, the idleness, the corrupting habits of competition, the prevalent false views of the objects of education, wholly evade criticism in the presence of a few tolerably successful products who have survived the perilous discipline. The masterly hand of M. A. B. lashes the whole system as it now exists with well-merited scorn.

For an account of the existing government of the University of Cambridge, and the real meaning and bearing of the reforms contemplated, the entertaining pamphlet by a "Member of the Senate"[10] may be advantageously read. The real vices in the modern English system of imparting the highest kind of mental culture are so gross, transparent, and persistent, that every contribution by way of vehement protest may be gladly welcomed. Such a contribution is all the more acceptable when it proceeds from one like Mr. Quain,[11] who has himself achieved conspicuous eminence in an arduous professional calling, and seems to look round with something like despair on the quantity of waste that attends the training of the new generation. There are two main faults in English education which really lie at the root of all the more detailed mistakes to which such a host of youths are incessantly being sacrificed. They are, first, that the matter of education does not interest or stimulate the mind and moral curiosity of the pupil. Secondly, which is only the first fault in another form, the matter of education has not sufficient bearing on the requirements of adult life. Now, no one who is not a mere pedant in educational reform supposes that all teaching is to be made nothing else than agreeable to the pupil, and that nothing is to be taught but what can be turned to distinct practical account. The complaint is that English education errs by excess the other way. What once represented real interests and tangible concerns represents them no longer, and yet still composes the main structure of English teaching. On the other hand, all the real modern interests and concerns are hardly recognised at all. Mr. Quain quotes foreign criticisms on the leading facts of our educational system, and explains the evils of excessive athleticism by the existence of the other evils:—

[9] "Public School Reforms: a few Remarks and Suggestions on the Mental, Moral, and Physical Training of Youth." By M. A. B. London: L. Booth. 1870.

[10] "A few Brief Remarks on Cambridge University and College Reform.' By a Member of the Senate. London: Longmans. 1870.

[11] "On some Defects in General Education: being the Hunterian Oration of the Royal College of Surgeons for 1869." By Richard Quain, F.R.S. London: Macmillan. 1870.

"The schoolboy, taught nothing of natural science, knowing no use of the world around, except as it is known to all untaught persons, civilized and uncivilized, except as it ministers to sport or to the pleasure of active exertion, has no other attractive employment but these. Had he been engaged in school-work which was not wholly irksome; had he learnt to look with intelligence on natural objects, learnt to think 'how and why' things have come to be as they are and to work out the answer, there would then be, in intelligent observation and the acquisition of attractive and most necessary knowledge, healthful out-door occupations, in various forms. But they do not exist."

No book could be more seasonable at the present moment than a report of an argument turning on the state of public education in America in respect of the use of the Bible in common schools.[12] The argument is not only useful by way of illustrating the possible questions that may and will arise in this country if the question of the inclusion or exclusion of the Bible in the school programme be left to be decided by a local board, but also supplies a very vivid picture of the modes of thought prevalent in the States on the complex question of secular education. The question arose upon the passing of a resolution of the "Board of Education of the city of Cincinnati, prohibiting the instruction and reading of religious books, including the Holy Scriptures, in the common schools of Cincinnati, it being the true object and intent of this rule to allow the children of the parents of all sects and opinion in matters of faith and worship to enjoy alike the benefit of the common school fund." The case was decided in favour of the retention of the use of the Bible. The argument turned upon the degree in which the Christian, or any revealed religion, was recognised as the basis of the constitution, and upon the degree in which the use of the Bible was essentially presupposed in maintaining that basis.

The Report of the Commissioners despatched to the United States by the French Government, for the purpose of reporting upon the condition of Public Education, is a document of no ordinary interest.[13] Its actual contents necessarily consist of much the same matter as Bishop Fraser has lately made known to Englishmen, though differing so far as it is viewed from a French standing-point, and for French and not English purposes. M. Hippeau, in summing up the result of his investigations, delights in insisting on the connexion of democratic freedom with a high order of public education. In such a country as France, he notices, the offices to be distributed are severely limited, and there is a natural, though unconscious disinclination to encourage studies among the people which will only multiply the hungry aspirants for political honours. The principle of "self-government," on the other hand, at once enlarges the area of government, and so relies more prevalently on the cooperation of great numbers of the population, and also entirely takes out of the way the

[12] "The Bible in the Public Schools." Arguments in the case of John D. Minor et als *v.* The Board of Education of the City of Cincinnati et als. Superior Court of Cincinnati. Cincinnati. 1870.

[13] "L'Instruction publique aux États-Unis: Rapport adressé au Ministre de L'Instruction publique." Par M. C. Hippeau. Paris. 1870.

jealous craving on the part of the large mass of the people for what is only in the hands of a carefully chosen few. The whole of this work, though compressed within a moderate space, is of the greatest interest, and presents a complete picture of the whole educational system of the United States. It is well known that the main feature and leading unit of that system is the "free or common school." This school is partly a national, partly a State, and partly a local or municipal institution. The land or part of the funds is partly contributed by the nation; the general administration is determined upon and controlled by the State, or by the central committee appointed by the State Legislature; and the actual work and appointments are superintended by the local committee. Many circumstances have conspired to raise the standard of female education. Among these are the large draught upon the male teachers made by the late war, and the great demand for teachers in the new freedmen's schools in the South. The real successes obtained in the education of women and the high conceptions of education getting to be prevalent, have no doubt contributed to the same end. M. Hippeau notices that whereas a good general education of a liberal and scientific character is more widely diffused in the States than perhaps anywhere else, yet evidence of excellence in single branches of knowledge has hitherto been only rarely attained. This may be attributed in part to the democratic constitution of society; and in part to certain exceptional conditions of life, which are unfavourable to habits of persistent and secluse study.

An Essay on "The Science of Law and its Reform," by a Queen's Counsel, is a work which naturally excites considerable expectations.[14] In fact, it may be said to promise the matter which is needed more than anything else at the present time, when loose political language, vague legal terminology, inaccuracy of expression in debate, are hourly causing an endless amount of confusion and delay. The work, however, is painfully disappointing, as may be seen at once when it is said that the following expressions are co-ordinated together for the purposes of independent definition—The Truth, The Law, Justice, Principle in Law, Rule of Law, Equity. What is wanted is a clear line drawn between logical, ethical, and juridical conceptions, and no scientific analysis is worth anything that does not proceed upon a full recognition of all of them, and a careful distinction established and maintained between them.

A valuable "Appendix" or "Second Part" of Dr. Holzendorff's "Encyclopädie der rechtswissenschaft,"[15] is the "Rechtslexicon," containing a complete alphabetical catalogue of legal terms, with copious explanations, historical and exegetical.

It seems to be the special function of French writers at present to throw light upon the subject of social reconstruction, especially in the matter of the relations of capital and labour. The author of "Le

[14] "An Essay on the Science of Law, and on its Reform." By W. Forbes Johnson, Q.C. Dublin: Hodges.

[15] "Rechtslexicon. Herausgeben untermit wirkung namhafter rechtsgelehrter." Von Dr. Franz von Holzendorff. Erster Hefte. Leipzig. 1870.

Sublime'"[16] professes to have been a workman himself for twenty years, and to have invented or adopted the expression "sublime" to characterize a workman who, on one ground or another, is good for nothing. "One no longer speaks of a regular and well-conducted workman as being good, or a violent, idle, or drunken one as being bad; one calls the first a 'workman,' the other a 'sublime.' Workmen are classified as follows: the true workman, the workman, the mixed workman, the simple 'sublime,' the 'sublime,' who has gone down in the world, the true 'sublime,' the 'son of God,' and the 'sublime of the sublime.'" The author describes the different classes and their social habits with great detail, and shows a truly liberal spirit in his fear of inviting the assistance of Government for any other purpose except for vindicating the free action and expression of opinion on the part of all.

The philosophy of the progress of society has, since the days of Montesquieu and Rousseau, possessed a peculiar attraction for French thinkers. Madame Clémence Roger applies herself to the problem of reconstructing society from its earliest germ by recurring, in the first place, to the speculations of Rousseau.[17] It is said to have been under the mixed influences of Christian tradition and a hesitating philosophy, "still replete with the old instincts of race," that he collected a quantity of ideas on the nature of man, which were only up to the average standard of the intellect of his day. His consequences are logically drawn, and are only false if the premises as to the facts of human nature on which they rest are false, as they are. It is the purpose of Madame Roger to show that the whole history of the world exhibits a species of physiological development, and that in obedience to the strict laws of this development, animal life has succeeded to vegetation and mineral existence, human life to animal life, and social life to human life. Laws have done much to confound the internal action of this development, and it is only in perfect equality with full freedom for the display of differences, that is to be sought the perfection of society. Much of the ground travelled over has been already occupied by Mr. Herbert Spencer.

To classify the amusements of mankind according to the degree of selfishness they exhibit, and the injury to the happiness of other people they produce, is an idea sufficiently original to justify the treatment of a number of topics rather grave and momentous in a somewhat lighter spirit than usually becomes them. M. d'Esterno, in describing "The King's Amusement,"[18] is not thinking of a publicly crowned monarch, but of the uncrowned popular monarch who succeeded to the throne in 1789. In laying hold of all the good things that came in his way he was met by the problem of what to do with the game, which belongs to the country, and not to the town. The destroyers of game fall under four heads:—1st, those who wish to get other people's game; 2ndly, those who

[16] "Le Sublime, ou le Travailleur comme il est en 1870 et ce qu'il peut être." Par D. P. Paris. 1870.

[17] "Origine de l'Homme et des Sociétés." Par Mdme. Clémence Roger.

[18] "Comment le Roi s'amuse en France, et la loi aussi." Par M. d'Esterno. Paris. 1869.

wish to destroy other people's game; 3rdly, those who wish to hunt other people's game; 4thly, those who wish to manage other people's game. An immense mass of multifarious topics falls under the teaching of this book, as dress, female manners, racing, hunting, fishing, wolf-destroying, and the like. The modes of cure suggested are of a too legal nature for our taste, and altogether display an overweening confidence in the value of government supervision.

The reform of the Prussian constitution has an especial interest for Englishmen.[19] Many of the most serious questions, as education, representation, criminal procedure, and reconstruction of the army, presented in England, are the very same as those with which Prussia has already dealt, or is in the process of dealing with. Furthermore, all the leading speculators on constitutional reform in Prussia either take England as their type of constitutional perfection, or else pride themselves on displaying their familiarity with the most antiquated mysteries of English government. The writer on "The Reform of the Prussian Constitution," charges his countrymen with an abandonment of the English model, and an overfondness for a French one. The complaint is, that the notion of a "constitution" is habitually worked out from the general to the special; and some grand and far-seeking conception acquiesced in, which obliterates the details by its very splendour. The true mode of treating the subject is held to be the clear definition of the actual rights and duties of each citizen, with such restriction or extension of those rights and duties as any particular situation may demand. Thus definiteness succeeds to cloudland, and stern practical guidance to rhetoric and magniloquence.

The International Congress of Basle, in September, 1869, among many other advanced positions which they assumed, arrived at the conclusion that there ought to be no more private property in land. Dr. Adolph Wagner has devoted an interesting little pamphlet[20] to the examination in great detail of the value of the arguments alleged in support of this view. He holds generally that private property in land is not a sign of progressive national corruption, but rather of a high civilization, and that even the ordinary elements of physical subsistence for a people cannot be efficiently provided for in its absence. He takes especial pains to examine the theories held by Haxthausen and others, as to the great antiquity of village proprietorship in Russia and Sclavonia. Dr. Wagner points out that, up to 1592, the Russian peasants enjoyed a far greater freedom in respect of locomotion and freedom of service than after that date, when a ukase bound the peasant to the soil. The real question here discussed is not identical with the Irish and English one, but rather touches on the value of introducing a system of compulsory co-proprietorship, which is of course a very doubtful policy.

Publicity and a clear conception of facts are great helps to the solution of international controversies. Professor Montague Bernard

---

[19] "Die Reform der Preussischen Verfassung." Leipzig. 1870.

[20] "Die Abschaffung des Privaten Grundeigenthums." Von Dr. Adolph Wagner. Leipzig. 1870.

has not only rendered a vast service to the general progress of international law by his investigation of all the historical *data* concerning the relations of Great Britain and America during the late civil war, but he has also paved the way for settling the particular disputes arising out of the depredations of the *Alabama*.[21] It is true that Professor Bernard, while maintaining a judicial impartiality between the two countries, does not think it well for the two governments to revive the memory of any of the incidents of the war. He points out that in all times neutral States have pressed too far the interests and claims of neutrals, and belligerent States those of belligerents. "These facts show how the point of view from which a State regards questions of international right and expediency may be affected by the situation in which it is placed, and how rapidly even cherished opinions may give way before a great and violent change of circumstances." These considerations, however, in themselves go no way to prove that England ought not to be forward in having all claims against her of the private losses caused through the release of the *Alabama* fairly assessed. A sore of this kind should be more than merely covered with a false or scarf skin.

The history and main literary work of one of the greatest religious and social reformers in the East have an interest which no amount of repetition can dull. A German translator of the remains of the almost fabulous philosopher and prophet, Lao-tse, illustrated by copious notes, may, in truth, be said to open out the otherwise inaccessible.[22] Lao-tse, so far as anything is known certainly about him, lived in the seventh century before Christ, and was a contemporary of Confucius, who visited him. Confucius, for many days after his visit, kept a severe silence, till at last he said among other things that he had been rendered speechless with astonishment at his great contemporary's richness of conception and range of imagination. "Lao-tse's profundity of spirit and reach of thought is like a vast dragon: I stand by with open mouth and cannot utter a word." Lao-tse, from the character of his work, seems to have supplied just what is wanting in the social system of Confucius, though also to have needed the constructive, organizing, and materialistic conceptions of Confucius in order to embody and realize the spiritualistic aspirations which were peculiarly his own.

One of the most charming and beautiful as well as original little books that have recently shed a broad beam of fresh sunlight across the dreary waste of ordinary politics, is the translation of a French work which is described as "A Theoretical and Practical Treatise on Philanthropy applied to Armies in the Field."[23] This work is one of the best contributions that could be made towards the increase of friendly sympathies between States in peace or war, as well as towards the

---

[21] "A Historical Account of the Neutrality of Great Britain during the American Civil War." By Montague Bernard, M.A. London: Longmans. 1870.

[22] "Lao-tse Iao-te-king, der Weg zur Tugend." Aus dem Chinesischen ubersetzt und erklart. Von Reinhold von Plaenckner. Leipzig. 1877.

[23] "Help for Sick and Wounded," being a translation of "La Guerre et la Charité." By MM. Moynier and Appia. Translated by John Furley. London: John Camden Hotten.

restriction of the chances of wars being brought about. It consists of lectures, essays, reported speeches, and the like, all having for their object a diminution of the worst horrors of war. The work thus ranges over a very large field, including the possibility of forming international committees for the care of the sick and wounded in any war, the good treatment of prisoners of war, the diminution of the use of cruel weapons in warfare, the enforcement of recognised international duties in respect of those not actually engaged in a war. To projects of this nature the whole force of liberal sympathy ought to be heartily and decisively lent.

The termination of the long reign of absolutism in Austria, and the dawn of a truly generous and liberal policy in that country, present some of the most interesting and important phenomena of modern European history. A detailed account of the policy of reconstruction entered on and carried out by Count Beust is given by an "Englishman"[24] who, though anonymous, has evidently peculiar sources of information to rely on, and has given assiduous study to the subject of which he treats. Count Beust was called to the helm immediately after the war of 1866. Everything was against him. Commercial depression, national shame and prostration, apprehension of dismemberment, tumult among the nationalities, were only a few of the problems staring him in the face. On the 22nd of December, 1867, the official Gazette of Vienna published the various laws and the new constitution for Western Austria, which had passed both Houses, and had received on the previous day the sanction of the Emperor. Equal rights for all citizens—their eligibility to all public offices—their right to settle in all parts of the empire—the inviolability of property, domicile, and private correspondence—the full right of association—liberty of the press, religion, and education—equality of rights and protection for all nationalities—the separation of the judicature from government administration—the institution of trial by jury,—these and such reforms may well be said to corroborate the fame of the wise, truly liberal, and patriotic statesmanship of the Minister at the head of affairs.

Mr. Edward Dicey, in introducing to the public the account of his visit to the eastern parts of Europe, in his capacity of correspondent to a daily journal, is bold enough to claim for a visitor in that capacity a superiority, for some purposes, over those residing in foreign countries for a longer time.[25] "A traveller becomes so rapidly familiarized with the aspect of objects by which he is surrounded for any length of time, that he loses all sense of their novelty; and with the loss of this sense, he loses the power of conveying to others any portraiture of their external semblance." Mr. Dicey has certainly not lost this power himself, as his narrative is of the freshest and liveliest description, and affords about as efficient substitute for actual travel as can be hoped for at home. The opening of the Suez Canal and the current

---

[24] "The Austro-Hungarian Empire and the Policy of Count Beust." By an Englishman. London: Chapman and Hall. 1870.

[25] "The Morning Land." By Edward Dicey. In two volumes. London: Macmillan. 1870.

relations of the Egyptian and Turkish Governments are described and discussed with especial care. Mr. Dicey holds that the one permanent source of the dissensions between Egypt and Turkey is the superior progress in civilization made by the former power. Whatever progress has been made in the last is due to the initiative of Egypt.

Mr. Matheson's narrative of his travels from "England to Delhi"[26] is really, in every sense, a magnificent work. It is a splendid quarto, in magnificent type, with neat and graceful sketches by way of illustration, and treating of all the leading objects of interest in India, such as religion, government, education, land tenure, social life, mutiny reminiscences, and scenes and places. It is a book of travel worthy of its great subject.

The "Statistics of New Zealand,"[27] compiled from official records, will be found of great service to all those who have occasion to estimate precisely the current rate of colonial progress, and the special circumstances of New Zealand at the present time.

Those persons who really enjoy reading a grammar (and there are more such than might be supposed) will enjoy Mr. Bayldon's little "Elementary Grammar of the Old Norse or Icelandic Language."[28] The antiquarian and philologist will find this work a great aid in their researches, while it is said that "Icelandic furnishes more abundant analogies for the illustration of obscure English etymological and syntactical forms than any other of the hundred tongues."

The history of telegraphy[29] in all countries is well worthy of being written, whether for purely scientific and historical, or directly practical purposes. Mr. George Sauer's work is very complete, investigating as it does not only the early history of the invention, but also the details of its application in every one of the leading countries of Europe. The work contains a vast mass of curious and important statistics.

The modern reunion of history and geography, and of geography and ethnology, is at once indicated and celebrated by Mr. Hughes' valuable "Atlas,"[30] containing a chronological series of maps of Europe and other lands at successive periods from the fifth to the latter half of the nineteenth century; and Messrs. Bagster's "Ethnographic Atlas,"[31] exhibiting clearly the countries over which leading groups of ancient languages prevailed. We have already from time to time had occasion to draw attention to the valuable aid to popular education which Dr. Keith Johnston has given by his singularly clear little

---

[26] "England to Delhi: a Narrative of Indian Travel." By John Matheson, Glasgow. London: Longmans. 1870.

[27] "Statistics of New Zealand for 1868, Compiled from Official Records." Wellington: 1869.

[28] "A Elementary Grammar of the Old Norse or Icelandic Language." By the Rev. George Bayldon. 1870.

[29] "The Telegraph in Europe." Collected from Official Returns. By George Sauer. Paris: 1869.

[30] "A Popular Atlas of Comparative Geography: at successive periods from the fifth to the later half of the nineteenth century." By William Hughes, F.R.G.S. London: Philip and Son. 1870.

[31] "An Ethnographic Atlas." London: Samuel Bagster.

Atlases,[32] of which one of the British Empire is just published; and Mr. Bartholomew by his cheap and beautiful descriptive "Hand Atlas[33] of the World," of which some more parts are just out.

SCIENCE.

A BOOK just published[1] by Mr. C. O. Groom Napier of Merchiston, under the somewhat pretentious title of "The Book of Nature and the Book of Man," is certainly one of the most remarkable works which it has ever been our fortune to see. The greater part of it is devoted to an attempt at finding emblems of different phases of human life and character in the characteristic peculiarities, whether of structure or habits, presented by various plants and animals. The animal kingdom is principally laid under contribution in this most extraordinary essay, with what success may be seen from a few short specimens taken at random. Thus we are told (p. 132): "The mollusca as a class are suggestive of a certain stage in man's existence, —the pulpy stage;" from another passage (p. 209) we learn that "The blackbird may be compared with a whistling girl(!), shy and skulking, but withal pleasantly attired in modest black, and with a complexion tinged with saffron;" and immediately afterwards we are informed that the golden oriole, a rare visitor to Britain, "has a round, flute-like voice, exceedingly pleasing and attractive, but the bird is dirty and awkward in its habits in a cage. It reminds us of the gay Italian operatic singers, who also visit us in the spring. With all their excellence in music, their habits and morals are often such as we cannot admire." Then listen to the words of wisdom about owls (p. 206). "The owls as a class," says our author, "typify the House of Peers, and the eagle owl has been compared with the representative of that body, the Lord Chancellor, from the mixture of gravity, sternness, and vigour in its deportment. . . . The brown owl appears small after the eagle owl, and is common if not abundant in the woody districts of England. . . . We see analogy between it and some of the inferior peers. . . . The white owl is typical of a still humbler member of the House of Lords; one who has made money by *cotton*, and cannot leave off his cotton robe . . . Its back is marked like a 'chaste' popular print." Was ever such brilliant wit and pointed satire pressed into the service of Natural History? Our attention was directed to this passage on owls by a reference to it in a commendatory preface by the late Lord Brougham. How his lordship

[32] "Atlas of the British Empire." By Keith Johnston, LL.D. Edinburgh and London: W. and A. H. Johnston. 1870.

[33] "Descriptive Hand Atlas of the World." By J. Bartholomew. Parts V., VI., VII., VIII., IX., X. London and Edinburgh: A. Fullarton. 1870.

[1] "The Book of Nature and the Book of Man, in which man is accepted as the type of creation—the microcosm—the great pivot on which all lower forms of life turn." By Charles O. Groom Napier (of Merchiston). Illustrated with photographs and numerous woodcuts. 8vo. London: Hotten. 1870.

ever came to write such a note passes our comprehension; probably he wrote it, as Thomas Ingoldsby did the legend of Hamilton Tighe, "after dinner." The author's acquaintance with natural history is evidently very imperfect; nearly every page contains blunders of one kind or another. Not content with symbolizing human characters by emblems borrowed from organized nature, the author plunges also into the domain of chemistry in search of types, and brings out such prizes as these, both taken from the same page (p. 355). "Bromine is the type of those 'elves' that were believed to 'dance on the green;' that were '*in bad odour*,' but yet were supposed to give a charm to the woodlands;" and "Fluorine and its hydrogen acid cut glass, and reduce the hardest rocks to a solution or a gas, melting them into 'smoke,' as do created things at the command of THE ALMIGHTY." What elves have to do with the matter in hand it is hard to see, and the author is hardly justified in typifying God as he has done. The last paragraph is also remarkable for the beauty of its grammatical construction. In his final chapter Mr. Napier gives a sketch of his views of geology, and attempts a new reconciliation of geology and Genesis, but into this we will not follow him.

One of the results of the late expedition to Abyssinia is a valuable volume on the Geology and Zoology of that country from the pen of Mr. W. T. Blanford,[2] of the Indian Geological Survey, who accompanied the expedition in a scientific capacity. Mr. Blanford gives us a short narrative of his personal experiences on the journey. This is followed by his account of the Geology of Abyssinia, illustrated by a geological map of the country traversed by the expeditionary force. The chief portion of this remarkable country is formed of metamorphic rocks, constituting very elevated plateaux, capped with traps, and occasionally with sedimentary strata, which the author regards as of oolitic age. The few fossils obtained from these beds, some of which are described and figured as new species, seem to bear out this opinion of Mr. Blanford's. More than half the volume is devoted to the Zoology of Abyssinia, which the author seems to have found most easy of study. The birds and mammals obtained by him are catalogued, with remarks upon the habits and characters of some of them, and descriptions of a good many new species; and the author's general remarks upon the geographical distribution of the species in accordance with altitude will be found interesting and important. Thirty-seven species of mammals, and 293 species of birds are enumerated as having been procured by the author and his collectors. Twenty-two species of reptiles, and five species of batrachia are also noticed, and of the former, a few are described as new. Only two species of fishes were obtained, but a few land and freshwater mollusca were collected, and a list of these concludes the volume. As a contribution to our knowledge of the natural history of a part of the world so difficult of access as Abyssinia, Mr. Blanford's book is of great value, whilst at the same

[2] "Observations on the Geology and Zoology of Abyssinia, made during the progress of the British Expedition to that country in 1867–68." By W. T. Blanford. 8vo. London: Macmillan. 1870.

time it shows how much yet remains to reward those who may hereafter be fortunate enough to travel freely through its wonderful valleys, without the hindrances which must have perpetually beset a naturalist attached to an invading army.

Mr. Wallace's name has been associated in the minds of naturalists with the establishment of that theory which is commonly known by the name of "Darwinism," since a period even antecedent to that of the appearance of Mr. Darwin's celebrated book. It was, indeed, the reading before the Linnean Society of a paper written by Mr. Wallace far away in the island of Ternate, that caused, or at all events hastened the publication of the "Origin of Species;" and it is therefore no empty boast on the part of Mr. Wallace, that he claims to be "an independent originator" of the theory of natural selection. In a little volume now before us,[3] this paper is reprinted verbatim, preceded by a still earlier contribution to this department of science, published in the "Annals and Magazine of Natural History," in September, 1855 (four years before the appearance of Mr. Darwin's book), in which the author indicates some of the leading principles of the modern theory, but limits himself chiefly to a demonstration of the law, that "every species has come into existence coincident both in space and time with a pre-existing closely allied species." Since his return to England, Mr. Wallace has devoted much of his attention to the subject of the origin of species, and has from time to time published in scientific and other journals highly interesting papers bearing upon this subject, in which the great store of facts observed by himself in his wanderings through the rich islands of the Eastern Archipelago, has often furnished him with strong arguments and brilliant illustrations. These articles, with two which are now first published, he has collected into a small volume, the first two papers, as already stated, being reprinted verbatim, whilst the others have received some alterations and additions. The longest, and certainly one of the best of these articles, is the admirable treatise on "Mimicry and other Protective Resemblances among Animals," which appeared originally in this Review in July, 1867. Another important paper is that on the Malayan Papilionidæ, as illustrative of the theory of natural selection, reprinted, but without the illustrations, from the "Transactions of the Linnean Society;" and a third article, to which we would call particular attention, is the last in the book, which treats of "Natural Selection as applied to Man," but advocates certain opinions which seem to us quite incompatible with a logical application of the theory.

The cultivation of Alpine plants has already many devotees, but Mr. Robinson's elegant little book[4] will probably add greatly to their number. The author expresses a very just abhorrence of the modern practice of what is denominated "bedding out," and endeavours in this work to show how much more interest attaches to the denizens

[3] "Contributions to the Theory of Natural Selection." A Series of Essays. By Alfred Russell Wallace. Small 8vo. London: Macmillan. 1870.

[4] "Alpine Flowers for English Gardens." By W. Robinson, F.L.S. Sm. 8vo. London: Murray. 1870.

of the rocky mountain side, humble and inconspicuous as they often are, and to indicate how, with comparatively little trouble, they may be made to furnish a far more pleasing effect than miles of geraniums, verbenas, and calceolarias, worked up into ribbons or other set patterns. He describes the mode of cultivation to be adopted, and dwells especially upon the construction of the artificial rockeries in which the beautiful Alpine plants are best cultivated, and this will be found to be a matter of considerable importance, as it is mainly upon the judicious arrangement of the masses of stone that the success of the cultivator depends. In this section of his work, Mr. Robinson illustrates many of his statements by reference to the beautiful rock-garden of Messrs Backhouse, near York, one of the finest examples in existence, and he shows by means of figures both the proper arrangement of the stones and that which is best adapted to defeat the intentions of the cultivator. This first part also includes an account of "a little tour in the Alps" in search of Alpine plants. The second part of the book consists of a descriptive alphabetical list of the best Alpine plants, with directions as to the mode of cultivating them, and concludes with a series of selections for special purposes. Mr. Robinson's work will prove a welcome boon to the many horticulturists who would gladly break away from the trammels of "bedding out," and seek to give a new and more intellectual direction to their gardening proclivities.

Mr. Stevens seems to us to have been rather injudicious in selecting the title of "Flint Chips" for his most interesting and important work on what may be called the lithurgic phase of human existence.[5] It is, in fact, a most admirable and instructive treatise on the stone-weapons and implements of all ages, with details of the habits of the stone-using peoples, and illustrations of other branches of manufacture practised by them. Commencing with the rough stone implements of the Drift period, the rudest efforts of human industry, and those which have been found in caves along with the remains of animals now extinct in Europe, Mr. Stevens describes in order the successive steps in the progress of the art of working stone as manifested in Europe during the Neolithic period forward to the lake-dwellings of the South of Europe, and the great shell-mounds of Denmark and other parts of the North; noticing at the same time those facts as to the habits of the prehistoric European tribes which, as it were, group themselves round these lasting examples of their handiwork. He then passes to the consideration of the stone period in America, the account of which is especially rich and valuable, as might indeed be expected from the fact that this book is at once a treatise on stone-implements and a catalogue of the contents of the Blackmore Museum, at Salisbury, of which the author is the honorary curator, and which contains probably the finest collection of American remains in the world, including the series collected by Squier and Davis during their

---

[5] "Flint Chips; a Guide to Prehistoric Archæology, as illustrated by the collection in the Blackmore Museum, Salisbury." By Edward T. Stevens. 8vo., London: Bell & Daldy. 1870.

researches into the Mounds of the Ohio, an excellent description of which is here given. This American portion of Mr. Stevens's book is naturally the largest, and includes the description of a most interesting series of objects, not only in stone but also in pottery, and occasionally in bronze or other metals. Those interested in the study of the early history of human progress, will find in Mr. Stevens's book an immense mass of most reliable information, excellently arranged, and gathered from the most varied sources; upon the Stone-age conditions of America especially it may be regarded as a perfect encyclopædia. The illustrations, drawn by Mr. De Wilde, are admirably executed.

M. Paul Bert has reproduced in a handsome volume the lectures delivered by him at the Museum of Natural History upon the "Comparative Physiology of Respiration."[6] We strongly recommend to all interested in the many subjects included under the title of Respiration these lectures of M. Bert. He has applied to the elucidation of it, the mechanism of the pneumograph by which he obtains diagrams, somewhat like those of the sphygmograph, of the respiratory rhythm. The apparatus he employs is of various kinds, and is fitted either to the respiratory apertures of the animal or to the sides of the thorax. Space does not admit of a description of the various methods, and without the diagrams it is doubtful if a description would be intelligible, but so well adapted are they, that M. Bert can register the respiratory movements even of fishes, as well as those of all air-breathing creatures. In fishes M. Bert introduces a ball of caoutchouc into the pharynx and another beneath the gills, so as to register the movements of both at the same time, and he dispels the notion that the water is swallowed by the mouth and passed out over the gills. Many other fallacies too have been exploded by similar experiments; for example, it was stated by Rosenthal that there is an antagonism between the pneumogastric nerve and the superior laryngeal and nasal nerves. The first was supposed to preside in some fashion over the contractions of the inspiratory muscles, especially the diaphragm, the second over the contractions of the expiratory muscles and the relaxation of the others. But experiment has proved that excitation of the pneumogastrics, the laryngeal and nasal nerves at the same time will arrest respiration whether during inspiration or expiration, and if the excitation be powerful death will ensue. Experiments upon animals kept in a confined atmosphere prove that death which ensues from this cause happens in the case of warm-blooded animals from lack of oxygen, but that reptiles die on account of the excess of carbonic acid. No less interesting and important are the experiments made with a view of showing the resistance to asphyxia exhibited by various animals. If we consider the length of time during which a diving bird can remain under water we shall find that it is enabled to do this because of the large quantity of blood contained in its vessels,

[6] Leçons sur la Physiologie comparée de la Respiration. Par Paul Bert. Avec 150 figures. Paris: Baillière. 1870.

which furnishes an ample reserve of oxygen. If we bleed a duck, we reduce its diving powers to those of an ordinary fowl. The resistance exhibited by a new-born animal is due to the vitality of its tissues, and to the small quantity of oxygen taken up by its muscles compared with the same amount of the muscle of an adult animal. M. Bert fully examines the so-called respiration of the tissues and the composition of the blood, and minutely describes the respiratory apparatus of all animals, invertebrata and vertebrata. He also gives a history of the labours of those who first studied the phenomena of respiration. We know no work in which the subject is so fully handled, and we think that the experiments which M. Bert has conducted will set at rest some, at any rate, of the disputed points connected with it.

In a somewhat lengthy treatise M. Joly considers the subject of "Instinct and its relations to Life and Intellect."[7] In the first portion of the book M. Joly examines instinct as it is found existing in animals, in the second we have an essay on the mind of man, intellect, free will, and so on. With the feeling of life, we are told, there exists the desire for its development, pain accompanying all that detracts from and hinders, pleasure attending on all that carries forward the well-being of the animal. Therefore every being which lives, and is conscious that it lives, strives to live. This is the first postulate of all psychology. Instinctive acts are those which tend to this end, the particular acts varying according to the species of the animal. These acts vary indefinitely, becoming more and more complex, and requiring imagination and memory. Yet they are all instinctive: there is in them no intellect; for this does not exist in the animal creation. "Even in the higher animals instinct alone coordinates all the impressions received." Instinct develops more and more, it heralds and prophesies the advent of man, but not till man comes upon the stage is intellect to be found. Even in man there is a certain animality and instinct, which serve as the basis and material for his higher intelligence; but the latter is the property of man alone, for man alone has an end and an ideal, the idea of eternal perfection. When we have read all this, we feel that the whole of it is nothing but words. It is the old, old story of consciousness, the consciousness of what we are ourselves, the unconsciousness of what everything else is. What end is gained by saying that the acts of the superior animals are those of instinct and not of intelligence? It is clear that if one person calls them by one name, and another by the other, the difference is one of words, and nothing else. And the many creatures which form intermediate links between the higher animals and the highest man are left out of the question. Is the mind of the savage, the child, the idiot, the lunatic, a mind fraught with instinct or with intelligence? On all these points writers will differ throughout all time, because the dispute ever has been, and ever will be, one of words, and words only.

---

[7] "L'Instinct, ses Rapports avec la Vie et avec l'Intelligence. Essai de Psychologie comparée." Par Henri Joly. Paris: Thorin. 1869.

It is with regret that we see the announcement of the death of Dr. Edwin Lee, whose little book on the "Baths of Rhenish Germany" will be interesting to many.[8] The present publication formed a portion of Dr. Lee's larger work, "The Baths of Germany." He has reprinted this separately because, as he tells us, he has not visited for some years the baths of Central Germany. The present edition has been corrected up to the latest date, and also contains a notice of Spa and its mineral springs, which we recommend to those wishing to avail themselves of chalybeate waters, and to visit a bathing-place not entailing a very long journey. This publication will be found a useful guide by those who contemplate trying the waters of the above-mentioned district.

In 1858 were published in this Review two articles upon "Medical Reform and Medical Education," which have here been reprinted in a volume,[9] it being thought that they have no little bearing on the question of medical legislation which is receiving so much attention at the present time. These articles had considerable weight with those who framed the Bill which was introduced into Parliament in 1858, and became the Medical Act of that year. "Although the greatest part of the book was written twelve years ago, the author trusts that the information and lessons it conveys will still be found useful, and that the medico-political views which he advocates will meet with increasing recognition and acceptance by his professional brethren, as well as by the Government itself." It also comprises certain papers reprinted from the *Medical Mirror*, containing a description of the several projects of reform now immediately occupying the attention of the profession.

Scarcely four years have elapsed since the appearance of the first volume of the "System of Medicine," to which, under the editorship of Dr. Russell Reynolds, so many distinguished men of the medical profession contributed. Yet we now have before us the second edition.[10] Revised by the respective authors, but not rewritten, these articles are now set forth as most complete and authenticated essays on the various subjects with which they deal. The general diseases of man are treated of in this part; the infantile diseases; the fevers; the exanthemata; the epidemics, as the plague and cholera; and such disorders as gout, rheumatism, and constitutional syphilis. Such names as Marson on small-pox, Seaton on vaccination, Garrod on gout, Maclean on the diseases of tropical climates, show how thoroughly the men who contribute to the work have made the subject their own on which they write. We think it will be long before this publication will cease to be the handbook of reference for the practice of medicine in this country.

---

[8] "The Principal Baths of Rhenish Germany. By Edwin Lee, M.D. Fifth Edition. London: Churchill. 1870.

[9] "The Medical Institutions of the United Kingdom: a History exemplifying the Evils of Over-Legislation." By John Chapman, M.D. London: Churchill. 1870.

[10] "A System of Medicine." Edited by J. Russell Reynolds, M.D., F.R.S. Second Edition. London: Macmillan. 1870.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

TWO literary productions of the Abbey of St. Albans, with an appropriate original essay and Appendix, are comprised in the first instalment of Mr. Riley's Calendar.[1] The short *Abbey Chronicle* was drawn up by an inmate of the monastery whose name is now unknown.

The *Annals*, which is considerably longer, is ascribed to the pen of John de Amundesham, or Amersham, a monk of that house, though it appears by no means certain that the writer was really so designated. Both works relate to about the same period of time, the *Chronicon* covering the interval 1422-1431, the *Annales* the interval 1421-1440. To the unattractive appearance of the quarto volume which contains the former, and to the difficulty of deciphering the cramped and minute hand in which the record is written, Mr. Riley attributes the neglect which it has hitherto experienced. But for these and similar drawbacks, a series of documents elucidating the first nine years of Henry VI., a period extremely deficient in illustrative historical matter, would in all probability have long since been submitted to critical examination. In its general character the "Abbey Chronicle" resembles, Mr. Riley tells us, a Court chronicle almost as much as a monastic one; the situation of St. Albans at the end of the first day's journey from London, on the great northern road, rendering its magnificent hospitality particularly welcome to men and women of high station and exalted rank, who were for ever moving about, as business, intrigue, or amusement dictated. Hence it is that we find alike recorded in the pages of the anonymous writer, himself an inmate of the house, the movements of the young King and his mother, the visits of the elder Queen Dowager, Johanna of Navarre, of the Protector, Humphrey Duke of Gloucester, of Henry Beaufort, Bishop of Winchester, and of other personages of noble or knightly degree; convocations and meetings of the higher clergy; victories gained abroad, and defeats or losses sustained; ceremonials and state processions, prosecutions of Lollards, raids of robbers and outlaws; accidents and misadventures; imposts, crimes, conflagrations, floods, and variations of the weather. The *Annals* appear to have a more limited range. We read in them of synods, charters, ordinances for the guidance of the master of the works, the abbot's grievances and attempts to mollify the bishop, get a glance at some terribly obnoxious persons who, like Samson's fire-bearing foxes, overran the fields of the church, and set the wheat of Catholic doctrine in a blaze. Mr. Riley refers us also in his introduction to

[1] "Chronica Monasterii S. Albani a Johanne Amundesham," Monacho ut videtur Conscripti (A.D. 1421—1440) quibus præfigitur Chronicon rerum gestarum in Monasterio S. Albani (A.D. 1422—1431) a quodam auctore ignoto compilatum. Edited by Henry Thomas Riley, M.A., of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. Vol. I. Published by the authority of the Lords' Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1870.

the route and adventures of Abbot Whethamstede on his way to the Council of Pavia, to his remarkable poetical effusions, and the numerous parodies of Scripture language to be found at the commencement of most of the chapters of the *Annales Monasterii S. Albani*, topics which he proposes to elucidate in the introductory essay to the next and concluding volume.

Another of the publications issued under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, the "Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts," edited by J. S. Brewer, M.A., and William Butler, Esq., deals with the transactions of the reign of Queen Elizabeth.[2] The period which it covers consists of little more than two years—namely, from January, 1601, to March, 1603. In an instructive preface Mr. Brewer sketches the events which followed the close of the Administration of Sir Henry Sidney and preceded the appointment of Sir Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy, so far as they can be gathered exclusively from the papers of Carew. The chief difficulty of the new deputy lay in the disaffection of the Desmonds, reinforced by Spanish encouragement. Unfortunately the cause of Irish independence was implicated with the Papal supremacy and the restoration of the old religion, and in resisting the dictation of Gregory XIII. and Philip II., English rulers incurred the odium of contemning the rights of conscience. On the other hand, the temptation of confounding rebellion with adherence to Popery, was not always easily avoidable. The character of the Administrations of Lord Grey of Wilton (why *Gray?*), Sir John Perrot, and Sir William Fitzwilliam, is briefly adverted to in the preface; the state of Ireland under their successors, Lord Russell and Lord Burgh, is described. The comparatively united action of the Irish people, under Tyrone, whose genius for intrigue and skill in political combinations, Mr. Brewer regards as very uncommon in the ruler of a half civilized people, enabled the insurgents to set the authority of Elizabeth at defiance. The arrangements for the expedition of the Earl of Essex, as Lieutenant and Governor-General, indicated extraordinary liberality, but the end was by no means answerable to the means. Mr. Brewer regards this non-correspondence of cause and effect as an enigma, and remarks with the sublime obscurity of a man who gives it up, "the most thoughtful skill, the staidest judgment of English statesmen and soldiers, directly they touch Irish soil, are lost in mystery." Yet the miscarriage of the attack on Ulster is partly explained by the inferiority of the troops and acts of cowardice on the part of the officers that had demoralized their men, and possibly by an error of judgment on the part of the Earl. The jealousy and impatience of Elizabeth, again, led to Essex's recal, for, if Mr. Brewer is correct in his interpretation of her conduct, Elizabeth dreaded the consequences of the self-will and popularity of the Earl, who was in fact master of the succession to the English Crown. The corre-

[2] "Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts preserved in the Archiepiscopal Palace of Lambeth, 1601—1603." Edited by J. S. Brewer, M.A., and William Butler, Esq. Published by the authority of the Lords' Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1870.

spondence between Essex and the Queen contained in the third volume of the "Calendar" is pronounced by Mr. Brewer to be unsatisfactory. When Lord Mountjoy, the new deputy, arrived in Ireland on the 24th February, 1600, Sir George Carew was nominated Governor of Munster. The present contains numerous letters of the successful intrigues set on foot by Cecil to promote the wishes of his favourite Carew, who desired to return and to keep Mountjoy in Ireland, who was equally anxious to return. Various other subjects are illustrated by the papers which are comprised in the "Calendar," as the Siege of Kinsala, the new coinage for Ireland, the manners of Elizabeth's Court, the discontent of her courtiers, the use of tobacco, the employment of Irish companies among the English troops, and the execution of Marshal de Biron, who declared shortly before his death that he was "the victim of a sorcerer, the greatest necromancer in the world, who had made use of his ambition for his destruction, having let him many times see and speak to the devil in person." The "Calendar" is followed by an Appendix and General Index.

The daughter of Elizabeth's successor became the wife of the unfortunate King of Bohemia, the brother of the lady who married the Elector George William of Brandenburg, whose son Frederick William, known as the "Great Elector," is the subject of an historical study intended for the German people, by Karl Friedrich Ledderhose.[3] Succeeding his father in 1640, he exhibited unusual prudence and energy, correcting abuses and restoring order in the finances. After receiving the investiture of Prussia, and concluding peace with Sweden, he contrived at the peace of Münster in 1643 to obtain possession of Magdeburg, Wallenstadt, Minden, and part of Pomerania. It was chiefly owing to his exertions that the principle of equal privileges for both divisions of the Protestant Church was recognised in the treaty then made. In 1656 he joined the Swedes in the invasion of Poland, and contributed to the victory at Warsaw. By a convention concluded with Poland at Wehlau, he obtained the entire sovereignty of Prussia, and in 1678 completed the conquest of Pomerania. After the treaty of Oliva, Frederick directed his attention to internal improvements, rebuilt ruined towns, cultivated waste lands, constructed roads, and encouraged commerce. When Holland was menaced by Louis XIV., the Great Elector engaged to furnish a contingent for the defence of the republic. His military achievements, in the ensuing war with France, the attack at Rathenow, the fight at Fehrbellin, the capture of Stettin, and the famous winter campaign, are described in the fifth book of our author's history. The sixth and last book extends over the period 1679-1688, or from the Peace of St. Germain to the death of Frederick in the April of the year last-mentioned. An enlarged territory, a full treasury, and an efficient army, were the bequests which he left to his successor, Frederick I., King of Prussia.

---

[3] "Friedrich Wilhelm der Grosse, Kurfürst von Brandenburg." Fur das Deutsche Volk dargestellt von Karl Friedrich Ledderhose. Mit vier Holzschnitten und dem Facsimile des grossen Kürfursten. London: David Nutt. 1870.

In the year of the Great Elector's death occurred that English Revolution commonly designated "glorious." Lord Macaulay did not live to complete the reign of William III., the hero of that historical outbreak. This deficiency has been compensated by Lord Stanhope, who has prefixed to his "Reign of Queen Anne until the Peace of Utrecht,"[4] a little before her death, an introductory chapter recording the incidents of the last part of William's reign, a period of between one and two years. Lord Stanhope remarks justly that in the reign of Anne the main figure in war and politics is undoubtedly Marlborough. However correct in this theory of a central figure, the author has not, we think, succeeded in making us feel that Marlborough is the sun round which the subordinate historical luminaries revolve. The portrait of the great general nevertheless is fairly executed. His victorious strategy and brilliant successes are thoroughly recognised; his faults—his avarice and his duplicity—are not glossed over; but the fine traits in his character, the courage, the courtesy, the affectionateness, all that makes up the personal fascination of the man who never besieged a fortress which he did not take, never fought a battle which he did not win, never conducted a negotiation which he did not bring to a prosperous close, are brought out in splendid relief. In the description of the great battles—Blenheim, Ramillies, Oudenarde, Malplaquet—we miss the force, the fire, the circumstances which should be the appropriate characteristics of the recital of such heroic passages of arms. Anne herself was a queen of great respectability, conspicuous for weak friendships and an innocent intellectual mediocrity. Her reign was rendered memorable by the exploits of Marlborough, the meteor-like progress of Peterborough, and the talents of Bolingbroke, Swift, Defoe, Addison, and Steele. In it occurred the great storm which followed the opening speech of 1703, the storm in which the Bishop of Bath and Wells and his wife were killed as they lay in bed by the fall of a stack of chimneys; when buildings were shattered, spires beaten off church steeples, the Eddystone Lighthouse swept into the sea, the old English parks covered with prostrate trunks and branches, and when no fewer than 17,000 fallen trees were enumerated by the patient De Foe in his ride through Kent shortly after the occurrence of the storm. The trial of Sacheverell, the favourite of the populace, who proclaimed the doctrine of passive resistance, which, preached as it was without any qualification, was interpreted as a condemnation of the principles of the Revolution, and exasperated the Government into the ill-advised impeachment of the High Church divine. For the mild sentence of a three years' suspension was regarded as equivalent to an acquittal; the clergy rallied round Sacheverell, the Queen secretly favoured him, bonfires and illuminations celebrated the welcome termination of the prosecution, ladies crowded into the churches where he read prayers, and when he set out to take possession of a valuable incumbency in Wales his journey became a festal

---

[4] "History of England, comprising the Reign of Queen Anne until the Peace of Utrecht." By Earl Stanhope, Corresponding Member of the Institute of France. 1701—1713. London: Murray. 1870.

progress. The war of the Spanish Succession, the leading event of Anne's reign, had scarcely a more prosperous issue. The Peace of Utrecht sanctioned the very arrangement which it was the object of that war to avert; for France maintained the grandson of Louis XIV. on the throne. England, however, secured the recognition of her new dynasty, a footing at Gibraltar and Minorca, a commercial treaty with Holland, and the demolition of Dunkirk. A second great event was the union of Scotland with England, a measure the consequences of which are appreciated in somewhat extravagant terms by the noble historian. His recent contribution to the history of his country was written, he tells us in the preface, in accordance with the wish expressed to him by several persons, as a connecting link between the close of Lord Macaulay's "History of England" and the commencement of that from the Peace of Utrecht, which he published while still bearing the title of Mahon. We are glad to have such a volume from so accomplished and agreeable a writer as Lord Stanhope. If not very original or artistic he is pleasant, judicious, and well informed. The new volume occupies, satisfactorily enough, the vacant space which it was written expressly to fill.

A Revolution which was to Europe what that of 1688 was to England, broke out just a century after in France. The reflective and dispassionate record of this prodigious political and social convulsion, which we owe to the research, the diligence, and the judgment of the German historian Von Sybel, will be generally acceptable to the readers of an age which would be conservative if it were not liberal, and liberal if it were not conservative.[5] For a brief notice of the first two volumes of the English translation of this valuable work we may refer to the historical section in the *Westminster Review* for April, 1868. The second instalment of the history, in an English translation by Mr. Walter Perry, has the same characteristics as the first. Opening with the establishment of the Committee of Public Safety, the narrative carries us through the dictatorial period during which Danton was pre-eminent, the Reign of Terror, the victorious campaigns in Belgium, the supremacy of Robespierre, the 9th Thermidor, the third petition of Poland, and the treaty of Basle, the revolt of the 13th Vendémiaire, its suppression by Napoleon Bonaparte, the close of the Convention, the triple alliance between England, Austria, and Russia, the warlike operations on the Rhine and the Alps, and a glance at the circumstances and prospects of Europe at the end of the year 1795. In resuming his narrative Von Sybel contrasts the progress of Russian imperialism with that of French democracy, and *pairs* the conquest of Poland with the overthrow of the Bourbons, and the repulse of the Prussian invasion from Paris with the first breach between the German powers and the final resolution of Prussia to join in the partition of Poland for St. Petersburg. In April, 1793, again, while the

---

[5] "History of the French Revolution." By Heinrich von Sybel, Professor of History in the University of Bonn. Translated from the third edition of the original German work by Walter C. Perry, Esq. Author of "The Franks." In four volumes, vol. iii. 4to. London: Murray. 1870.

Polish provinces were occupied without resistance by their oppressors, the Parisian party, though beaten in the field, forged a weapon for future victories in the Committee of Public Safety. Such were the opposing characteristics of the crisis which preceded the institution of the first Committee of Public Safety. Early in March the intelligence of the loss of Aix-la-Chapelle reached Paris. At this juncture Danton arrived from Belgium, and intervened in the conduct of State affairs with such a display of vigour and sagacity that he became for some months the directing spirit of the patriotic movement. Von Sybel, who seems ignorant of the reclamations of Thiénot, Robinet, and Bougeard, reiterates the old accusations against Danton of scandalous immorality, and of the direct origination of the September massacres. We touched on this point in our notices of Robinet's Memoir of Danton and the collection of reports drawn up by MM. Geffroy, Zeller, and Thiénot, contained in the number of this Review to which we have already drawn attention, and do not propose to discuss the question on the present occasion. The estimate which Von Sybel has formed of the abilities of Danton may be contrasted with the severe censure which he passes on his active career. Thus he says that Danton's short term of office had sufficed to awaken in him the statesman's sense of order and conservatism. He plainly saw that what France wanted was a dictatorship, and was anxious to substitute military rule for declamations on liberty. In fact, Danton saw clearly that the work that lay before his countrymen was the defence of France against foreign invasion. He took up a decided position, and discerning in the actual position of affairs far greater incentives to a bold advance than a timid retreat, he refused to hear of a humiliating peace such as the Girondists advocated. Laughing at the idea of a universal war with all kings, he obtained from the Convention a distinct declaration that as France would allow of no interference in her domestic politics, so she, on her part, renounced all right to meddle with the constitution of other countries. If Von Sybel rightly construes his intentions, he was bent on teaching the Jacobins that more was to be done for the Revolution by firmness and prudence than by frantic violence, and showing the Gironde that peace was only to be obtained by the energetic conduct of the war to a successful end. The steps he took to this end were highly fertile of consequences, if not for the moment, at any rate for the future. In another place the historian admits that Danton and his colleagues of the Centre desired to check the progress of Communistic mob rule, and for this purpose to bring back the foreign policy of the country to a moderate and orderly system. When Danton was deeply engaged in his negotiations with Sweden and Russia, he renewed his efforts at a reconciliation with the Girondists; but when he proposed an amnesty for the past, received from Guadet a decided and unconditional refusal. On the 10th July, Robespierre took possession of the helm of the State. The aversion to bloodshed and civil war, regard for the material welfare of the people, for justice and morality, considerations of the danger of foreign invasions, all which, Von Sybel tells us, under the leadership of Danton had kept the Committee of Public Safety in the paths of moderation and

mediation, immediately vanished into air. The antipathy of our historian to the Titan of the Revolution, strongly marked as it is, does not prevent him from recognising on occasion his immense practical ability and his earnest desire for peace, moderate counsels, and conciliatory measures. Besides the chapters which describe the career of Danton and Robespierre, those which portray the incidents of war in La Vendée, which relate the revolt in Poland, delineate the Russian plans against Turkey, paint the progress of the Russian arms in Poland, the taking of Cracow and Warsaw, will be found full of valuable material. The story of the unhappy Dauphin is told with all the harrowing details preserved in the descriptions of Lasne and Gomin, the author accepting it as authentic though admitting that it may possibly be exaggerated. The legend of Mademoiselle de Sombreuil also seems treated as authentic. Thiénot, in correcting Michelet, who appears likewise to have accepted "la fable du verre de sang," adds, "verre de sang qui ne contenait que de l'eau versée à la jeune fille défaillante par un des meurtriers saisi de pitié." That there are but few references in such a work as the present is a deficiency that we can easily pardon; but that there is no index to four thick volumes of historical and biographical detail is a deplorable omission. Possibly, however, the work, though described in the title page as consisting of four volumes, is to be continued, and in that case the desired index may yet appear.

The military despotism which superseded the dictatorial republic was prostrated, in its turn, on the field of Waterloo. A journal of the campaign of 1815, written by the late General Cavalié Mercer, and edited by his son, is an interesting contribution to the literature of the period which followed the return of Napoleon from Elba.[6] The journal, which assumed its present form about forty years ago, was compiled from "rough notes jotted down every evening, after the scenes and events of the day were over." It is well described in the preface as a diary of the writer's own impressions, from the first landing in Belgium to the final embarkation for England. The narrative is simple and unpretending; has frequently a freshness and piquancy about it which are very charming; and occasionally contains descriptive passages which, from their faithful registration of the facts and circumstances recorded, bring the scene before us with a startling life-like reality. The first volume opens with an account of Ostend, Bruges, and Ghent. In the sixth chapter, we find Captain Mercer enjoying the delicious tranquillity of Strytem, renowned for its lovely scenery and infernal and eternal frog-concert. At occasional drills on the common, near the village of Denderhoüt, not far from Alost, he had opportunities of observing the curious corps of French exiles drilled by the Duke of Berri, whom he describes as intemperate, brutal, and abusive. Incidents of the stern and harsh conduct of the Duke of Wellington; a sketch of a singular character, Paul Acornati

[6] **"Journal of the Waterloo Campaign, kept throughout the Campaign of 1815." By the late General Cavalié Mercer, commanding the 9th Brigade Royal Artillery. In two volumes. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood. 1870.**

Visconti, the Turco-maniac lord of Gaesbeke, with a narrative of local exploration and military detail, and much excellent scene-painting, fill up the interval between the occupation of Strytem and the unexpected entrance on the field of Quatre Bras. On the last occasion Captain Mercer's battery stood in position on the brow of the declivity, with its right near the wall of that farm. Massy, isolated thunder-clouds hung suspended over him, while the distant hill lately occupied by the French army still lay bathed in brilliant sunshine. At this moment a single horseman, followed by several others, mounted the plateau which Captain Mercer had left; then dark figures, thrown forward in strong relief from the illuminated distance. This single horseman was Napoleon, who had placed himself at the head of the Chasseurs (?) and dashed forward in the hope of being able to catch the vanguard of the English. This is one of the glimpses of the battle of the 17th. Of the great struggle of the 18th, Captain Mercer gives us no scientific relation; he tells us only what he saw, declaring that a general account of a great battle, professing to rest on personal observation, is simply incredible. The slow, deliberate fire of his own troop; the scream of the wounded lad; the alarmed doctor with the umbrella; the sweep of the French cavalry over the front ridge; the dark mass of horsemen recalling an enormous surf bursting over the prostrate hull of a stranded vessel; the mysterious humming noise; the suffocating air; the bewildered surgeon, crying, as a cannon shot rushed hissing past, "There, there! what *is* it all?"—are part of what Captain Mercer saw and heard on that eventful day. Thrice attacked, the gallant artillery officer thrice discomfited the Brunswickers' charging column. He had at least three narrow escapes, and frequently felt the displacement of the air against his face, caused by the passing of the shot close to him. Of grim Dantesque circumstances, there is abundance in these pages. The dreadful spectacle of driver Crammond's visage; the mutilated horse, with long melancholy neigh, looking about as if in expectation of coming aid; the continued thunderlike reverberation of the ground beneath the simultaneous tread of the horses during the deliberate advance of the French column, make us see, and hear, and feel the horror of the great field of blood. Taken suddenly in flank by the French guns at a later period in the day, Mercer's battery suffered so terribly that, though still victorious, it was unable to participate in the forward movement which preceded the final triumph. His description of the day concludes with a notice of the bivouac of the Prussian artillery, which arrived on the spot where he was stationed about dusk, and of the groves, yellow cornfields, still and quiet villages, seen from the moonlit battle-field, where the gallant author of the diary long continued to gaze. The second volume contains an account of the passage of the army, of the difficulty of the march, of the Prussian devastations, of Paris, of the French people, and the return to England. Captain Mercer was the second son of General Mercer, of the Royal Engineers, who served on Sir H. Clinton's staff during the American War of Independence. Born in 1788, he obtained a commission in the Royal Artillery at sixteen; was sent to Ireland at the time of the Rebellion; joined Whitelock's un-

fortunate expedition in 1808; held the rank of Second Captain at Waterloo; was ordered to Canada, having the brevet rank of Major, in 1824; commanded the artillery at Nova Scotia as Lieutenant-Colonel, at the time of the Maine Boundary dispute; and subsequently had charge of the garrison at Dover, after which he retired from active service. Although none of the debated questions connected with the great battles are elucidated by the diary, yet, as his son, from whose interesting editorial preface we have borrowed these biographical details, remarks, it has a distinct value, as probably, if not certainly, the first account of the campaign given to the world by an artillery officer, and will be welcome to the surviving veterans of this stormy epoch, who, while they rejoice to go again over the scenes of their younger days, will be foremost amongst those lovers of peace whom Mr. Cavalié Mercer pleasingly pictures as "congratulating themselves on the cessation of such strife between two noble nations, whose last (and may it continue to be the last) hostile rencontre took place upon the plain of Waterloo."

In the recently published letters of Sir George Cornewall Lewis are two interesting communications from Lord Aberdeen, on the amount of influence which England may be supposed to have possessed on the overthrow of Napoleon, 1814, and especially the effect of the Spanish war.[7] According to Lord Aberdeen, though the battle of Waterloo was the real fight of giants, which decided the fate of Europe, the battle of Leipzic was the great turning point of the war, and the Duke of Wellington's Peninsular victories only a secondary influence. Sir G. C. Lewis's treatment of the patriotic tradition which ascribes Napoleon's downfall to British prowess is characteristic of his bold and aggressive criticism. The authority of Niebuhr, the prestige of Bunsen, the formidable phalanx of hieroglyphical and cuneiform pundits, exercised no coercion over his cold, unimpassioned intellect. Even if, as we think, he was sometimes extreme in his sceptical reflections, the vigour and independence of mind which he displayed in his judgments are deserving of all praise. In general this dissent from reigning opinions is expressed with courtesy, where the address is personal; but when he is speaking of, and not to, the persons from whom he dissents, he employs language which is by no means complimentary to the subjects of his criticism. Thus, in an admirable letter on mesmerism, he writes—"Miss Martineau, already a believer in mesmerism, of an enthusiastic and credulous temperament, and nearly stone deaf, is formed by nature for a dupe." "Alison's History" he describes as "heaps of balderdash," with occasional gleams of acuteness and good sense; Froude, he declares, "is a complete historical sophist;" of Hallam's new volume of the "Introduction to the Literature of the Fourteenth, Fifteenth, and Sixteenth Centuries," he says—"It is dry, meagre, and ill-written, with a few misplaced passages of laborious rhetoric. So far from understanding

[7] "Letters of the Right Honourable Sir George Cornewall Lewis, Bart., to various Friends." Edited by his brother, the Rev. Sir Gilbert Frankland Lewis, Bart., Canon of Worcester. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1870.

any one subject well, he does not seem to understand any one book well. His text is a mere digest of compilations and biographical dictionaries;" and after some depreciating remarks, he adds, "it must be confessed that charlatanerie is marvellously successful." He speaks in very different language, however, of Mr. Mill's "Logic," of Mr. Grote's "History of Greece;" and has sometimes an admiring word for a political opponent, as when he recognises in "Bulwer" comprehensiveness, capacity, and oratorical ability. The letters addressed to various friends—Sir Edmund Head, Mrs. Austin, Mr. and Mrs. Grote, Mr. Freeman, and members of his own family—contain little that is personally interesting, but abound in information, and sometimes valuable criticism on men and books. The note on the Martello towers; the comments on the vulture, with reference to the augury of Romulus and Remus; the expression of opinion on Pitt, Palmerston, and Louis Napoleon, are entertaining or instructive. Of the present Emperor of the French, Sir G. C. Lewis wrote, shortly after the *coup d'état*—

"Louis Napoleon is a man with a great deal of selfish ambition and with considerable daring and firmness. The Assembly would not allow him to be re-elected for another term of four years, and being able to reckon on the support of the army, he determined to put them down by force and establish a mock Constitution, but in reality a military Government. The cry about Socialism is mere hypocrisy; the leaders of the Assembly whom he sent to Ham are not Socialists,—nor is it true that there was any intention of arresting him. It is clear that the whole affair is a *singerie* of the Consulate and Empire, but the use of force has been more direct than under the Convention or at the 18th Brumaire. The proceedings of the Comité de Salut Public were regular and constitutional as compared with his performance. . . . . . . A foreign war would be the infallible result of a real restoration of the Imperial *régime* in France."

Of a famous passage in Mr. Kinglake's book, Sir G. C. Lewis says—

"His attempt to throw all the credit or blame of the expedition to Sebastopol upon the Duke of Newcastle is a complete delusion. His story about the sleepy Cabinet may be partially true, but the plan of the expedition had been discussed by the Cabinet at repeated sittings, and the despatch in question only embodied a foregone conclusion. I do not agree with Kinglake that a careful discussion of the draft would have led to giving a wider discretion to Lord Raglan. The discretion which the despatch gave seems to me to have been unusually wide and scarcely justifiable. If it had been more discussed the Cabinet would perhaps have thought that they were throwing on him undue responsibility."

Sir G. C. Lewis's "Life" is not included in the "Letters" before us, but occasional notices are inserted by the Editor to elucidate their contents. A brilliant reputation at Eton and Oxford was succeeded by deserved distinction as a public servant, and as a student and writer. After twice serving as a commissioner in a subordinate capacity, he succeeded his father, in 1839, as one of the three principal Poor Law Commissioners. In 1847 he was appointed Secretary of the Board of Control; six months afterwards Under Secretary to the Home Office, and in 1850 Financial Secretary to the Treasury. In 1852, failing

to secure his re-election, and turning his attention to literary occupation, he consented to become editor of the *Edinburgh Review.* In 1855, when his father died, he was returned for the vacant Radnor Boroughs, and soon after accepted the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer. Subsequently he became Secretary of State for the Home Office; and in 1861, on Mr. Sidney Herbert's retirement, Secretary at War. Born in London, of an ancient territorial family, on April 21, 1806, he died at Harpton Court, in Radnorshire, in April, 1863. Honest, upright, and possessing copious and ample information, free from all political fanaticism, and cautious in his adoption of any practical expression of policy, Sir G. C. Lewis was a valuable though not a brilliant servant of the State. Though his prediction of the break-up of the United States was a mistake, his judgment of our own national duty was sound, and he took a foremost part in discouraging the recognition of Southern independence. The selection of letters by his brother, Sir G. T. Lewis, which we have now noticed, forms a welcome contribution to our knowledge of the scholarly statesman. In a second edition, a letter addressed to Mr. Grote, now misdated and misplaced, might be subjected to an obvious correction—the last volume of the "History of Greece" having appeared in 1856, not 1846—and the index might be revised with advantage, for M. Charles Comte was not the author of the "Cours de Philosophie;" and Mr. John Mill did not write the "History of British India," nor is Mr. John Mill a different person from Mr. John Stuart Mill, as the present index sets forth.

With the exception of a brief interval, 1792-1814, the descendants of Hugh Capet have held royal sway in France ever since their renowned ancestor was chosen King of the French in A.D. 987. In this election, M. Ernest Mourin[8] sees not a mere palace intrigue, but the expression of an organic revolution. With the accession of a new dynasty, there appeared also a new nationality, a new people, a coalition of the Celtic and Germanic races. The "Carlovingians" were not rejected because they were too German, but because they typified the Latin idea—the imperial monarchy, the Roman centralization—which was radically antagonistic to the separating, individualizing, feudal tendencies then dominating society. In this struggle of principles, the old *régime* was represented by the line of Charles the Great, the new by the Counts of Paris—the sons of the national soldier Robert the Strong. The drama had its *dénouement* in 987, in the definitive victory of the feudal party and the establishment of the third royal race. Interested in the numerous and picturesque facts which make up the history of the struggle; in the personal traits of the principal actors, passionate as barbarians, or supple and insidious as the men of an empire in its decline; in the political questions, sometimes unexpectedly analogous to those discussed in our own day, M. Mourin has made the corresponding epoch the subject of close and diligent study, depicting, with the help of

---

[8] "Les Comtes de Paris. Histoire de l'Avénément de la troisième race." Par Ernest Mourin, docteur ès lettres, agrégé d'histoire. Paris. Didier.

Frodoard, Richer, and Gerbert, the period which extends from Eudes to Hugh Capet. The disquisition is divided into thirteen chapters, and appears to be a really valuable historical study. In the last chapter the feudal renaissance is treated as the victorious element in the revolution of 987.

In the social phenomena of the fourteenth century Dr. Reinhold Pauli sees the preparation for a second renaissance.[9] It was the epoch of conflict between the forces of State-disintegrating feudalism and decaying romance with the new movements of national spirit and the first impulses to political consolidation. Regarding the Black Prince as one of the last knights and one of the earliest generals, he has made him the subject of a special study, constituting him into a sort of a typical character in this age of grotesque splendour, oppressive chivalrous mechanism, and brocaded etiquette. In the volume of essays in which this heroic personage takes the lead, we find other more or less striking individualities, all of whom sat for their portrait to an artist whose judgment bears a happy proportion to his talent. Richard III. is sketched in clear and forcible outlines; his intellect recognised; his ambition asserted; his criminality allowed. The same remark applies to Henry VIII., to whose career two papers are dedicated, his political and ecclesiastical policy being considered in one of them, and his relations to the Emperor Maximilian and his claims to the Imperial crown being reviewed in the other. The imposing qualities of Henry are not denied by the essayist, who, however, refuses to erect a statue to him as to a blameless hero. In the famous divorce question Dr. Pauli candidly admits the force of some of the considerations by which Henry's conduct has been extenuated; but he does not therefore lose sight of the considerations of a private and passionate character, which in his belief were the ultimate determining motives with the despotic sensualist. In a note Dr. Pauli indicates his dissent from the opinion expressed by Bergenroth on the conduct of the Princess Catherine prior to her marriage with the King. Bergenroth, with all the praiseworthy energy of pursuit by which he was distinguished, appears scarcely to have possessed the calm discriminative faculty necessary to appreciate the value of his alleged discoveries, and it would seem that the views entertained by him as to the character of Catherine of Arragon and her sister Joanna of Castile, and the inedited record of the life of Don Çarlos, purporting to be written by Juan de Avila, are none of them capable of being substantiated. A series of studies, under the generic title of "Cavaliers and Roundheads," comprising portraits of Blake, Cromwell, and Milton, an essay on Ireland, a biography of Sir Peter Carew, a study of Canning, and an appreciative sketch of Prince Albert's life and character, complete the carefully and attractively written set of essays in which Dr. Pauli has embodied his impressions of noteworthy periods or persons in English history.

An eminent countryman of Dr. Pauli's, Friedrich Schleiermacher,

[9] "Aussätze zur Englischen Geschichte." Von Reinhold Pauli. Leipzic. 1869.

has long been and is likely to be the subject of critical disquisition or biographical illustration. In the July number of the *Westminster Review* for 1868, we gave some account of Dr. Schenkel's essay on the life and character of this Luther of the nineteenth century, and made some general observations on the theosophical system which he advocates. In drawing attention to Herr Wilhelm Dilthey's "Leben Schleiermachers" we shall not again travel over the same ground.[10] The new work will consist of two volumes, one only of which has as yet issued from the press. In drawing up this elaborate memoir of the German theologian, Herr Dilthey has been assisted by the literary wealth placed at his disposal by Madame Gräfinn Schwerin-putzar, the daughter of his hero, by Böcking, Dohna, Stark, and Waitz. The present volume begins with an introduction and ends with a set of documents intended to throw additional light on Schleiermacher's spiritual development. Two books make up its principal division: the first extending over the period of his youth and early education, or from 1768 to 1796; the second dealing with his maturity and the period of the intuitive representation of his general view of the universe, or from 1796 to 1802. The incidents of Schleiermacher's life, his friendship with Schlegel, the influence of the Kantian philosophy on his mind, and the literature which he read or which he produced up to this date, occupy above 500 pages of closely printed matter, the whole volume containing nearly 700 pages. So that, when the second instalment completes the work, the admirer of Schleiermacher will probably find as circumstantial an account of his life and writings as he could possibly wish.

An equally minute biography of a still living celebrity by Dr. Friedrich Ebeling is in process of composition, one volume only having as yet appeared of the "Life of Count Beust."[11] To this German statesman fate has assigned the part of effecting the reconciliation of Austria with Hungary, and of according to the latter country a triumph over Germanism in Austria. It has been said that the idea which inspired the conciliatory policy of the Austrian Government was conflict with Prussia; and Beust's early opposition to the Liberal party, when minister of Saxony, has been cited to show that it was not his devotion to German Liberalism that induced him to ally himself with the Radicals in Austria after his accession to office as Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1866. Talent, aptitude for business, and promptness of decision have not been denied him, but his claims to the character of a large-minded and foreseeing statesman have been called in question. These doubts, however, are not shared by Dr. Ebeling, who regards the Count as possessing a political genius of a very high order. In the instalment of the biographical work now before us the author sketches the early career of Count Beust, brings us face to face with the demagogic action and the proceedings of the Diet in Saxony, and relates

---

[10] "Leben Schleiermachers." Von Wilhelm Dilthey. Erster Band. Berlin. 1870.

[11] "Friedrich Ferdinand Graf von Beust. Sein Leben und vornehmlich staatsmännisches Wirken." Von D. Freidrich W. Ebeling, Herzogl. Sächs-Archiorath. Erster Band. Mit Portrait in Stahlstich. Leipzig. 1870.

the part played by his hero during the last weeks of its session. A chapter on the Crimean war, another on the Italian war, 1859, and a closing chapter on questions connected from a German point of view with the Saxon Diet of 1860-61, still leave the portrait which Dr. Ebeling endeavours to draw for us in a necessarily incomplete state.

Our next work carries us back into the last century.[12] A pleasant, readable book is M. Paul Stapfer's "Laurence Sterne," definable in his own language as a narrative of Sterne's life and an analysis and criticism of his works. For the biographical portion of the book the author is principally indebted to Mr. Percy Fitzgerald, whose "Life of Laurence Sterne" was long since noticed in our pages, and to M. Emile Montégut, Mr. Fitzgerald's reviewer in the *Revue des Deux-Mondes*. The sketch of Sterne's life is sufficiently instructive, and the critical estimate of his writings is sound. M. Stapfer seems to us to pass a fair judgment on the moral impropriety of Sterne's writings, and yet to have that hearty admiration for what is admirable in them, which proves the critic's possession of the affirmative element in his art. An alleged unpublished and anonymous fragment by Sterne, which the autograph-hunting wife of an Oxford friend placed in the hands of the author, but of whose genuineness we are sceptical enough to entertain a doubt, is prefixed to the memoir and critical comment. Direct external evidence of that genuineness there is none. The presumptions that favour it are the alleged similarity of the handwriting to that of the author of "Tristram Shandy," its discovery in York, a place which he frequented, and the supposed Sterne-like character of the composition. Nothing but indisputable objective evidence, however, would convince us that Sterne wrote this medley of starry lucubration and moral philosophy, though it is not without a witty and graceful originality of its own. M. Stapfer rightly considers that Sterne's talent was never so conspicuously or so gloriously displayed as in his creation of character, and he delights us by echoing the sentences of Sir Walter Scott, and suggesting that if ever the citizens of York or London erect a statue to his hero, they may very well engrave on the pedestal the words, "Au créateur de *l'oncle Tobie* l'Humanité reconnoissante."

The single prisoner in the Bastile, whose misfortunes Sterne deplored, was not half so mysterious a person as the masked captive who died there in 1703.[13] M. Topin has exercised considerable ingenuity in his efforts to solve this historical enigma, and has, we think, argued the question with great plausibility, identifying the man with the black velvet mask whom St. Mars brought with him from Exiles in 1698, when he assumed the governorship of the famous fortress, with the unfortunate minister of the Duke of Mantua. The hypothesis which he forms is not original, but the arguments by which objections are met, are some of them new and forcible. In particular, that Matthioli was not, as has been maintained, the dropsical prisoner—

---

[12] "Laurence Sterne: Sa Personne et ses Ouvrages. Étude précédée d'un fragment inédit de Sterne. Par Paul Stapfer. Paris. 1870.

[13] "The Man with the Iron Masque." By Marcus Topin. Translated and edited by Henry Vizetelly, Author of "The Story of the Diamond Necklace." London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1870.

one of the couple of jail birds in the charge of St. Mars who died in 1687—seems established by his reasoning, and the difficulty of identification on the ground of supposed earlier death disappears. Matthioli had consented, in 1678, to further the designs of Louis XIV. by admitting a French garrison into Casal; and, as the Duke wanted money, and the King was willing to pay for the possession of the fortress, the conditions of surrender were speedily arranged. From some cause or other, Matthioli appears to have changed his mind: the terms of the engagement transpired; the documents relating to the proposed policy of the French King and bearing his signature were, or were believed to be, in Matthioli's actual or virtual custody; and to recover these compromising papers became a paramount object with Louis and his ambassador, D'Estrades. Matthioli accordingly was arrested, and, after being threatened with torture, took the necessary measures for the recovery of the important documents. The Duke of Mantua continued indifferent to the fate of his minister, and a report being spread of his accidental death, his widow retired into a convent, and the world soon ceased to interest itself in the sad fortunes of the ill-starred diplomatist. The letter already referred to, and purporting to be written by St. Mars to D'Estrades, if authentic, supplies evidence that Matthioli was in his keeping on June 27th, 1681, about two years after his singular disappearance, for we read: "Matthioli restera ici avec deux autres prisonniers." In 1694 there is further testimony to show that three State prisoners were brought to Exiles, the official residence of St. Mars, one of them, expressly called his old prisoner, M. Topin identifies with Matthioli. In 1698, St. Mars accepted the governorship of the Bastile, and again we find evidence of the continued existence of the same old prisoner. That the prisoner who accompanied St. Mars on this occasion was the prisoner who died in 1703, and was buried in the church of St. Paul and registered as Marchialy, is a fact that has never been questioned. The name seems an obvious distortion of that of the unfortunate statesman, sometimes written *Mar*thioly—a very intelligible distortion, if we allow a little for ignorance and negligence combined. We should not do justice to the author of the volume before us if we were to omit all recognition of the historical sketches which precede the exhibition of his argument for the identification of the masked prisoner with Matthioli, sketches which have for their object the refutation of the counter-hypotheses which have identified him with a brother of Louis XIV., the Count Vermandois, the Duke of Beaufort, the Duke of Monmouth, Fouquet, and the Armenian patriarch, Avedick. The original, for it is Mr. Vizetelly's readable translation that we have now before us, has been eagerly perused in France, several editions of it having been called for in the course of a few months.

"In the first decade of this century, at La Cayla, an ancient château in Languedoc, were born a sister and brother, Eugenie and Maurice de Guérin, who lived and died obscurely, who living, could never see the reason why of their sufferings, but who dying, left behind them, in their letters and journals, a precious treasury of religious

thought and consolation."[14] To make their lovely pathetic story more popularly known is the object of the daintily-written monograph by Miss Harriet Parr, the opening sentence of which we have just cited.

We wish Mr. Taylor had omitted from his valuable volume most of his preliminary observations on the race and origin of man, and on the Mosaic cosmogony, which he describes, with simple effrontery, as consonant to reason and geology, on the celebrated ship *Argo*, and those "coloured missionaries, Cadmus and Pelops."[15] Apart from his obsolete speculations his book is a rich repository of information on the manners, customs, mythology, rites, songs, proverbs, fables, and language of the Maori and Polynesian races in general. In the second edition of "Te Ika a Maui; or, New Zealand and its Inhabitants," some additional matter has been inserted. The ethnology and geology have been extended; the natural history and botany of the islands have been included; and the author's observations on the earthquakes of a country in which he has resided for thirty years as a missionary, have been recorded. The volume concludes with a chronological sketch of events and incidents in New Zealand from its discovery by Abel Tasman, in 1613, to the death of Rawiri Waiawa, and the arrival of Colonel Gore Brown as Governor in 1855.

Newfoundland, the official discovery of which is ascribed to Sebastian Cabot, was formally annexed to the British Crown by Sir Humfrey Gilbert, in 1583. Through the efforts principally of Captain Richard Whitbourne, a bold Elizabethan seaman, it was permanently colonized under James I., the province being named Avalon. A curious little volume,[16] edited and illustrated by T. Whitburn, contains some explanatory notices by the editor, and the description of "The New-Found-Land," by the promoter of the settlement, with sundry official documents and an autobiographical sketch.

Two volumes of the series of "Ancient Classics for English Readers,"[17] published under the editorial management of the Rev. W. Lucas Collins, M.A., carry out the principle announced in the title of giving a connected outline of the facts recorded in the Greek or Latin originals. To his digest of the "Inquiry or History of Herodotus," Mr. George Swayne has prefixed an instructive introductory notice; while Mr. Trollope dilates on the merits and shortcomings of the man who, in his judgment, "has done most to move the world," Caius Julius Cæsar, in the brief essay in which he

[14] "Maurice and Eugénie de Guérin." Monograph. By Harriet Parr. Author of "Essays in the Silver Age," "Life and Death of Jeanne D'Arc," &c. London: Chapman and Hall. 1870.

[15] "Te Ika a Maui; or, New Zealand and its Inhabitants, &c. &c. Second Edition. With numerous Illustrations. By the Rev. Richard Taylor, M.A., F.G.S. London: William Mackintosh. 1870.

[16] "Westward Hoe for Avalon in the New-Found-Land, as described by Captain Richard Whitbourne of Exmouth, Devon, 1622." Edited and illustrated by T. Whitburn. London: Sampson Low, Son, and Marston. 1870.

[17] "Ancient Classics for English Readers." Edited by the Rev. W. Lucas Collins. "Herodotus." By George C. Swayne, M.A., late Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

introduces us to his condensation of the great conqueror's "Commentaries."[18]

The only biographical element in M. Taine's "English Positivism,"[19] translated by Mr. T. D. Haye, is contained in the preface, in which we are informed that when the "Study" first appeared, Mr. John Stuart Mill addressed a letter to its accomplished author accepting it as conveying in a few pages an adequate notion of the contents of his work on "Logic," considered as a body of philosophical teaching, but protesting against M. Taine's characterization of the views he adopts as especially English. "They were so," Mr. Mill admits, "in the first half of the eighteenth century, from the time of Locke to that of the reaction against Hume." "But," he continues, "this reaction beginning in Scotland, assumed long ago the German form; and ended by prevailing universally. When I wrote my book I stood almost alone in my opinions, and though they have met with a degree of sympathy which I by no means expected, we may still count in England twenty *à priori* and spiritualist philosophers for every partisan of the doctrine of experience."

BELLES LETTRES.

WE cannot commence this section, where we have so often spoken of Dickens, without a word upon the great loss which the whole world has sustained. How great that loss is may best be known by the fact that each one feels as if they had lost a personal friend. How great that loss is may best be known by the fact that it is impossible to take up a book, or magazine, or paper, without finding some illustration drawn from his marvellous stores of fancy and wit. This is not the time to assign him his place amongst the world's humorists. It is enough to say that he ranks with Shakspeare, Cervantes, and Molière. He has created a school of humour of his own. And though we have often in the pages of this Review expressed our disagreement from the wild licence of his followers, yet there was always this difference, even in his most extravagant moods, between the Master and them,—theirs was the wit of fools, his the folly of a wit.

"Lothair"[1] reached us so late in the quarter that it is impossible for us to give any adequate notice of it in our present number. That the book is a success, is not to be wondered at. The peculiar position of the author, a brilliant style, the attraction of great personages but slightly disguised, have taken captive the whole literary world.

---

[18] "The Commentaries of Cæsar." By Anthony Trollope. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons. 1870.

[19] "English Positivism. A Study of John Stuart Mill." By H. Taine. Translated from the French (with the Brother's permission) by T. D. Haye. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co. 1870.

[1] "Lothair." By the Right Honourable B. Disraeli. Fourth Edition. London Longmans, Green, and Co. 1870.

"Higher Law,"[2] like the "Pilgrim and the Shrine," appeals to a class of readers very different from that constituted by the ordinary subscribers at Mudie's. It almost requires special training. Unless the reader is thoroughly acquainted with the great questions of the day, unless he thoroughly, too, perceives the tendencies of modern thought, unless he is at home with the last Biblical criticisms, appreciates the lessons of Darwin and Huxley in science, and has laid to heart the doctrines of the more advanced school of physiologists, much in this very remarkable book will be perfectly unintelligible. Yet the book will find a large number of readers, who, as time goes on, are sure to increase. Just as it has been noticed that, in Germany, young ladies instinctively recognise the difference between *vernunft* and *verstand*, which has to be taught to us English, so the time will come when what are now regarded as obstacles will be accepted as commonplaces. But the most superficial reader need not be frightened away from the book. If he is capable of admiring wit and humour, he will find both in some of the minor sketches; if he has any love for description he will find charming pictures of scenery in Mexico; if, too, he is capable of appreciating what true love means, he will find himself in a spiritual atmosphere, such as we know of in only one novel of the present day. But the value of the book lies in its development of that "Higher Law" which is exemplified in a double way by Margaret's fitness of character for Noel, and Noel's reciprocal fitness of character for Margaret. It would require the whole of this section to follow out the analysis of the temperaments and characters of Maynard and Noel;—to give, with any chance of success, a picture of the struggle between duty and passion, which the latter goes through. We can merely here say that the whole of the love scenes in Mexico, and those on board the steamer, between Noel and Margaret, are painted with an exquisite sense of poetry and delicacy of feeling. Briefly, too, we must say, that that same purity of style, earnestness of tone, that same depth of philosophic reflection which marked the "Pilgrim and the Shrine," may all be found rendered still more attractive by the beauty of the story in the present work. There is no novel, in short, which can be compared to it for its width of view, its cultivation, its poetry, and its deep human interest, as seen in the love of Maynard and Margaret, except "Romola."

We wish that novelists would study "Higher Law" for its admirable criticisms upon art, more especially upon their own craft of story-telling. Here is one passage out of many which we might select:—

"If you aim at really high work," said Maynard, "you are right to disregard trade exigencies. Those belong to the province of the dealer. Trade has one object, art another. The artist who estimates his work by a trade-success abandons his calling in doing so. When he says, 'Will it pay?' instead of 'Is it good and true?' he has no barrier between him and the abyss." "I suppose," said Noel, "he makes the public the judges, and

[2] "Higher Law." A Romance. By the Author of "The Pilgrim and the Shrine." London: Chapman and Hall. 1870.

regards the pay as the proof of their approbation." "That is, he has no ideal or standard of his own," returned Maynard, "and he is therefore no artist. Nature and genius may be burked at once if everything is to be reduced to the level of a saleable commodity."—(Vol. ii. pp. 255, 256).

Yet success is the one test by which both publisher and author are guided. The publisher urges the author to use the strong stimulants of sensationalism to please the uneducated public; and the author, allured by the double bribe of gold and public favour, willingly obeys the call. It is, therefore, with real pleasure that we call attention to "Lettice Lisle,"[3] a story which appeared in the pages of the "Cornhill Magazine," and is now published in the convenient form of a single volume. The writer boldly states in the preface that his work deals with the peasantry of one of the southern counties, and that he hopes to interest his readers, not merely by an account of their lives, but by an actual reproduction of their modes of speech. In this we think the writer has succeeded admirably. And his, or rather perhaps, her, task was by no means easy. It is not enough to give a number of provincial words, in order to represent a dialect. You want to catch also the peculiar sounds, which, as all students of Mr. Ellis's recent work know, is so excessively difficult, but further to give, what is still more difficult, the peculiar idioms. By the help of footnotes, the author has removed all the obstacles which most readers encounter when they turn to such a tale as the "Devonshire Dialogue," probably the most beautiful tale ever written in a provincial dialect. In the present story the peasants are naturally drawn, and peasant life on the south-west coast is accurately described. The pictures, too, of the New Forest are admirably done, and will stand the test of comparison with those in Mr. Blackmore's well-known story. Altogether the tale may be strongly praised for its quiet truthfulness as a study of peasant life.

Mr. Tottenham need[4] not be afraid that his novel will be mistaken for a pamphlet in two volumes. His power to describe character and incident saves him from falling into any blunder of that kind, whilst his intimate knowledge of Ireland and Irishmen gives his tale permanent value. He is really able to reproduce what he has seen, and to make the reader feel what he has felt. His picture of both simple and gentle, of boor and gentleman, of the old Irish squire and the new English proprietor, are all in their ways excellent. We must also bestow a word of praise upon the minor characters. To any one who wishes to understand the state of Ireland, written by one who really does know the country, and has not merely taken a return ticket to Dublin, this is one of the few novels with a moral which we can recommend.

The interest of "Unawares"[5] centres in Charville, a French

[3] "Lettice Lisle." By the Author of "Stone Edge." London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1870.

[4] "Terence M'Gowan, the Irish Peasant." By G. Tottenham. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1870.

[5] "Unawares. A Story of an Old French Town." By the Author of "One Year." London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1870.

town, which is admirably described. We have had so often to condemn stories of French life, that it is both a pleasure and a surprise to find one which we can unreservedly praise, both from its tone and its adherence to truth. The picture of the old doctor is in every way excellent. The character, too, of Thérèse is still more delicately drawn. It is in her female characters that the writer's strength is shown. The descriptions, too, are full of poetry. Why the novel is called "Unawares," the reader must find out for himself. It is a puzzle which is well worth unriddling, and which contains the plot and secret of the story.

Of the remaining novels, we must speak briefly. Everybody has read Mr. Reade's new tale[6] as it appeared in the pages of the *Cornhill*. For power it stands unsurpassed. Mr. Reade is here seen at his best. Still we do not think it will produce any effect upon the class which it so vividly describes. What the Sheffield workman requires is education, especially in the first principles of justice and political economy. Irma[7] is a tale upon the truth and accuracy of which we are not competent to decide. Its literary merits are, however, great. We are puzzled, too, whether to describe "A Poet Hero"[8] as a novel or not. The tone is excellent. The book may be recommended almost as a history.

What "Barnes's Poems" are to the west-country peasant, are "Waugh's"[9] to the north-country peasant and artisan. No poet in the North and North Midland Counties is so popular as he is, at least, amongst the poor. We have seen his well-thumbed volumes lying on the window-shelf of cottages in the High Peak district, and in the dingy rooms of mechanics in the smoky Lancashire factory towns. And the secret of his success is obvious. He sings of the sorrows and joys, and hopes and aspirations of the poor. He never writes over their heads. He intimately knows their ways and their lives. In short, he feels for them. Further, too, he addresses them in their own language, the language which they have been used to from their cradle—language which to them is so expressive of tenderness and pathos. To this, too, partly does "Tim Bobbin" owe his immense popularity in the same wide district. To this does the local primitive preacher also owe some of his success in the wilder parts. 'Waugh's Poems" are learnt by heart, and there can be no better proof of affection or true popularity. Yet Waugh is certainly unknown to the majority of our readers. Drawing-rooms, we fear, will not appreciate him. He must be left to the cottage, to enjoy the blessing of the poor. Yet if any one wishes to understand why he is so popular, to understand, too, something of that tenderness which

---

[6] "Put Yourself in his Place." By Charles Reade. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1870.

[7] "Irma: a Tale of Hungarian Life." By Count Charles Vetter Du Luys. London: Strahan and Co. 1870.

[8] "A Poet Hero." By Countess von Bothmer. London: Cassell, Petter, and Galpin. 1870.

[9] "Poems and Lancashire Songs." By Edwin Waugh. Third Edition. London: Bell and Daldy. 1870.

makes him such a favourite, let them turn to two songs in the present volume, "Come whoam to thy children an' me," and "Come, Mary, link thi arm i' mine." The first, as a picture of a poor man's home—the wife and children sitting up for the father, and the little boy in the midst of his prayers, turning round to know if his father would bring him a drum—is worthy of Burns. One more word of praise. Although Waugh so continually dwells upon the sorrows and sufferings of the poor, yet his tone is always manly and honest. His counsel is always that of a brave man. Such poems as his, read as they are so continually by the poor, must have no small effect upon their character. When we meet with such a book, we can to a certain extent appreciate the oft-quoted saying of Fletcher of Saltoun, "Let me make the ballads of the people, and I care not who makes the laws." May Waugh live to write many more such manly ballads, as,

> "God bless these poor folk that are strivin'
> By means that are honest an' true."

We regret, for a reason which we shall afterwards state, that we cannot join the chorus of praise, nor share in the enthusiasm which has been raised over Mr. Kent's poems.[10] To speak the truth, they appear to us the most prosaic of poems, in spite of the great effort to appear otherwise, which we ever remember to have read as coming from an able and educated man. We do not confound Mr. Kent with the ordinary herd of poetasters. He appeals to a very different standard of criticism. By that he must be tried. He has evidently studied the best models. But effort is visible in every page. He is always straining. Nor is he, after all, able to go beyond the surface of things. He paints merely outsides. He seldom, so to speak, gets beyond the bark of the tree. He has none of that Wordsworthian power to see through Nature, which every descriptive poet must have to take any rank. His ideal of beauty seems to be that of the photograph. He is faithful and accurate enough in his descriptions of the country, of flowers and birds. But this is not enough. This faithfulness in mere detail and externals is not the whole art of great poets, but only a portion of it. Hesiod, Homer, and Shakspeare paint nature accurately enough it is true, but they do a great deal more. They go far beyond this. It is the one vitalizing power—imagination, which Mr. Kent lacks.

Thus, to make our meaning plainer, Mr. Kent, in an ambitious passage, speaks of

> "The lordly moth of radiant dragon-dyes,
> Its wings of damson velvet dusted down
> With powdered gold like amber in a meal."—(p. 38.)

His admirers will doubtless appeal to this as an example of the accuracy of his descriptions. So it is. Shakspeare, too, talks of "the

---

[10] "Poems." By Charles Kent. A New Edition. London: C. Tucker. 1870.

mealy wings of butterflies." But if Shakspeare had done nothing more than this, he would have risen little above the song of the Hampshire children about the moth,—

> "Millery, millery, dusty poll,
> How many sacks hast thee stole?"

The beauty of that magnificent speech in "Troilus and Cressida" (act iii. sc. 3) consists in the way in which Shakspeare translates and interprets the facts of nature, and passes on and through them, and gives them a human interest—how man, like the butterfly, shows only his brightness to the summer; how he is too often valued (a favourite theme of Shakspeare's) not for being a man, but, like the butterfly, for accidents and honours, which are without him.

Again, there is, to our thinking, another great fault in all Mr. Kent's poems. They are all overloaded with false jewellery. Mr. Kent deals too much with cheap similes. This is, of course, a matter of taste. Some people like tinsel. We do not. Nor is Mr. Kent always original. Here is a passage which has been most deservedly praised—

> "Time was when thro' the dusky vales of Crete,
> The linnet, dight with plumes of tawny gold,
> Within the thickets rustled till the sweet
> And fragile blossoms fluttered to the mould."

Now this would have been deserving of the praise had the idea been quite new. Here, however, are Bloomfield's lines—

> "Stopt in her song, perchance the starting thrush
> Shook a white shower from the blackthorn bush;
> Where dewdrops thick as early blossoms hung,
> And trembled as the minstrel sweetly sung."

We repeat that we regret to speak in so condemnatory a tone of the volume, because we feel how bitter will be the disappointment to one who has laboured so long in the Muse's service as Mr. Kent. If labour could make a poet, it would have done so in Mr. Kent's case. We cannot, however, part with the book without expressing a word of praise for its generous tone and sympathies.

Mr. Locker[11] has put all those who enjoy his light and sparkling verses under an obligation by collecting them into a single volume. We have on a former occasion spoken of their great merits. We can now only repeat our former praise. His Muse satirizes without being offensive. His verses sparkle without any false glare. There is an absence of that vulgarity which occasionally jars upon us in the "Bon Gaultier" ballads. There is, too, less repetition and less of mere artifice than in that well-known collection. The present volume deserves a place somewhere between Thackeray and Praed. We can afford room for only one short quotation, and that shall be upon Mr. Locker's brethren:—

[11] "London Lyrics." By Frederick Locker. London: Strahan and Co. 1870.

"I look on bards who whine for praise,
With feelings of profoundest pity:
They hunger for the Poet's bays,
And swear one's waspish when one's witty.
The critic's lot is passing hard,—
Between ourselves, I think reviewers,
When call'd to truss a crowing bard,
Should not be sparing of the skewers."—(pp. 154, 155.)

It is said that Professor Huxley, after having been for some time examiner at the University of London, not long ago declared that it would take him two years of absolute rest to hear either the terms "cell" or "germinal matter" without a sort of inward shudder. We feel quite sure that if Mr. Locker had to criticise all the little thin green and purple octavos of verse on our table he would never wish to hear the word poetry again.

The author of "Life Below" has published a long poem called "Hadyn."[12] We do not understand it, and if we thought that any of our readers could, we would give some extracts. Mr. Michell, in his "Immortals,"[13] tells us of our present, past, and future. In our present state, he thinks that angels are permitted at certain seasons to visit the world (p. 203). As to the past, he is of opinion that the Noachian Deluge was caused by a comet (p. 216) And with regard to the future, he considers that heaven is somewhere near the Pleiades, or among them (p. 207). We certainly think that Mr. Michell shows considerable powers of imagination. Mr. Joseph Shield[14] writes a poem on the "Death of Lucretius," concerning which he says in the preface, "Nothing could be further from the truth than to suppose this is an attempt to compete with the Laureate." Whether Mr. Shield wishes it or not, people are sure to make comparisons, and we cannot even pay him the compliment of "an two men ride the same horse one must ride first." But he makes even a greater blunder in "Adela," where he introduces a witch scene. Of course Mr. Shield would say that nothing could be further from the truth than to suppose that this is an attempt to compete with Macbeth. And this brings us to the point, how do such persons as Mr. Shield suppose that they are to be judged? Do they imagine that we are to forget everything that has been written by Shakspeare, Milton, or Wordsworth?

Mr. Osborn[15] sends us two thick volumes of dramas, which have taken him no less than two years to publish. We think that Mr. Osborn quite misunderstands the signs of the times, if he imagines

---

[12] "Hadyn, and other Poems." By the Author of "Life Below." London: Provost and Co. 1870.

[13] "The Immortals; or, Glimpses of Paradise." A Poem. By Nicholas Michell. London: William Tegg. 18"0.

[14] "Adela: a Tragedy. And the Death of Lucretius: a Poem." By Joseph Shield. London: Provost and Co. 1870.

[15] "Dramatic Works." By Laughton Osborn. Vols. I. and II. New York: James Miller and the American News Company. London: Trübner and Co. 1868-1870.

that there is any public to welcome them. Scarcely any one, except some student, turns to the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher, or Marlow, or Massinger, or Ben Jonson, and, we think, will not therefore be likely to pay much attention to Mr. Osborn. Besides, he labours under very great disadvantages, even for the mere workmanship of his art. Shakspeare could never have risen to half his greatness, had there not existed a dramatic school in which he could have trained himself and perfected his art by competition and comparison with others. Did Shakspeare live in our days he would most assuredly in the present position of the stage not have been a dramatist. We therefore, upon the most general grounds, can hold out but faint hopes of success to Mr. Osborn. No revival of the glories of the stage seems just at present possible. Turning to the plays themselves, we think that in the passages which we have examined—for it is impossible to wade through over a thousand pages—Mr. Osborn mistakes violence for dramatic power, and a mere flux of words for eloquence. On the other hand, his notes show extensive and well-digested reading, a power of analysis of character, an insight into motives, and literary and artistic criticism of real value. We most sincerely trust that Mr. Osborn may be able to find some other field in literature in which he is likely to reap a richer harvest than he can ever hope to gain from his tragedies.

"A Handful of Flowers and Weeds"[16] is a strange hodge-podge of verse and prose. We have Hymns and Charades, Prose Translations and Fragments, and odds and ends of all sorts. The writer has apparently poured forth the contents of her common-place book with those of her album. We certainly prefer the prose to the verse. The latter is what most persons who possess any poetical expression could produce, but which they are sensible enough not to publish.

"The Tragedy of Lesbos"[17] is evidently the production of a scholarly and refined mind. The thoughts are often striking, and the language often melodious in the extreme. Here for instance are a couple of stanzas taken at random:—

"Spring-tide once more, the buds upon the bush
Start like a buried fountain's myriad drops;
Morn after morn the newly-wedded thrush
Sings to his lover in the laurel copse.

"The spring is in my heart, and with its power
The budding passions put on fresh attire;
Love's winter hath relaxed, and hour by hour
I sing to thee my newly-found desire."—(p. 37.)

The writer, too, shows an intensity of feeling which is very rare. Still, with all these excellences, we doubt if "Lesbos" will ever be

[16] "A Handful of Flowers and Weeds in Prose and Verse." From a very old Portfolio. By the Author of "The False Step and the Sisters." Lond Longmans, Green, and Co. 1870.

[17] "The Tragedy of Lesbos." By E. H. Pember. London: Macmillan and Co. 1870.

popular with the general public. Here and there a scholar will, perhaps, be attracted to it for the sake of its culture and tone. To a select few we can commend it.

Most readers of our contemporary the *Spectator* will have been struck from time to time by the poems which have appeared in its columns bearing the signatures, amongst others, of Mr. Hill and Mr. Church. Mr. Hill[18] has now collected some of his own into a volume which is sure to find a large public. The great characteristic of Mr. Hill's poetry is its intense earnestness. Here, for instance, is a sonnet, which, if we rightly remember, first appeared in the pages of the *Spectator* :—

"IN A FASHIONABLE CHURCH. *May*, 1869.

"The air is faint, yet still the crowds press in:
With stir of silks and underflow of talk,
That falls from lips of ladies as they walk,
Ere yet the dainty service doth begin;
Ah me! the very organ's glorious din
Is turned to pliant trimness in its place;
And over all a sweet melodious grace
Floats with the incense-stream good souls to win!
O God! that spak'st of old from Sinai's brow,
And Thou that laid'st the tempest with a word!
Is this Thy worship? Come amongst us now
With all Thy thunders if Thou would'st be heard.
So tyrannous is this weight of pageantry,
Almost we cry, Give back Gethsemane!"

This reveals to us something more of the temper of Wordsworth than we have heard for a long time. Earnestness is in short the key-note of Mr. Hill's poetry. There is scarcely any great social or political event which has taken place of late years on which he has not something to say, as equally well worth reading as this sonnet. To all those who have at heart the well.being of England, the relief of the suffering poor, and the education of the multitude, we most strongly recommend Mr. Hill's poems. Every one may learn from them lessons of nobleness and charity.

The late Mr. William Leighton[19] came of a poetical family. We remember being struck some years ago with the remarkable power of description shown in Mr. Robert Leighton's poems. The nephew possessed much the same power and facility. A love for nature in her quietest moods and a vein of delicate fancy distinguish the present poems. What Mr. William or Mr. Robert Leighton might have accomplished had their lives been spared, it is impossible to say. We can but lament the early deaths of two relatives who were certainly endowed with poetical gifts of no common order.

Mr. Reynolds's "Glaphyra"[20] is imbued with a classical spirit. The

[18] "A Scholar's Day Dream, Sonnets, and other Poems." By Alsager Hay Hill. London: Chapman and Hall. 1870.

[19] "Poems." By the late William Leighton. Longmans, Green, and Co. 1870.

[20] "Glaphyra, and other Poems." By Francis Reynolds. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1870.

lines breathe of the old-world. We find the same characteristics in his shorter pieces. Mr. Reynolds's must, we fear, be contented with the praise of a few. His poems will not touch the multitude.

A note prefixed to Mr. Buchanan's "Book of Orm"[21] states that continued ill-health compels the omission of two poems, "A Rune found in the Starlight" and the "Song of Heaven." From the same cause, too, we regret to learn that section ix. is incomplete, and wants an all-important canto. Of course such important omissions preclude us from passing any final judgment on the work. We will not take upon ourselves to decide how far the state of Mr. Buchanan's health has affected what we already possess. Certainly the poem, as it stands, is pervaded with a wild, feverish unrest. Mr. Buchanan's mind appears to be in a transitional state. We think, considering the vast importance of the subject, that it is a pity he did not adopt the Horatian maxim. The passages which we like best may most of them be found in the section entitled "The Man and the Shadow." Mr. Buchanan is here himself again. He treads the firm ground of reality. His descriptions are clear and sharp-cut. Take for instance the following picture:—

> "Here let us pause:
> Here where the grass gleams emerald, and the spring
> Upbubbling faintly seemeth as a sound,
> A drowsy hum heard in the mind itself—
> Here, in this stillness, let us pause and mark
> The many-coloured picture. Far beneath
> Sleepeth the glassy ocean like a sheet
> Of liquid mother-o'-pearl, and on its rim
> A ship sleeps, and the shadow of the ship;
> Astern the reef juts darkly, edged with foam
> Thro' the smooth brine: oh, hark! how loudly sings
> A wild, weird ditty to a watery tune,
> The fisher among his nets upon the shore;
> And yonder, far away, his shouting bairns
> Are running, dwarf'd by distance small as mice,
> Along the yellow sands. Behind us, see
> The immeasurable mountains, rising silent
> Against the fields of dreamy bliss, wherein
> The rayless crescent of the mid-day moon
> Lies like a reaper's sickle; and before us
> The immeasurable mountains, rising silent
> From bourne to bourne, from knolls of thyme and heather
> To leafless slopes of granite, from the slopes
> Of granite to the dim and ashen heights,
> Where, with a silver glimmer, silently
> Pausing, the white cloud sheds miraculous snow."—(pp. 30, 31).

There is a sustained beauty and simplicity about this passage which show that Mr. Buchanan has lost none of his old cunning. From the same section, however, other passages equally fine and

[21] "The Book of Orm." A Prelude to the Epic. By Robert Buchanan. London: Strahan and Co. 1870.

simple might easily be quoted. Of the remaining sections the "Songs of Seeking," are perhaps the most remarkable. A more spiritual insight is revealed than we have before noticed in any of Mr. Buchanan's writings. Here his progress is most fully seen. The feeling is both deep and pure. "The Devil's Mystics" are somewhat too acrid; but it is at present impossible to judge of them in their incompleted state. The power, however, is undoubted. With this short notice, we must close our account of a book which will most certainly leave an impression upon the younger minds of the present generation.

Mr. Rossetti,[22] like Spenser and Keats, is the poet's poet. He has already received the highest praise. He has been praised by the praiseworthy. No two such remarkable criticisms have appeared, in our generation at least, as those upon Mr. Rossetti's poems by Swinburne and Morris. Those reviews show clearly what poets find to love in poetry. Rossetti's poems are steeped in an element of beauty. They possess the "beauty making beautiful old rhyme," which poets prize. He delights, too, in that form which is such a puzzle to the ordinary, earless, unrhythmical reader, that Steevens affirmed that it would require an Act of Parliament to make the public read the sonnets of Shakspeare. Yet the sonnet is the form in which the great poets delight. The form yields itself to the perfection of art. And the sweetest and daintiest poems in the present volume are the sonnets. As Meres said of Shakspeare's, they are sugared. Perhaps some of them are oversweet. A few, as "Nuptial Sleep," "The Supreme Surrender," and some others, are only to be read in solitude. Here, however, is one which appeals with its Shaksperian wealth of imagery, no less than its Shaksperian sense of melancholiness, to all hearts:—

BARREN SPRING.

"Once more the changed year's turning wheel returns:
And as a girl sails balanced in the wind,
And now before and now again behind
Stoops as it swoops, with cheek that laughs and burns,—
So Spring comes merry towards me now, but earns
No answering smile from me, whose life is twin'd
With the dead boughs that Winter still must bind,
And whom to-day the Spring no more concerns.

Behold, this crocus is a withering flame;
This snowdrop, snow; this apple-blossom's part
To breed the fruit that breeds the serpent's art.
Nay, for these Spring-flowers, turn thy face from them,
Nor gaze till on the year's last lily-stem
The white cup shrivels round the golden heart."

But it is the wide octave which Mr. Rossetti sketches, which impresses us most. Nearly every metre may be found in the compass of this small volume, and each has yielded new music. He has given us

[22] "Poems." By Dante Gabriel Rossetti. Third Edition. London: F. S. Ellis. 1870.

infinite variety, from the sweetness of the sonnets up to the weirdness of "Sister Helen," with its wild lilt. Each poem, however short, is marked by an individuality of its own. And there is no test of genius like this. Just as we say such and such a piece is Wordsworthian, so we should say, now that we have been let into the secret, this is Rossetti. Mr. Rossetti has, in fact, widened the limits of poetry. He has also dared to treat subjects which no other modern poet has dared. And his success is his best justification. Of "Jenny" it may be truly said, *omnia munda mundis, immunda immundis.* Of the songs we can simply say that, except in Shakspeare and Goethe, we know of none where thought and pathos are linked together in such melody. Our praise, however, will probably not seem so very extravagant by those who can feel the beauty of the following:—

PLIGHTED PROMISE.

"In a soft-complexioned sky,
Fleeting rose and kindling grey,
Have you seen Aurora fly
At the break of day?
So my maiden, so my plighted may,*
Blushing cheek and gleaming eye
Lifts to look my way.

Where the inmost leaf is stirred
With the heart-beat of the grove,
Have you heard a hidden bird
Cast her note above?
So my lady, so my lovely love,
Echoing Cupid's prompted word
Makes a tune thereof.

Have you seen, at heaven's mid-height,
In the noon-rack's ebb and tide,
Venus leap forth burning white
Dian pale and hide?
So my bright breast-jewel, so my bride,
One sweet night, when fear takes flight,
Shall leap against my side."

After reading this we think every one will exclaim with us, "Here is a new singer!"

Among recent collections of poetry Dr. Hannah's "Courtly Poets"[23]

* May, a maid.
"The fairest may she was that ever went."
SPENSER. *Sh. Kal.*

The way in which Mr. Rossetti has instinctively, as it were, selected some of the most beautiful of our forgotten words is not amongst the least of the charms of his poetry.

[23] "The Courtly Poets, from Raleigh to Montrose." Edited by J. Hannah, D.C.L., Warden of Trinity College, Glenalmond. London: Bell and Daldy. 870 .

must hold a very high place. Most books of this kind are either a mere publisher's venture or an author's "pot-boiler." Few collections are made with the care and taste of the "Golden Treasury." Few editors possess Mr. Palgrave's gifts. But Mr. Palgrave's was a very easy task compared with Dr. Hannah's. In the latter case, wide reading, critical insight, and great industry, have been needed. But the labour has evidently been one of love. We wish we could persuade Dr. Hannah to give us a companion volume of extracts from some of the less known Elizabethan poets—from such poems, say, as Goldingham's "Garden Plot" (1578), or Cutwode's "Caltha Poetarum," (1599). Both these poems are full of great beauties. But editing such extracts would require the greatest caution, especially in the case of the second work. No one but some such editor as Dr. Hannah is competent for this task. He would perform it, we feel sure, with the same skill and the same knowledge with which he has edited "The Courtly Poets."

One of the best edited of the Globe Series of poets is Mr. Christie's "Dryden.[24] Everything seems to be done which is needful. A good life of the poet is prefixed. The best readings are adopted. The quotations are verified. The notes are to the purpose, and really clear up the difficulties. Lastly, a most full glossary is appended. Here and there, perhaps, we might wish for a little more illustration of some of the less known phrases; but, as a rule, it is ample. Is Mr. Christy, however, quite explanatory enough for younger students, when at page 476 he writes, "a fescue is a wire with which a person teaching reading points to the letters?" Undoubtedly fescue may be a wire in the particular instance. It would, however, have been well to have said nothing about this word, which is used in Shakspeare, and comes to us through the French festu, Italian festuca, from the Latin. In Withal's Dictionary (1586), under the heading of "The Schoole, with that belongeth thereto," we have the word "a festu" (sig. K 2 verso), whilst in the "Defensio Legis" (1674), we have the curious form "festraw." Fescu, or fescue, may be found as a translation of festuca, and used as synonymous with a straw, in many of the Latin dictionaries of the seventeenth century. The word is used by Tennyson, and is employed by botanists to denote a well-known genus of grass. Again, perhaps, such a term as "stickler" should be more fully explained, but we have no space now to define the duties of such an officer. Let us repeat that the edition is most carefully edited, and will be of real use to all students.

Translations still continue to increase, though we much doubt if their readers do. Of course, Mr. Baring's[25] version of the Odes of Horace is scholarly. But it is also something more, terse and poetical. We have compared several of his versions with those of Lord Lytton,

[24] "The Poetical Works of John Dryden." Edited, with a Memoir, Revised Text, and Notes. By W. D. Christie, M.A. London: Macmillan and Co. 1870.

[25] "The Lyrics of Horace, done into English Rhyme." By Thomas Charles Baring, M.A. London: Rivingtons. 1870.

and in various instances, as in the "Lydia dic per omnes," must give Mr. Baring the palm for conciseness. But the question arises, what is the use of so many translations, all of about the same level of excellence? Mr. Baring is hardly likely to find an audience with the general public, whilst scholars will prefer the original.

But if Mr. Baring's translation is hardly likely to find readers, what can be said of Mr. Middleton's[26] version of the first two books of the Æneid? No one is likely to take up such a translation as Mr. Middleton's, which has no particular recommendation which we can discover, of a portion of a great poem. Mr. Middleton has, apparently, from what he tells us at page 89, never looked into any translation of Virgil. We should advise him then at once to turn to Stanyhurst's (1583); and, if we mistake not, he will derive more amusement from it than we have been able to do from his own.

We have often recommended prose translations of verse as conveying more adequately to mere English readers the general sense of the original than a verse translation. Although Mr. Strong's[27] translations do not appear to be primarily intended for mere English readers, yet they may be especially recommended to them. His versions of Catullus—and no one is so difficult to translate—are especially graceful. We are surprised, however, that Mr. Strong, writing chiefly for the benefit of Scottish students, should make no mention of Mr. Cranstoun's very beautiful translation, probably the best which we possess.

England will soon rival Germany in its Shaksperian literature. Mr. Roach Smith, besides being one of our ablest antiquaries, is also known as an ardent Shaksperian scholar. His little work on "The Rural Life of Shakspeare, as Illustrated by his Works,"[28] is a worthy sequel to his "Remarks on Shakspeare," published last year. The great difficulty which every writer encounters when dealing with such a theme, is the fact that Shakspeare seems to be thoroughly at home with each subject. You can, out of his plays, prove him to be a sailor, lawyer, farmer, or sportsman. Of his collected works, we may say, as has been said of the Bible :—

> Hic liber est in quo quærit sua dogmata quisque,
> Invenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua.

What each one undertakes to prove as to Shakspeare out of his own works, he generally does, at least to his own satisfaction. Mr. Roach Smith's work is not open to these objections. If anything could with certainty be said of Shakspeare, as of every great poet, it is that he was a lover of the country. The attempt, therefore, to trace all the notices

---

[26] "The First Two Books of the Æneid of Virgil." Translated by Empson Edward Middleton. With Explanatory Notes. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1870.

[27] "Specimens of Translations from Catullus and Virgil." For the use of University Students. By Herbert A. Strong, B.A. Glasgow: James Maclehose. 1870.

[28] "The Rural Life of Shakspeare, as Illustrated by his Works." By C. Roach Smith. London: J. Russell Smith. 1870.

of rural life in his works is perfectly legitimate. And Mr. Roach Smith's method is eminently successful. He is not led away by his enthusiasm beyond the region of fact. We are not carried into the cloudy region of speculation, as we so often are by German commentators. Mr. Roach Smith treads on firm ground. Thus he gives us notices of gardens from "King Richard II." and other plays, and collects all the allusions to husbandry. These passages have evidently been brought together with no little labour and patience. But Mr. Roach Smith is not content with merely bringing these passages together. He criticises them all in detail. And his criticism certainly throws a great deal of curious information and unsuspected light upon various points. We do not, however, always agree with him. From the flowers, Mr. Roach Smith, by an easy transition, turns to the fruit. His disquisition upon the apples mentioned in the various plays is one of the most interesting parts of his work. From orchards Mr. Roach Smith turns to country customs, habits, and games alluded to by Shakspeare, illustrating his remarks by references, especially to the "Midsummer Night's Dream," which is especially rich in all such matters. Then follows a discussion upon the wild plants in Shakspeare, which is done with equal knowledge. Mr. Roach Smith then examines the evidence of Shakspeare's love of hunting, not forgetting the allusions to the coursing on "Cotsale," mentioned in the "Merry Wives of Windsor," and the picture of the wounded stag in "As you Like It." We have not space to follow Mr. Smith through all his references to the various sports alluded to in the plays. It must be enough to say that he touches upon them all, including hawking, fishing, and bear-baiting, and illustrates them all in a perfectly easy and natural way. Of Shakspeare's knowledge of the habits of bees and pigeons, of shepherd's life, he gives us, too, various examples. The only question is, might not all this knowledge be affirmed of any other great poet? Two editions [29] of Shakspeare, which are now appearing, call for some notice. We have no hesitation in giving the preference to that by Mr. Clark and Mr. Wright. Mr. Hunter's is very well as far as it goes. But when we compare the two editions together, say in such a play as the "Merchant of Venice," the superiority of the former edition is at once apparent. The notes are fuller, and Shakspeare is more constantly explained by himself. Sometimes the annotations of the rival editors are somewhat at variance. Thus, in the fifth scene of the third act, Mr. Hunter makes the following comment upon the passage, "And I do know a many fools."

"*A many fools.*—The expression *a many* is now only provincial, though the corresponding expression *a few* is national and reputable English."—(p. 106.)

We turn, however, to the other edition by Clark and Wright, and there we find the following note.

---

[29] "I. Clarendon Press Series. Shakspeare's Select Plays." Edited by W. G. Clark, M.A., and W. A. Wright, M.A. Oxford: the Clarendon Press. "II. Shilling Annotated Plays of Shakspeare for Students." By the Rev. John Hunter. London: Longmans and Co.

"*A many.*—Still used occasionally by our poets. Tennyson, for instance, in the 'Miller's Daughter':—

'They have not shed a many tears,
Dear eyes since first I knew them well.'"—(p. 115.)

Wherever we have been able to fairly test the notes together, we have found the advantage lie with Messrs. Clark and Wright's edition. We wish we could persuade the latter editors to number Shakspeare's lines consecutively, as is done in a Greek play. We have found their method of division excessively tiresome and laborious when we wished to find a note on any particular passage. Further, the reader's labour might be much abridged by full head lines to the notes. Messrs. Clark and Wright must know, by their repeated use of the Concordance, how useful such a plan of notation as we propose would be.

The Early English Text Society continues its great work, which has already done more to illustrate the language, literature and life of our country, than that performed by any other society. It must be obvious, however, that there are very few persons who can criticise the single volumes. Often the editor himself is the sole possessor of all the information on the particular subject. To one volume, however, which has been recently issued, we would direct especial attention. English Gilds [30] is a work of national importance. The editor, Mr. Toulmin Smith, was unfortunately cut off in the midst of his labours. The work, however, was carried on and completed by his eldest daughter, who had been his constant assistant. The Introduction, Index, and especially the Glossary, bear ample testimony to her fitness for the post, and to her patient industry and research. To make the work still more complete, the committee applied to Dr. Lujo Brentano, as the greatest authority on the subject, for assistance. He has, in the most liberal way, written for the work an essay "On the History and Development of Gilds," which is thoroughly exhaustive. As has well been said, Dr. Brentano has shown "that in him the old Brotherly Gild-feeling to fellow workers still exists." The value of his essay cannot be overrated. The great pains which Mr. Toulmin Smith has bestowed upon the work, may be at once seen by turning to Stratford-upon-Avon. As Mr. Toulmin Smith truly says, everything which concerns the birthplace of Shakspeare, has been made the object of the most ardent research. Fisher, in the early part of the century, examined the Records of the Gild. Since that time, Halliwell has gone over the same ground. In describing Halliwell's labours, Mr. Toulmin Smith falls into a slight mistake. He accurately enough says that Mr. Halliwell, in 1863, published a "Descriptive Calendar of the Ancient MSS. and Records in possession of the Corporation of Stratford-upon-Avon," and then adds "unfor-

---

[30] "English Gilds. The Original Ordinances of more than one hundred early English Gilds." From original MSS. of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. Edited with Notes by the late Toulmin Smith, Esq.; with an Introduction and Glossary, by his daughter, Lucy Toulmin Smith. And a Preliminary Essay in Five Parts on the History and Development of Gilds, by Dr. Lujo Brentano. London: the Early English Text Society. Trübner and Co. 1870.

tunately, the work has neither Contents nor Index." The latter assertion is not quite correct. In 1865 Mr. Halliwell published a very full index of all the names. The family name of Shakspeare is found occurring a great many times. Unfortunately, however, Mr. Halliwell only printed twenty-five copies of this index. Of these, in November 1865, he destroyed fifteen, so that only ten copies of this invaluable work remain. Mr. Toulmin Smith's ignorance is therefore not to be wondered at, when the book is of such excessive rarity. To return to Mr. Toulmin Smith's own labours: as he remarks, after all the research that has been instituted, he has for the first time brought to light documents which will be interesting, not as merely being connected with the birthplace of Shakspeare, but as possessing a high intrinsic value of their own.

Further, Mr. Toulmin Smith has also printed for the first time "The Report of the Commissioners of 37 Henry VIII. as to the Gild of Stratford-upon-Avon." The following extract will convey to all those who know the present town, and the position of the churches, a very clear idea of the place just twenty years before Shakspeare's birth, and as it in all probability remained during the early period of his life.

> "There be, at thys present tyme, v prestes; whereof one, A Scolemaster of Gramer, and celebrating dyvyne servyce w'in a Chapelle stondyng in the myddes of the same, ffor the greate quyetnesse and Comffort of alle the parissyoners there; ffor that the parisshe Churche stondythe owte of the same towne, dystaunt ffrom the moste parte of the sayd parisshe halffe a myle and more; and in tyme of syknes, as the plage and suche lyke dysseses doth Chaunce w'in the seyde Towne, than (then) alle suche infectyne persons, w' many other ympotent and pore people, dothe to the seyd Chapelle resort ffor there dyvyne servyce. And in the same Towne there ys a markett wekely kepte; and havyng in yt abowt MD houselyng people; together w' vij lyttle hamlettes thereto belonging, whiche hathe no other resort but only to the same Chapelle and parisshe Church."—(pp. 221, 222.)

Now this is certainly an important document, as giving us a picture of Stratford as it probably was in Shakspeare's early days. Probably, too, in the priest, "A Scolemaster of Gramer, and celebrating Dyvyne Servyce wtin a Chapelle," we may have the prototype of "The Pedant that keeps a School i' the Church," to whom Malvolio is compared in "Twelfth Night" (Act iii. sc. 2). In another extract which Mr. Toulmin Smith gives from the same Report of the Commissioners, we have a notice of "ij Chapelles, the one caulyd Bysshopston, and the other Luddyngton, beyng Members of the seyd Parishe, and eche of them dystaunt ffrom the seyd Churche ij myles" (p. 222). It was at Luddington that Shakspeare was supposed to have been married; but the register, like the chapel, has been destroyed. We should have liked to have given further illustrations of the great importance of Mr. Toulmin Smith's work, but we think that our extracts will have shown its value. We cannot, however, conclude our notice without again expressing our obligations to Miss Smith and Dr. Brentano for their labours, without which the work would have been deprived of a great deal of its utility both to the scholar and the general public.

THE

WESTMINSTER

AND

FOREIGN QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER 1, 1870.

ART. I.—THE LAND QUESTION IN ENGLAND.

THE contrast between England of the fifteenth and England of the nineteenth century in regard to the tenure and occupation of the land is positively startling. At the former period, according to Chancellor Fortescue, England was noted throughout Europe for the number of her freeholders and for the general prosperity of her inhabitants.

"The country," he tells us, "was then so filled and replenished with landed men, that therein so small a little hamlet cannot be found where dwelleth not a knight, an esquire, or such a householder as is there called a Franklin, enriched with great possessions, and also other freeholders and other yeomen. . . . . After this manner are none other realms of this world disposed and inhabited. For though there be in them men of great power, of great riches and possessions, yet they dwell not nigh one to another as such great men do in England; neither so many inheritors and possessors of land are elsewhere as in England."*

Two centuries later, according to Gregory King's estimate, the small freeholders were still a very numerous body. In 1688 there were in England 40,000 families "freeholders of the better sort," and 140,000 "freeholders of the lesser sort;" in all 180,000 families possessing freehold estates. This is exclusive of the higher nobility, baronets, knights, esquires, and gentlemen, who are classified separately and number 16,560 families, all of which were the owners of more or less land. Taking therefore Gregory King's estimate of the total number of landed families of all ranks and conditions at 849,000, it would appear that one family in every four were freeholders at the time he lived. How

* "De Laudibus Legum Angliæ," cap. 29-36.

different the state of things at the present day, when one-half of England is owned by 150, and 19½ millions of acres in Scotland are owned by 12 persons!*

The facts stated imply a great and radical change. The question arises:—Has this change been beneficial or otherwise? Is employment, in proportion to population, more abundant? Is labour, taking other things into account, better remunerated? Are the people as a whole more prosperous than formerly, in regard to their material comforts and social condition? These questions, we fear, cannot be answered in the affirmative. On the contrary, it must be admitted that the change has been an unfortunate and in many respects a disastrous one for the country.

It is not a mere coincidence that the introduction of pauperism in England was contemporaneous with the extinction of the class of small freeholders and farmers. The connexion between them was that of cause and effect. In England, in former days, the nobility, it is true, held large estates, but they did not monopolize the whole land of the country. Between each large estate there were numerous small freeholds, owned and cultivated by a class of yeomen; while at the same time large spaces all over the country were specially reserved from appropriation, and set apart for the common use of the people. The small freeholds began to be absorbed into the large estates about the middle of the fifteenth century. About the same time a great demand arose for wool. English wool was then in great repute all over Europe for manufacturing purposes, and the price was so high that the landowners found it more profitable to grow wool than any other kind of agricultural produce. With a view to meet the increased demand for this article, immense areas of land were laid down in pasture all over the country. But land laid down in pasture employs less labour than if devoted to tillage; and thousands of labourers were consequently thrown out of employment. When remonstrated with for the course they were taking in depriving so many people of a livelihood, the landowners, in terms which express the now prevailing notions with regard to the rights of property, replied—"Have we not a right to do as we like with our own?" and carried the day. Large and small farms alike were appropriated to pasture, and the fate of the small farmer was sealed. The clearance system was then for the first time adopted, and it was remorselessly carried out. "As for turning men out of a hold," says a writer

* The total number of landowners in England at the date of the last census was 30,766; but this includes the owners of building sites, town and suburban allotments.

of this period,* "they take it for no offence, but say the land is their own, and so they turn them out of their strouds like mice. Thousands in England through such beg now from door to door, who have kept honest houses." Again, the author of a tract published in 1581 says, "Sheep are the causes of our mischief; they have driven husbandry out of the country; now it is altogether sheep, sheep, sheep! I have known a dozen of ploughs within six miles abandoned, laid down within seven years; and where threescore persons and upwards had their livings, now one man with his cattle hath all." But the evil had become serious long before this, for in 1489 we find the Legislature recognising the fact that land, unlike other property, was not to be used for the exclusive benefit of the owner, had enacted a statute providing that all farmhouses should be maintained with a competent quantity of land, under penalty of seizure of half the profits. Again, the 25th of Henry VIII. declared that the accumulations of farms had reduced "a vast multitude" of the people to poverty and misery, and forbade any man to have more than two farms, or to keep on hired land more than two thousand sheep; and the 5th and 6th of Edward VI. required that as much land should be kept in tillage as had heretofore been the case. Shocking evidences these, it will be said, of the ignorance of our ancestors as to the first principles of political economy. However, one way or another, the process of accumulation went on till there were few small freeholds left in the country. Then the commons began to disappear. From 1670 till 1867 no less than 7,000,000 of acres of commons have been swallowed up by the Enclosure Acts, and gone to increase the already large estates of adjoining proprietors. As the work of accumulation proceeded on the one hand, so did the impoverishment of the people on the other, till the net result showed itself in the hideous shape of pauperism, which was formally recognised† by the Act of Parliament in the reign of Elizabeth, when the poor rates were made compulsory.

Note next the effect of the system on our agricultural population. In the good old days of English husbandry the farmer and his men lived under the same roof, ate at the same table, and joined in the same amusements. If we take Chancellor Fortescue as an authority, they had plenty of all kinds of flesh and fish to eat, something stronger than water to drink, and

* Bernard Gilpin, in Strype's "Ecclesiastical Memorials."

† The Act 43 Eliz. passed in 1601, just 269 years ago. There are no means of arriving at the gross amount expended in poor rates since that period, as no regular returns were obtained previous to the present century, but the amount must have been enormous.

wore "fine woollen cloth in all their apparel."* The farmers of those days and their men were on a par also in point of education, intelligence, or social position. But the farmer of that period has become extinct, and only the labourer remains. And what of him? Have long years of training in the art of husbandry made the hired servant of to-day a more skilful husbandman—a more efficient labourer than he was in the past? Is he not, on the contrary, as ignorant, as stupid, and as generally inefficient as a man well can be? without a desire to advance himself, as he is without the opportunities of advancement? Is it not a standing grievance at agricultural gatherings that the one great difficulty farmers have to contend with, in their endeavours to keep pace with the times, is the intense stupidity of the agricultural labourer? A few facts will go far to explain the degeneracy, physical and mental, of our rural population. In the year 1863 the Privy Council directed a medical inquiry to be made into the food of the poorer classes in England; and Mr. Simon, the gentleman appointed to conduct the inquiry, found, on actual examination, a very alarming deficiency. The standard adopted was that obtained from experience during the Lancashire cotton famine, under the influence of which "starvation diseases," as they are called, were proved to supervene. This standard, in the case of a man, was 4300 grains of carbon and 200 grains of nitrogen. Now, as regards the agricultural population, it was found that more than a fifth had less than the estimated bare sufficiency of carbonaceous food, and that more than a third had less than the estimated bare sufficiency of nitrogenous food; and that in the three purely agricultural counties, Berkshire, Oxfordshire, and Somersetshire, insufficiency of nitrogenous food was the average diet.† Read by the light of these facts, can we be surprised at

* "I should find it difficult," says Hallam, "to resist the conclusion, that however the labourer has derived benefit from the cheapness of manufactured commodities, and from many inventions of common utility, he is much inferior in ability to support a family to his ancestors three or four centuries ago. I know not why some have supposed meat was a luxury seldom obtained by the labourer. Doubtless he could not have procured as much as he pleased, but from the greater cheapness of cattle as compared with corn, it seems to follow that a more considerable portion of his ordinary diet consisted of animal food than at present. It was remarked by Sir John Fortescue, that the English lived far more upon animal diet than their rivals the French, and it was natural to ascribe their superior strength and courage to this cause."—*History of the Middle Ages*, vol. iii. p. 374.

† "We are curious to know," says Mr. Caird, "how money was economized, and heard from a labourer the following account of a day's diet:—After doing up his horses he takes breakfast, which is made of flour with a little butter, and water 'from the tea-kettle' poured over it. He takes with him to the field a piece of bread and (if he has not a young family and can afford it)

the deterioration that has taken place among our agricultural population? The wonder is rather that they are as good as they are. We have got rid of the yeoman and small farmer class, are we not in a fair way of getting rid of the agricultural labourer also, by the slow but terribly sure method of sheer starvation? Let it be asked in all seriousness if a system which produces such results as these can be a right one? Can we say that it is creditable to our humanity that a large and important section of our fellow-creatures should actually be kept on the point of starvation while able and willing to work for a living?

So much for the physical condition of the agricultural labourer. His mental condition is no better. It is vain to talk to him of the necessity of life insurance, annuities for old age, or for making a provision for his wife and children. He barely manages to obtain subsistence from day to day, and all his efforts are devoted to that one object. Life with him is a constant "struggle for existence." To talk of educating him under such circumstances is absurd. He has neither the time nor the means for indulging in such a luxury as education, and his children are not likely to be any better off than himself in this respect. Bad as is his condition in the present, his future prospects are still worse. The next grade above him is too high for him ever to have a chance of reaching it. He has no ambition because he has no hope. He must drudge on in his own dull way to the dreary end, and that end is the gaol or the workhouse.

With the lower stratum of society in such a state of physical and mental degradation, we need not wonder at the prevalence of crime. Physical privation means moral degradation. Insufficiency of food implies deficiency of everything that is necessary to the comfort and decency of domestic life. Can we expect the moral condition of those to be otherwise than low whose constant care it is to earn a bare subsistence? Unfortunately we are not left to infer that such is the case. We are supplied with an overwhelming mass of evidence on this point which puts the matter beyond dispute.* This evidence

---

cheese to eat at midday. He returns home in the afternoon to a few potatoes, and possibly a little bacon, though only those who are a little better off can afford this. The supper very commonly consists of bread and water. The appearance of the labourer showed, as might be expected from such a meagre diet, a want of that vigour and activity which mark the well-fed ploughman of the northern and midland counties."—*English Agriculture*, pp. 84, 85.

* See especially the Report on the Employment of Women in Agriculture; Mr. Chadwick's Report on the Sanatory Condition of the Labouring Population; the Report of the Welsh Commissioners; and Reports of the Poor Law Commissioners.

proves but too conclusively that crime and immorality prevail in England to an alarming extent. If we are to believe the official reports that have from time to time been laid before Parliament, if we are to believe the statements of clergymen who have had ample opportunities of ascertaining the condition of the several parishes in which they reside, or of gentlemen well known for their truthfulness and philanthropy, then indeed we cannot resist the conclusion that this country has reached a depth of degradation that is perfectly appalling.* An agricultural labourer's cottage sometimes contains three, but oftener only two rooms, and in a great many cases only one room, which is used as a living and sleeping chamber for the whole family. Sometimes in an ordinary sized room there may be found sleeping in close proximity father and mother and grown-up sons and daughters. It is said not to be an uncommon thing even to find young men received as lodgers where only one room is available for the whole family. The consequence of this state of things on the rising generation may be imagined. In some parishes the number of illegitimate children exceeds that of those born in wedlock. At first the public were horrified at these disclosures. They looked to the landowners for the removal of the scandal; but the landowners did not see it in the same light, and did nothing. For months the press kept publishing details that opened the eyes of the public to the enormity of the system which produced such a state of things. But soon the tale began to pall upon the public appetite; and the *Times*, which had taken a prominent part in the exposure, was the first to recognise the fact, when on one occasion, after drawing attention in its leading columns to some more striking proofs of the depravity of the rural population than it had yet published, the writer expressed a fear that to call farther attention to the subject was "calculated to deaden rather than excite the anxiety of the public by a thrice-told tale." And so the matter dropped. This was years ago; but nothing has since been done to remedy the evils then complained of. To insufficient accommodation is now superadded the infamous gang system. Young children of both sexes, in charge of men

* S. G. O., in a letter to the *Times* newspaper, says:—"Sad and lengthened experience has convinced me that the producer of bread by the sweat of his brow, for his body's sake and his soul's sake, can be placed in no worse position than he is at home—in merry England, Christian England, England the nurse of industry, the very hotbed of philanthropy. Late, very late experience—knowledge acquired far and near, from those in whom I can put trust—facts of which I am cognizant from sources which defy contradiction—all prove to me that in hundreds of our villages the social condition of man is below that of any country of which I have ever read."

of loose character, are led about from farm to farm in gangs; by day working in the fields, and at night sleeping in sheds and outhouses. Can we doubt but that the work of demoralization commenced in the cottage will be easily consummated in the field? Our criminal class is but another evil fruit of the seed we have sown. It is the ultimatum of social degeneracy towards which we have been travelling ever since the ejection of the small freeholders and small farmers,—pauperism and the chronic starvation of agricultural labourers being but intermediate steps in the process.

Not only is our present land system responsible for the deterioration of our farm labourers, and in a great measure for the advance of pauperism and crime, but to it we are indebted for the ever-increasing burden of taxation. According to the law of England, the land belongs to the Crown. When originally granted to private individuals, its tenure was subject to certain conditions, generally of military service, and it was resumable by the Crown if these conditions were not complied with. In those days the land was the only source of revenue for the State. It provided for the poor, maintained justice, supported armies, and bore all the imposts of the community.

"The early European system," says Hallam, "knew neither the necessities nor the ingenuities of modern finance. From the demesne lands the Kings of France and Lombardy supplied the common expenses of a barbarous court. Even Charlemagne regulated the economy of his farms with the minuteness of a steward, and a large portion of his capitularies are directed to this object. Their actual revenue was chiefly derived from free gifts made according to an ancient German custom, at the annual assemblies of the nation, from amercements paid by the allodial proprietors for default of military service, and from the freda, or fines accruing to the judges out of composition for murder. These amounted to one-third of the whole weregild; one-third of this was paid over by the court to the royal exchequer. After the feudal government prevailed in France, and neither the heribannum nor the weregild continued in use, there seem to have been hardly any sources of regular revenue besides the domainal estates of the crown."*

From the meanest vassal to the proudest noble all had a personal and material interest in the soil; and in proportion to the extent and fertility of the land held by each, were his obligations to the State increased or diminished. The feudal system was at least an equitable one, which is more than can be said of the one we have substituted in its place. Military service was then, in the strictest sense, a rent-charge on the land; the lords of the soil were simply tenants of the Crown, neither more nor less.

* "Middle Ages," vol. i. p. 208.

Now, however, since military tenures have been abolished, and the expenditure of the Government is maintained by a general system of taxation, we do not find that the rents have reverted to the State. Modern landowners claim the rights, but have taken good care to disown the obligations, of their position. They have adroitly managed to relieve themselves of their burdens by transferring them to the shoulders of the people; and, being legislators as well as landowners, they found little difficulty in giving the sanction of the law to their proceedings. In the first place, they substituted a pecuniary assessment for military service, and then made the assessment so low that it was found necessary to supplement it. In other words, they retained their rents and provided a substitute in the shape of customs and excise duties.

Pauperism, as we understand it now, had no existence under the feudal system. The poor were provided for in those days, but not out of the pockets of the ratepayers. Under the feudal system there were no rights without corresponding duties. The vassals gave their services, and in return the lord apportioned them land, and afforded them the benefit of his protection. But under the process of that revolution by which they came in time to claim their land as their own property, the landowners not only created pauperism, but contrived to cast upon others the duty of its relief. The law of settlement practically confined the poor to the place of their birth, and all that the owners of property required to do in order to escape payment of the poor rates, was to take care that there should be no poor people living on their estates. Nor have they been slow to take advantage of the law in this respect. Systematically they have proceeded with the work of ejectment. All over the country the labourers' cottages have been pulled down, and their late occupants driven to seek shelter in the nearest village or town, where they have to pay exorbitant rents for miserable hovels. The town or village may be miles distant from the scene of his labours, and in addition to his day's work, the labourer has the task of walking to and from his work without any additional compensation being allowed him. Thus he is turned out of his home, his hours of labour are increased, he is compelled to pay a higher rent for worse accommodation, and all the while his wages remain the same as before. What if the labouring poor can only find shelter in crowded and squalid dwellings in the lanes and alleys of our towns and villages, where health is unknown? The result is achieved: the landowners get rid of the poor rates; the tradesmen and shopkeepers of those towns and villages have to maintain the crowds of people thrown on their hands, to multiply in a state of ignorance, disease, vice, and finally, to give birth

to an army of criminals so numerous and so dangerous to the community, that the public are at their wits' end how to deal with them.

Another evil attending our land system is, that while the land itself is constantly increasing in value, we have no corresponding contribution from that increase in aiding to defray our public expenditure. If the land in feudal times, when the soil was cultivated in the rudest manner, was able to maintain its poor and defray all the expenses of State, ordinary and extraordinary, why should it not do as much now, with all our scientific acquirements, our steam ploughs and thrashing machines, our improved live stock, and our vast and varied experience of the capabilities of our soil and climate? To this it will no doubt be answered that the population of the country has largely increased since the period referred to; that a comparatively small proportion of the population is now engaged in agriculture, and that it is but right that those other classes of the community who may be following industrial and commercial pursuits, should contribute their fair share to the public revenue. We admit the fact as to the increased population, and the comparatively small proportion engaged in agriculture; nor do we dispute the justness of the argument that the industrial classes should bear their fair share of public taxation. It is forgotten, however, by those who put forward this plea that the value of land has increased in quite as great a ratio as the population; that the land has derived additional value from this increase of population, and is now quite as able as it ever was to meet all the demands that may be made upon it.* It may be alleged, indeed, that this in-

* Gregory King estimated the population of England and Wales in 1688 at 819,000 families, which, reckoning 5⅓ persons to a family (at the rate of 4½ to each male adult), will give a total of 4,669,500; and he estimates the annual income from landed property at this period as follows:—From land, 10,000,000*l.*; burgage or houseing, 2,000,000*l.*; all other hereditaments, 1,000,000*l.*; making a total of 13,000,000*l.* According to the census of 1861, the population of England and Wales was 20,061,725, and the return under Schedule A. of the income-tax at the same period was 120,069,903*l.* Between the two periods therefore, there was an increase of 429 per cent. in population, while there was an increase of no less than 923 per cent. in real property. In other words, the value of real property increased at more than double the rate of population. Take another comparison. Mr. Caird found, from actual observation, that the rents for arable land and labourers' cottages in the agricultural districts of England had, since the period of Arthur Young's visit, risen exactly 100 per cent. Arthur Young made his tour in 1770, and Mr. Caird his in 1851, just eighty years after. We have no means of ascertaining the actual population of England and Wales in 1770, as no census had been taken for some time before or after that date; but we know it to have been 17,927,609 in 1851, and we also know that the decennial rate of increase in the population has for a long period been, as nearly as possible, 14 per cent. If therefore we take eight decennial periods at this rate, we shall find the increase

crease is due to the enterprise of the landlords. This is not the case, however. Increased value is no doubt given to land by what are called improvements, which are made sometimes by (1) the landlord, as when Mr. Smith of Deanston, by a thorough system of drainage, increased the rents of his estate from 15*s*. to 40*s*. an acre. (2) More frequently they are made by the tenants, as in Scotland, when they have long leases, and in almost every case have greatly improved the leaseholds by a large expenditure in manuring, subsoiling, and draining. Rents in the lowlands have risen of late from 10 to 20 per cent., chiefly from this cause. In Ireland, under another form of tenure, the small farmers have reclaimed large estates from their original bog or heather, erected the necessary fences, dwellings, and farm buildings by their own labour, and in many cases thereby doubled and trebled the value of the land.* (3) By corporate bodies in constructing works of public utility, such as harbours, common roads, canals, and especially railways. (4) By the Government, as in France, Belgium, and the continental states generally, in the construction of railways; and as in India by the construction of roads, railways, and works of irrigation. Whatever, in fact, increases the fertility of the soil on the one hand, or decreases the cost of production on the other, proportionately increases the value of the land.

But there is a natural as well as an artificial process of raising the value of land. In a country where there is no population to consume its produce, and no means of transporting that produce to

during the eighty years to have been 112 per cent. as against 100 per cent. increase in the rents. But we know for a fact that by far the largest proportion of this increase of population has taken place in the metropolitan and manufacturing, and little if any in the agricultural districts. Between the census of 1851 and 1861, for instance, three-fourths of the whole increase took place in the towns, and the purely agricultural districts showed a decrease. Cambridge and Rutland decreased 5 per cent.; Norfolk, Wilts, and Suffolk, 2 per cent.; Anglesea and Montgomery, in Wales, also sustained a loss. If therefore arable land increased in eighty years 100 per cent. in value, we may safely assume, if we did not know it for a fact, that near the great centres of population, where the pressure was the greatest, the value of the land had proportionately increased.

* "The Irish landlords, partly politically and partly to obtain additional rent by means of the potato, encouraged or (what was enough, without active encouragement) permitted subdivision and the increase of population. The inhabitants of Ireland, from 4,088,226 in 1792, rose to 8,175,124 in 1841. The landlords were unable or unwilling to expend money on their estates. They allowed the tenants themselves to make the provision by building and reclaiming land from its original state of bog, or heather, or stony field, necessary to lodge and feed this increased population. It is thus that many estates have been created, and almost all have been enlarged by generation after generation of tenants without assistance. It was the tenants who made the barony of Ferney, originally worth 3000*l*. a year, worth 50,000*l*. a year."—*Ireland, Journals, Conversations, and Essays*, by N. W. Senior, vol. ii. p. 240.

be consumed elsewhere, any expenditure of labour or capital in improving the land would be sheer waste, as land under such circumstances would have no value whatever. It is population, with its necessities, which in the first instance gives land its value. In the earlier stages of society a few wandering tribes occupy a large territory, and land is almost valueless. As population increases land is more appreciated, and flocks and herds supersede the less useful animals of the chase. After a further increase of the population, and when cultivation has been resorted to, a new and distinct value is given to the land. As yet, however, it is not a saleable commodity, for where every one has as much of it as he can use, there is little or no demand, consequently no purchasers, and no rent, as rent only becomes possible when a still further increase of population renders the supply inadequate to the demand. It is evident therefore that population is the source of all value in land. Without population there can be no market for agricultural produce, and without a market the produce and the land from which it is raised are alike valueless. The farther removed the land is from a market, the less is its value; the nearer and better the market, the more valuable the land.

In the Western States of America land is cheap and population sparse; as you proceed towards the seaboard population becomes denser, and land more valuable. In Australia, it is said, land near centres of population is let as high as 7*s.*, 10*s.*, and even 20*s.* an acre, the tenant fencing and clearing the land, and making all the necessary improvements; while equally good land is in the interior, but at a distance from market, let as low as twopence and threepence an acre. Here it is clear that population alone gives value to the land. The landowner, in fact, need not expend a shilling on improvements. He may neglect his property; he may lose sight of it altogether; he may be an absentee; still its value goes on increasing if population settle in the neighbourhood, and he will ultimately reap the benefit of this increase through no effort of his own. In the same manner the tenant would not be able to pay a high rent for the use of his farm unless he got a corresponding high price for his produce. On the consumers therefore falls the burden of high rents. Thus Mr. Caird found that while the rent of land in the districts he visited had increased 100 per cent. during the eighty years previous, the price of meat had also increased 70 per cent., and the price of butter and wool 100 per cent. during the same period. It is evident therefore that if the land belonged to the State instead of to private individuals, as in England, income and expenditure would be self-adjusting, increased expenditure caused by increased population would be met by a corresponding increase in the rents

from land. By a wise and beneficent adaptation of nature, the land is really capable of meeting all the demands that society, enlarged and elevated, may make upon it. The rule is, the greater the demand the greater the supply. As in nature, the greater the evaporation the more copious is the dewfall, the heavier the crop (so long as it is not carried off the ground) the more is the fertilizing of the soil increased. In the tropics, where vegetation is most luxuriant, the soil is the richest, every successive crop having only served to increase its fertility. As the plant by its roots takes up food from the soil, and by its leaves from the atmosphere, so manufactures enrich a country as well as agriculture. Agriculture extracts wealth from the soil, but with manufactures an accession of population becomes necessary, and then a new source of wealth is added to that already in existence, and both help to enrich the soil that supports them.

Another evil resulting from our land system is the stagnation of agriculture. No one can say that agriculture in England is in a satisfactory condition at the present day. It certainly has not kept pace with manufacturing industry. In the manufacture of cotton and woollen goods, of cutlery, of steam engines, and a thousand other articles, England stands unrivalled. She supplies the world with the products of her workshops, but she cannot raise food enough for her own people. England is now the largest grain importing country in the world, though for centuries she not only supplied herself with breadstuffs, but was also a large exporter of wheat long after the bounty system had been abolished. Within less than a century France has quadrupled her agricultural produce,* while England, according to the most eminent authorities, now produces less grain by about two millions of quarters than she did in 1770, when Arthur Young made his estimate.† The two principal Channel Islands, where the agricultural population is in the one twice, and in the other three times as dense as in England, and the non-agricultural population respectively four and five times as dense, not only produce food enough for their own consumption, but annually export large quantities to England. It has been proved beyond doubt that in Belgium, Holland, the Rhine Provinces, Saxony, Lombardy, and Switzerland, the soil is better cultivated, the gross produce and net profits greater, and (the real test) the land commands a higher price, than in England, with her large population and vast accumulated wealth; while at the same time the cultivators in those countries are better fed, better

* Lavergne's "Rural Economy of England," p. 144.
† Caird's "English Agriculture," p. 523.

educated, and in every respect more prosperous than the same class with us.*

The full effects of this stagnation in agriculture it is impossible to estimate. We can only reason from analogy. We know the effects of a bad harvest, as it comes home to the experience of every one. It influences the rate of discount, injures national credit, checks enterprise, and lowers the rate of wages. A good harvest, on the other hand, means cheap food, cheap money, new enterprises, increased demand for labour, and high wages. If these are the ordinary results of a single harvest, good or bad, it is easy to imagine the consequences that would follow a succession of such; in other words, from a permanent increase or decrease of the means of subsistence. There is no reason why England at this moment should not supply food enough, and more than enough, for her own population. There is no want of land, for out of the 77½ millions of acres in the United Kingdom, only 45½ millions are under cultivation or in permanent grass, the remaining 32 millions are lying waste, though fully one-half is capable of cultivation. Yet there is no real lack of capital, for English capital is going a begging all over the world.† There are tens of thousands of acres of land in Canada, in Australia, and other Colonial possessions, in which English capital has been invested to the extent of 40*l*. or 50*l*. an acre in clearing alone, which are now growing grain for the English market. And Heaven knows there is no deficiency of labour. At the present moment there are said to be not less than 150,000 able-bodied poor amongst us whom it would be a charity to turn to some profitable account. Just imagine the wealth that all the labour now going to waste might create! Why, it is not far short of the total of the able-bodied population of the colony of

* It is usual with a certain class of writers, when treating of this subject, to argue that, as it is necessary to buy in order to sell, if we do not purchase, say wheat from the United States, the United States has not the means of buying manufactured goods from us. But if this argument is good for anything, why not reduce still more the quantity of home-grown wheat, or even cease to grow it altogether, and so enable our transatlantic cousins to purchase more of our manufactures? Or if supply and demand have already become so nicely adjusted, had we not better cease producing any more, lest we should disturb the equilibrium? But supposing we have arrived at such a nice adjustment, would it not be better to have our own population in the double capacity of producers and consumers, and thereby develope to the utmost the resources within our reach and under our own control, and save the cost of transportation both ways? The latter, at all events, would be a clear gain.

† In a recent number of "The Money Market Review" it is estimated that 50,000,000*l*. of English capital are invested in foreign railways; 110,000,000*l*. in colonial railways; 200,000,000*l*. in Indian and colonial debts; 400,000,000*l*. in foreign stocks, besides an unknown amount in foreign banks, insurance, steam navigation, dock, plantation, land and mining companies.

Victoria, who raise an annual revenue of 3,000,000*l.*, and own rateable property of the value of over 40,000,000*l.*, nearly the whole of which has been acquired in less than half a generation. But we must add to these 150,000 able-bodied paupers the number of able-bodied labourers who are continually going about in search of work, those employed on half time, and the criminal class in penal servitude, altogether making an unemployed able-bodied population of something like a million. What if increased production did lead to low prices? Are we to keep down production in order to keep up prices? Is it nothing that the standard of living throughout the country would be raised, and that the means of subsistence would be within the reach of thousands who can now barely keep body and soul together? And would not cheap food, which is so essential to cheap production, enable us to maintain our present pre-eminence in manufacturing industry, now endangered by the high price of provisions?

The present system is, moreover, an unwarrantable monopoly in an era of free-trade, and a mischievous absolutism in a free State. We cannot believe we are in our proper position as a people while we allow a large part of our population to starve, our resources to be wasted, and the land, which should contribute to the wealth of the nation, misappropriated in the manner it is at this moment. Unlike an ordinary commodity, land cannot be increased in quantity at pleasure. Its ownership is a monopoly. We pride ourselves on being a free people, but we submit to an absolutism on the part of the landowners which is a disgrace to our civilization. A landowner in this country is endowed with more than sovereign power. A sovereign reigns for the good of his people, a landowner for his own pleasure and profit. The public may concern themselves much about the rights of property, but the owners of property need not give themselves the slightest trouble about the interests of the public. Blackstone says that, "every Englishman may claim a right to abide in his own country so long as he pleases, and not be driven from it, except by sentence of the law," but times have changed since Blackstone's day. The landowner is the man in possession, and possession is nine-tenths of the law. The land is his, and he may do exactly as he likes with it. He may refuse to sell, let, or allow any one to occupy it. He may consign a whole county to the solitude of a deer forest. He may clear a large territory of its population as he would exterminate vermin when they become troublesome. Fifteen thousand souls, without respect to age, sex, or condition, and for no fault of their own, were turned out of the Sutherland estates in the early part of the present century. And this barbarity was committed in

open day, and in the name of law! But if one landowner can act in this manner, why not all; and since all the land is owned by some one or other, where are we to draw the line? And if landlords have, as they maintain, legal right to do so, it is clear that the English people exist merely on the sufferance of the landowners, who are truly masters of the situation; that as a nation we have no *locus standi*, no common inheritance, no territorial rights whatever.

It will be found, if we examine the subject more closely, that our notions of private property in land are altogether peculiar. The alienation of the public territory to individual proprietors is a modern innovation. The bare idea of alienation is repugnant to three-fourths of the human race. To the American Indian, North and South, to the New Zealander, the South Sea Islander, the aborigines of Africa and Australia, the idea is altogether incomprehensible. To their unsophisticated notions the land appears to be as necessary to their existence as the air they breathe. The idea of its absolute, permanent alienation never entered their minds, as they cannot conceive of the existence of the tribe or nation apart from the soil. Individual ownership of the soil is as repugnant to the civilized mind as to the savage—to the semi-barbarous nationalities of the West, as to the luxurious civilization of the East. Thus in Peru, in the time of the Incas, there are no traces of individual proprietary interest in the soil. We find there existed in that country a threefold division of the public territory. One part was appropriated to the sun, another to the Inca, and a third to the people. The lands apportioned to the sun were for the support of the temples, the maintenance of public worship, and the support of the priesthood. Those reserved for the Incas were for the support of the State, and the numerous members of the royal household. The remainder of the lands was divided into equal shares among the people.* The division of the soil was renewed every year, and the possessions of the tenant were increased or diminished according to the size of his family. All three divisions of the soil were cultivated by the people. First, the lands belonging to the sun were attended to; next those of the old, the sick, the widows and orphans, and soldiers engaged in actual warfare; then those belonging to the people; and last of all, those of the Inca. But the produce of all the lands set apart for the Inca, as well as those consecrated to the sun, were deposited in the public storehouses, and remained there as provisions for times of scarcity.† In Mexico

* Prescott's "History of the Conquest of Peru," pp. 20, 21.
† Robertson's "History of America," Works, vol. i. p. 234. An unfruit-

also, we are told,* the people held the lands in common, and alienation was unknown.

In the same manner the land among the ancient Teutonic nations belonged to the tribe or nation.

"A division of soil," says Professor Newman, "was made almost identical with that of ancient Egypt or India into three sorts of land, belonging to the Crown, the priests, and military order, that is, the nobles. The actual cultivators generally paid rent in some form to one or other of these possessors; but the principle was on the whole clearly upheld that the land belonged to the State, and to no private person."

Among the Slavonian races private property in land was unknown until recently.

"The idea of a private right of property in the soil," says Baron Haxthausen, "is foreign to the ideas and manners of the people; the extensive districts of Russia have always been regarded as the property of the nation, to the usufruct of which an equal right belongs to every individual. It follows as a natural consequence from this idea, that there is no private property in the soil, no right of inheritance, nor even a life or temporary right or usufruct in any definite share of the land. The principle which sprang from the original nomadic life of the people remained after their gradual settlement through all the phases of Russian history. The people settled upon the land and formed family communes, cultivating as much of it as they required: the country was large, and no one set limits to his neighbours, nor was it necessary at first to think of fixed boundaries. But when the country became gradually cultivated, limitations began to appear, and boundaries of the separate communes were necessarily constituted. These were established by the heads of the families, the chiefs of the country, and ultimately by the Czar. A kind of property, or at all events an exclusive possession by the communes of their territory, was thus gradually created. But however definite it may have been as a limit between individuals and communes, it never became a stable private right of possession or genuine property, independent of the head of the race or Czar, but was always regarded as a permission or assigned right. Within the communes the principle prevailed that no private property belonged to the individual, but only a temporary share in the usufruct."†

In ancient Egypt the soil belonged exclusively to the sovereign. Herodotus tells us, that Sesostris—

"made a division of the soil of Egypt among the inhabitants, assigning square plots of ground of equal size to all, and obtaining his

ful season was thus more effectually provided for than by the modern discovery of free imports, which leaves the supply in a great measure to chance.

* Prescott's "History of the Conquest of Mexico," p. 13.

† "The Russian Empire," vol. ii., English ed. 1856, p. 393, 4.

chief revenue from the rent which the holders were required to pay him every year. If the river carried away any portion of a man's lot, he appeared before the king and related what had happened, upon which the king sent persons to determine by measurement the exact extent of loss, and thenceforth only such a rent was demanded of him as was proportionate to the reduced size of the land."*

The same system of tenure is in force in Egypt at the present day; and so tenacious are the rulers of that country of their right of control over the soil, that the late Pacha dispossessed of their lands almost all private proprietors, allotting as a partial compensation to each, a pension for life proportioned to the extent of land taken from them.†

In Turkey the land is held under four different forms of tenure. There are—1. Mori, or Crown lands; 2. Vacouf, or pious foundations; 3. Malikaneh, or Crown grants; 4. Mulki, or freehold property. The first forms by far the largest portion of the territory, and is held direct from the Crown. The right to cultivate any particular portion of land is conceded on the payment to the Crown of a stipulated rent, and the land so held may be transmitted from father to son, but cannot be alienated on any account whatsoever. The Sultan continues to exercise the rights of seigniory over such land, and if the holder neglect to cultivate it for a period of three years, it is liable to be forfeited. The second form of tenure was obtained by grants from the sovereign for religious and educational purposes, and is entailed. The third kind was originally granted to the sophis, or old feudal troops, in recompense for stipulated military services, and is hereditary, and, like the former, is exempt from taxation. The last form of tenure, and that which exists to the smallest extent, is freehold, and is entirely confined to house property in towns and land in the immediate vicinity.

In India, from time immemorial the ownership of the soil has been vested in the State. The sovereign was the landlord, and the cultivators the tenants. The land was held on the communal system, as in Russia, each community containing within itself all the elements of self-government. The village community was governed by the headman, who collected the rents from the cultivators, and paid them to the representative of the sovereign. And this is the general system of land tenure throughout India at the present day, the Anglo-Indian Government being *de facto* landlord of the whole territory under its sway; but it was long before the English rulers understood the exact nature of the land tenure in that country. The zemindars who collected

* "Herodotus," book ii. c. 109. Rawlinson's translation.

† Lane's "Modern Egyptians," vol. i. p. 194.

the rents in a particular district, were regarded by them as the real owners, corresponding to our landlords. It was not understood that when the zemindars collected the rents they did not keep them, but handed them over to their sovereign, after deducting a per centage for collection, which enabled them to live in splendour.*

The importance of the land revenue to the Government of India may be imagined from the fact, that it forms the principal portion of the national income. Even now, notwithstanding the waste and mismanagement inevitable where the rents are assessed and collected by strangers, ignorant of the capabilities of the country, and of the customs of its inhabitants, the revenue from land alone, previous to the Mutiny, met all the expenditure of the Empire except military charges, which, in a conquered country, are necessarily heavy. The expenditure included public works, navy, mint, interest on debt, and pensions; and if we deduct waste and alienated land, the revenue to meet this large expenditure was derived from about one-sixth of the whole territory.

So far, then, we have arrived at the following conclusions: that pauperism in England has grown with the growth of large estates; that at the same time our agricultural labourers have been reduced to a condition incompatible with the maintenance of physical strength, and in many cases to the verge of starvation; that the poorer classes, driven into the large towns, living in hovels, dens, and garrets, in darkness, ignorance, and want, constitute a breeding-ground for crime and disease; that the rent derived from the soil has been diverted from its original purpose, and appropriated by individuals to their own personal gain and advantage, to the great detriment of the public, upon whose shoulders now rests the burden of raising the revenue; that the land so appropriated has been negligently cultivated, and the produce therefrom far below the standard of other countries. In a word, the system has benefited neither tenants nor landowners, producers or consumers. Whether viewed socially or economically, it has proved disastrous to the country at large.

These conclusions are still farther confirmed by the fact, that wherever the same system has been tried it has produced results equally evil. In republican Rome the patricians seized the land of the small freeholders, and drove the dispossessed and impoverished rural population into Rome. Here they bred a pauper horde requiring to be fed by State grants, and dangerous to the commonwealth, as they ultimately proved, a ready tool to be used by any ambitious general, as in the case of Marius first, and then

* Mill's "History of British India," vol. i. p. 217.

of Cæsar. There were no State-fed paupers in Rome till the people were dispossessed of the land, and there was no need for the importation of grain until pasturage took the place of agriculture. Precisely the same consequences followed there as in England. The patricians, while they monopolized the land, contrived to evade the payment of the land tax; and the very first substitute that was attempted to be imposed in its place was a customs duty on all foreign goods imported into Italy, and an excise duty on all home produce sold in the market.*

We have already referred to the original principle prevailing in Russia with regard to land. Look now at the consequences resulting from a change of principle. It was not before the commencement of the seventeenth century that the Czars began to convert the estates of the nobility, which had previously been granted for life only, into hereditary property. At the present day somewhat more than one-half of the Russian territory belongs to the nobility; and the remaining portion, called the crown provinces, to the Czar. An immense difference exists in the condition of the two portions of the empire. In the crown provinces the peasants have all along remained a free people in the full exercise of local self-government. In each commune the *starosta* levied the land-tax and delivered it to the Government; he administered all the affairs of the commune, and constituted, with the better class of people, a tribunal for deciding causes and disputes. From the earliest times the land-tax has existed in Russia, and was originally known as plough-tax, the word "plough" signifying a certain measurement of land that yielded a specific tax. This system of taxation continued in force till 1722, when, in order to facilitate computation, a poll-tax was substituted for it. Under the poll-tax, the poor were compelled to pay as much as the rich; and the natural result was a large amount of arrears, and a serious deficit in the revenue. These arrears the government from time to time remitted, but still they continued to accumulate. The system was unequal and unjust; the taxes were heavier than the poorer people could pay; the peasantry were impoverished in consequence, and the general result was a decrease of revenue and a serious decline in the trade, commerce, and agriculture of the Empire. This at length opened the eyes of the authorities. The burden of taxation had been taken off the land and put on the people, much in the same way as was done in England, and with similar effect. At the same time the richer members of the commune had gradually appropriated the village farms, and let them out to the poor peasants at

* "Gibbon," vol. i. p. 262. Milman's edition.

exorbitant rents. In this manner the quantity of land in the hands of the peasantry was gradually diminished. In 1837 it was ascertained that nearly one million of this class had, by fraud and oppression, been deprived of their holdings, and were wandering about the country in a state of destitution. The first thing the Government did was to abolish the poll-tax, and reimpose the old land-tax. This was effected in 1838. But as great numbers of the peasantry held no land, the conversion of the poll-tax into a land-tax had the effect of relieving this class from the payment of taxes altogether. It was therefore found necessary to redistribute the land among the peasantry, in order that all should contribute their fair share to the public revenue. This was accordingly done, and the happiest results followed. Within seven years after the reimposition of the land-tax, and redistribution of the land, the crown revenues had increased from thirty to forty per cent.; cultivation had increased thirty-four per cent.; the cultivation of tobacco had not only increased in quantity, but the quality and price, compared with former times, had increased sevenfold; the manufacture and sale of improved agricultural implements had increased sixfold, and the quantity imported, threefold; while at the same time the revenue from forests, pastures, and waste land belonging to the Crown had nearly trebled. Such were the results of the change in the tenure of land in the crown provinces. But at this time no change had yet taken place in the land system of the provinces of the Empire, where the territorial magnates ruled supreme. Here the ancient Slavonic communal system had been destroyed, and the right of possession in the soil withdrawn from the peasants, who were reduced to a condition of serfdom. Industry continued to languish, agriculture declined; and those portions of the country altogether presented a striking contrast to the crown provinces where the communal system had been restored to its full vigour.

"Sire," wrote Fénélon to Louis XIV., "your people, whom you ought to love as your children, and who have hitherto been so devotedly attached to you, are dying of hunger. The cultivation of the fields is almost abandoned; the towns and the country are depopulated; all trades languish and no longer support the workmen." Such was France a century before the Revolution. With the Revolution, however, came a change; the law of primogeniture was abolished, and the large estates were broken up. The effect was magical. In little more than half a century after this period, France had doubled her population and quadrupled her agricultural produce.

New England in the North, and Maryland and Virginia in the South, were both colonized about the same period by people

of the same race, speaking the same language, and under a similar form of government. In the South the land was originally parcelled out into vast estates on the English model. But the early settlers, or their descendants, could do nothing with the large properties without labour, and free labour was not to be had in a country where there was no land available for settlement. Hence slavery became a necessity in the South. In the North, on the other hand, where the land was taken up in small sections by actual cultivators, slavery was unknown; wages were uniformly high, agricultural settlements made rapid progress, and the country became prosperous to an extraordinary degree.

Western Australia is the oldest colony in the Australian group; and here the system had been adopted on an extensive scale of giving large grants of land to the first settlers. The result was as might have been expected. The land was of no use to the settlers without labour; but free labour they could not get, and slave labour was out of the question. But labour of some sort they must have; and so, after idly waiting till all the younger Australian colonies had outstripped them in the race, the settlers of Western Australia, in the year 1849, actually petitioned the British Government to make that colony a penal settlement! Singular that in countries so different in every respect as America and Australia, the results of landlordism should be much alike. In the one country it led to slavery, and in the other to convictism. In compliance with the wishes of the settlers, Western Australia was made a penal settlement; but the other Australian colonies protested so vehemently, and even promised to do more than protest, that England was fain to give way, and seek an outlet for her convicts elsewhere.

A survey of the whole question of tenure leads to the conclusion that, wherever the land is of easy access, and widely distributed among the inhabitants of a country, the soil is well cultivated, and the people industrious, prosperous, and contented. On the other hand, wherever the land is in the hands of a few large proprietors, cultivation is checked, and the mass of the people are idle, indigent, and improvident. All suggestions or proposals of a remedial nature must be guided by this general conclusion. To find the remedy in this case, therefore, we have but to ask, what system of tenure and mode of distribution in regard to land will best promote the national welfare?

In the ordinary state of society two things are requisite for productive farming: (1) Farms must be of moderate extent, so as to be within the means of a large body of competitors; (2) and there must be security of tenure for the cultivator. Both these essentials are obtained under the peasant proprietary sys-

tem. Security of tenure is perfect where the land belongs to the person who cultivates it; and small holdings are well cultivated because they are easily managed, and are within the means and capacity of the average standard of men who engage in husbandry. For one man who has capital sufficient to cultivate five hundred acres there are a hundred men who have sufficient to cultivate fifty; and all who have had any practical experience in the management of large business concerns, may soon discover that but few working men have what is called the administrative faculty. Indeed, the old proverb, that good workmen make bad masters, is true in more senses than one. Agriculture differs essentially from manufacturing. The latter pays best when conducted on a large, the former when conducted on a small scale. The manufacturer produces cheaper on a large than on a small scale, as with him it is simply a question of machinery. The more powerful and efficient his machinery, the smaller his expenditure in labour and management. But the soil is not like a machine, to be driven at a given rate, and to produce a given quantity of finished material. The soil has its whims and fancies, its likes and dislikes. Treated generously it will reward liberally. Every little plot of land has its own history and distinctive character of soil and situation; and each is influenced differently by the mode of cultivation, the manures, the crops, and the character of the seasons. The farmer who cultivates a small holding takes all these peculiarities into account; the farmer on a large scale ignores them. There cannot be a doubt of the fact that, as a rule, small farms are more profitable than large ones. This is the case even in England. The small farms in the western districts bring on an average a much higher rent than the large ones in the eastern counties. In Flanders, M. de Lavelaye, an eminently impartial authority, tells us "large farms constantly tend towards subdivision, for the simple reason, when subdivided they yield a higher rent." "The smaller the farm the greater the produce of the soil," he lays down as a rule which holds good all over the continent. Lord Dufferin also may be claimed as an equally impartial authority in the case of Ireland. He frankly admits all that the advocates of *la petite culture* assert, and assert with justice, as to its being the most productive. "It no doubt has a tendency," he says, "to increase competition, and consequently to raise rents. . . . . In Ireland, before the potato failure, the large farmers, who, in virtue of their long leases, controlled in a great measure the agriculture of Ireland, became so alive to the fact that they cut up their holdings into infinitesimal plots."* The farmers in England have neither long leases, as in

* Mr. Mill's "Plan for the Pacification of Ireland," p. 22.

some parts of Ireland, nor do they cultivate their own land, as on the continent or in the Channel Islands. As a rule they are yearly tenants, and in consequence they are slovenly farmers—a fact they are intelligent enough to know, and candid enough to acknowledge. "We are not farming,"—they frankly admitted to Mr. Caird, when remonstrated with for their backwardness—"we are not farming, and we know we are not farming; we are only taking out of the land what we can get from it at the least cost, as we do not know how long we may remain in possession, and have no security for what we might be disposed to invest in improved cultivation." Who can blame them? What man in his senses would do otherwise? Yet the popular idea is, that farming with us is conducted on the most approved scientific principles; that, with the smallest amount of expenditure of labour, the greatest possible amount of produce is obtained. There never was a greater delusion. Productive farming requires not only careful management, but large expenditure of capital. We have got beyond the antediluvian era, when a mere scratching of the soil was all that was required on the part of the agriculturist. The outcroppings of the mine have been exhausted, and to reach the rich deposits of ore underneath the surface, shafts must be sunk, adits run in, tramways laid, and steam-engines erected to pump the water from the mine and bring the coveted mineral to the surface; but all this requires capital, and capital requires security. The tenant is aware of the change that has taken place, and is prepared for the emergency. He is ready to expend his capital in the purchase of manures, improved farm implements, steam-engines, and all the stock in trade requisite for the effective working of his farm; he is even willing to undertake the landlord's duties, to drain the stiff clay, and effect other permanent improvements. But the landlord stops the way. He will neither furnish the capital himself nor allow others to do it for him. He will neither give the money nor the security, and until he is removed all hope of progress must be abandoned.

A great many plans have been proposed to give security of tenure to the cultivator, but they may be resolved into three. The first is, that the Legislature shall make it compulsory on landlords to grant leases to their tenants. This plan, if honestly carried out on the part of the landlords, would be a great improvement on the present practice; but it would not be sufficient to meet all the requirements of the case. Long before the expiration of the lease, if it became known that it would not be renewed, or a new one agreed upon, the tenant would begin to work out his land, so that by the time the lease actually fell in, the soil would be so impoverished that it would take years to recover its fer-

tility. This is the practice at present all over the world where leases exist, and it is ruinous to both landlord and tenant. Nor would the tenant have any great inducement to incur expenditure in permanent improvements under such a tenure—unless the leases were for a long period, and the conditions so stringent as practically to deprive the landlord of any control over his property. The second is, that the laws of primogeniture and entail be abolished, the transfer of land made easy and cheap, so that, like any other commodity, the land might pass freely into other hands, and ultimately come into the possession of those who could make a better use of it than its present owners. This at best would be but a slow, tedious, and, after all, a very unsatisfactory way of meeting the difficulty. First, because the land would be as much beyond the reach of the actual cultivator as it is at present; secondly, because there is no probability that even if the land changed hands, the claims of the actual cultivator would be considered any more than they are at present; and thirdly, even granting that the plan succeeded to the extent contemplated by some advocates, it would be virtually postponing the remedy to an indefinite period. The Encumbered Estates Act, Sir Robert Peel's measure for the pacification of Ireland, has now been in operation for a quarter of a century, but the land hunger of the Irish people is in no way appeased, and agrarian outrages are as rife as ever. The sale of confiscated land in France at the time of the Revolution, effected an important change, it is true, but the circumstances were totally different from what they are with us at the present day. In France immense quantities of land were thrown upon the market at once, and there could be no competition on the part of the wealthier classes, who were either imprisoned, guillotined, or had left the country; the land consequently was purchased at a low price by the cultivators, who were the only applicants. In England, however, there are no large quantities of land for sale, and even if there were, the competition would be of the keenest, and the land would inevitably come into possession of those classes who would hold it on precisely the same terms as at present. Another plan is that which was proposed by Mr. Bright for Ireland—namely, that the Government should purchase the estates of the great landlords and re-sell to the tenants their present holdings, the tenants to repay the State by yearly instalments. Security of tenure to the cultivator would undoubtedly be obtained by this means, but it is at best but the old cumbersome method over again. It is unnecessary, in the first place, that the cultivator should own the land at all. Secondly, it is undesirable to compel him to buy, as thereby he becomes crippled in his means, the capital required for working his land being absorbed in its

purchase. The bad effect of this system is seen in France, where the small freeholds as a rule are heavily mortgaged, and the farmers are impoverished by having to pay a high rate of interest for the use of their money. Thirdly, we doubt if the State would be justified in taking the land from one set of owners and simply handing it over to another set. And lastly, the scheme is objectionable because it provides no guarantee against a reversion of the land to the person from whom it was purchased, and the renewal of the old process of absorption.

There is however a simpler and more efficient plan than any of these. Let the Crown resume possession of the whole of the agricultural and unreclaimed land in the kingdom, and compensate the owners at so many years' purchase at the present rents. Let it retain possession of the land and lease it, in blocks of from ten to two hundred acres in extent, the leases to be for a period of thirty years. At the expiration of that period, let the land be valued, and if it has increased in value in the interval, whether owing to the enterprise of the tenant or to other causes beyond his control, let him have his lease renewed for another period of thirty years, conditionally on his paying, in addition to the old rent, one-half the value that has accrued since the commencement of his tenure. This plan, we think, would meet all the requirements. The cultivator would have what is so necessary to him, security of tenure, and ample encouragement afforded him to effect all necessary improvements; the man of small capital would have an opportunity of acquiring a holding suited to his means; while the landlord (*i.e.* the State) and tenant would each receive his fair proportion of the value that might accrue to the land during occupation.

The social advantages of this arrangement would be incalculable. No one who calmly considers our social condition can believe it to be a desirable one. Society in England is now divided into two well-defined classes. On the one side there are those who receive wages, and on the other side those who pay them. At the taking of the last census there were no less than 5,000,000 male adults in the United Kingdom in receipt of wages. Reckoning one male adult to represent a family of four and a half persons,* the wages class would thus number 22,500,000 in a population of 29,058,888 persons, being more than two to one of the entire population.† The wages class is thus out of all proportion to the rest of the community. This is both a new

* The number of persons to a family in 1861 was 4·47 in England, 4·5 in Scotland, and 5·14 in Ireland, giving the average for the United Kingdom as nearly as possible 4·50.

† Mr. Leone Levi's "Wages and Earnings of the Working Classes," p. xxiii.

and an alarming feature of modern society; for not only does the wages class far outnumber the other sections of the population, but there is also an antagonism between them that formerly did not exist. The old ties of sympathy and common interest which bound together the master and his workman, have been rudely broken. What is the employer's interest is no longer the interest of the workman; the temper of the latter is soured towards his employer, and the employer looks with suspicion on the workman. For years they have been getting farther and farther apart, and now they stand forth in two alarmingly distinct and compact masses. On the one side wealth and influence, and on the other poverty and numbers. As for what are called the middle-classes in English society, they have year by year been showing less sympathy with the working classes, and now they openly range themselves on the other side. The wages class hitherto has shown no disposition to lawlessness, for the very simple reason that it has never really felt its power. But with their trade organizations ramifying everywhere, there is no telling when they may both feel and assert it. It is well always to look danger in the face, and try if possible to avert it. In this case the danger can be averted only by restoring the balance of society. The people have been driven from the soil; let them be restored to it, and they will become identified with the progress and prosperity of the country.

There are also economic advantages of the highest order to be considered. High as the price of land in England now is, it cannot be said to have arrived at its maximum value. Gradually, for centuries, we have seen this value increasing; and while we continue to add to our population, and the country remains prosperous, the land will go on increasing in value. It would be absurd to attempt to limit the natural increase of the value of land. And this increase being natural, not artificial, or the result of any effort or expenditure on the part of the landowner, it has become a question with the political economist as to how far the landowner (being a private individual) is entitled to an increase so obtained?*

* "Suppose there is a kind of income that constantly tends to increase, without any exertion or sacrifice on the part of the owners: those owners constituting a class in the community, whom the natural course of things progressively enriches, consistently with complete passiveness on their part: in such a case it would be no violation of the principles on which private property is grounded, if the State should appropriate this increase of wealth, or part of it, as it arises. . . . . . Now this is exactly the case with rent. The ordinary progress of society which increases in wealth, is at all times tending to increase the incomes of landlords; to give them both a greater amount and a greater proportion of the wealth of the community, independently of any trouble or outlay incurred by themselves. They grow richer, as it were, in their sleep, without working, risking, or economizing. What claim have they, on the

But whatever increases the fertility or productiveness of the soil, or reduces the expenses of cultivation, also increases the value of the land, and both will be secured under the plan we have suggested. (1) There is the subdivision of the large farms into small ones. It is a well-known fact, that small farms always command a higher rent than large ones. The subdivision of labour is admitted to be the correct thing in manufactures, and so will subdivision of the soil be found to be in agriculture.* (2) There is the security of tenure afforded by a thirty years' lease, renewable at the end of that period, which would undoubtedly induce the leaseholder to make extensive improvements. (3) There would be no difficulty in obtaining capital on such a tenure. The millions of English capital now let out on doubtful securities abroad would be recalled, and freely invested in improvements at home. An enormous amount of capital might be absorbed in drainage, and other permanent improvements. It has been stated on good authority,† that only two millions out of seventy seven and half a millions of acres in the United Kingdom are at present drained. That capital so invested would bring in a sure and steady income, and large profit to the investors, there can be little doubt.‡ (4) Science too will aid in the work of improvement. Agriculture has derived great advantages from scientific discovery during this and the last half

general principles of social justice, to this accession of riches?"—Mill, *Principles of Political Economy*, vol. ii. p. 380. True, but how is it to be determined what part of this increased value is due to the "natural progress of society," and what to the enterprise of the landowners?

* "I would here remind you that, in this very neighbourhood, we have testimony that the poor can profitably rent land at 20*l*. an acre. Garden land, not one quarter of a mile from this room, is let to the poor at 2*s*. and 2*s*. 6*d*. a lug—the most convincing proof that it is worth in profit what we state, from 16*l*. to 20*l*., for we know that it is good ordinary land which here brings in 30*s*.; and if owners would let the garden land at 30*s*., the present poor occupier would have a yearly benefit of 18*l*. 10*s*. per acre. Why owners of land should charge the rich man 30*s*. and the poor 20*l*. can only be explained by the universal desire to make as much of property as circumstances permit."—*Lecture read before the Cirencester Chamber of Agriculture, in January last, by the Rev. John Constable, Principal of the Royal Agricultural College, and President of the Cirencester Chamber of Agriculture.*

† Mr. Bailey Denton, before the Rivers Commissioners.

‡ In an able pamphlet on Agricultural Progress, Mr. James Sanderson says:—"Drainage generally yields from 12 to 20 per cent. In a few instances I have known the total cost repaid by the first crop. As a rule, drainage executed by farmers is unsuccessful, and in nine cases out of ten, where landowners contribute pipes and tenants' labour, both labour and material are thrown away. Owners and occupiers, indeed, reap equally satisfactory returns from drainage, the former getting their estates permanently improved without expending one shilling of their own, the latter by paying 7 per cent. interest per annum, realizing in lieu 15 per cent. value."

century; physiology has taught us how to improve our breeds of cattle and sheep; chemistry has shown us the constituents of the soil, and the mode of supplying the deficiencies of each; mechanical discovery has furnished us with improved farm implements, and applied steam to the cultivation of the soil. But who can doubt but that we are yet only on the threshold of discovery, and that the next half century will supply results more startling than any we have yet obtained?

Such being the tendency of land to increase in value, why should not the State look forward to this ever-increasing value as a source of revenue? Under a liberal system of land tenure the present rentals of the country might be doubled, or even trebled, in a quarter of a century. This is no mere random assertion, but a moderate estimate. Every one knows that the rental of many farms has been doubled or trebled in a few years' time by drainage alone; and if this can be done on a small scale, why not on a large one? Here, then, is a source of revenue entirely undeveloped. Here is an opportunity for inaugurating free-trade in reality, for, carefully managed, the land revenue in time might become sufficient for all the requirements of the State. Then might customs and excise duties be abolished, and with their abolition, trade and commerce would expand, manufacturing industry increase, every new house or factory erected would be an addition to the capital of the State; every soul added to the population, instead of a burden, would only be the means of increasing the national property. At present the public occupies the position of an improving tenant who is subject to a rack-rent —the more he improves the higher the rent he has to pay. If we cannot escape the rack-rent, let us at least get compensation for our improvements.

There are certain collateral advantages to be derived from the State being the owner of the land, to which we need only passingly refer. Where there is one landlord for all properties, there need be no difficulty about carrying out improvements, when once they have been determined on. Roads, railways, canals, drainage, and irrigation works may be carried through the various holdings without vexatious delay or expensive litigation. Population need not be cooped up in unhealthy nooks and corners because the adjoining proprietor forbids the extension of the town in the only direction in which it is possible. Manufacturers need not be compelled to build their mills in unsuitable localities because landowners object to tall chimneys, but may select those places where labour is cheap and raw material convenient. Some of the most important manufacturing towns in England, Scotland, and Ireland owe their existence to the fact that the land in the locality happened originally to belong to some freeholder who was

not averse to dispose of it; and scores of mines that now employ hundreds of thousands of men and millions of capital, were long unopened simply because the great landlords hated contact with a manufacturing population. At whatever point of the question we look, we see the beneficial effects which a change of ownership in regard to the land would have on all classes of the community, the manufacturer and merchant as well as the farmer, the half-starved labourer, and the able-bodied pauper.

The plan which is here proposed for the settlement of this great social and economical question, will no doubt be denounced as revolutionary. Let it be at once frankly acknowledged that it is so, as the term revolution is now generally understood. A revolution is but another name for a thorough reform, and a thorough reform of our land system is urgently required. It is no use attempting half-measures when whole ones answer better, and are as easily carried. Our late Reform Act, which transferred the government of the country from the landed proprietors (heretofore the real rulers) to the working classes, was a revolution, and that of no ordinary kind; but it requires to be supplemented by another revolution which will rescue the land from its present wasteful and cruel usage, and make it available for the requirements and welfare of the entire community.

We deny that the landowners of this country as a body are entitled to much consideration. They have abused their trust and shirked their responsibilities; they claim that the land, their property, should be treated as ordinary property, while they prevent, by their settlements, its being made available for the payment of their just debts; they have been themselves grasping and intolerant; to a man they resist any attempt to control them in their dealings with their tenants; they refuse security of tenure to the farmer, which is one of the main elements of productive farming; they prefer subservient tenants to increased productiveness; they harass their tenants by impossible conditions, and plunder them by their game laws; they see in every labourer a possible encumbrance, and whether as pauper or *prolétaire*, they take good care to get rid of him. They have shown utter heartlessness in clearing their estates of the poor, and gross dishonesty in throwing the burden of their maintenance on others. The Roman patricians, like them, seized the public land and used it for their own pleasure and profit, but as some compensation they threw open the ports and gave free distribution of grain, our patricians however, not content with a monopoly of the land, long insisted on a monopoly of the market also. As a class they produce nothing, if we except paupers and poachers, and are rather a hindrance in the way of producers than otherwise. Their training and education unfit them for the business-

management of their estates, and Irish absenteeism has shown us how little we should lose were they to take themselves off altogether.

At least one man in our century understood the full importance of this subject, and had he lived we need be in no doubt as to the part he would have played in bringing it prominently before the public. In his last speech in the House of Commons Mr. Cobden said:—"If I were twenty-five or thirty years old instead of twice that number, I would take Adam Smith in my hand and I would have a league for free-trade in land as we have had a league for free-trade in corn. There is just the same authority in Adam Smith for the one as for the other, and if the matter were only properly taken up, not as a revolutionary or chartist notion, but as a step in political economy, I believe success would attend the effort; and I say this, if you can apply free-trade to land and labour too—that is, by getting rid of the abominable restrictions in your parish settlements and the like—then I say the man who does that will have done more for the English poor than we have been able to do by the application of free-trade to commerce." The man who carried the anti-corn law agitation to a successful issue saw and acknowledged that his work was not half done, that it was only commenced in fact; that a sweeping change in our land system was required; and to accomplish this he was prepared to devote all his energy and all his power of body and mind. Will any one follow in his footsteps and finish the work so nobly begun? Let us only look at this question in all its broad issues, and grapple with it promptly and manfully, as becomes a nation fully conscious of the overwhelming nature of its responsibilities.

Art. II.—American Literature.

The American Annual Cyclopædia. Vols. I. to VII. New York: D. Appleton and Co. 1862-69.

MANY circumstances concur to make the exodus of the Pilgrim Fathers the first fact of importance in the history of America—in its literary as well as in its political and ecclesiastical history. The Fathers were a branch of that great schism which counted Pym, Hampden, and Cromwell among its chiefs, and the tendency of which was to determine new limits to government and religion; and to place on what was considered a surer basis the liberties of a great empire. History testifies to the manner in which these designs were accomplished. The zeal and soul-rooted opinion which drove Charles I. to the block were not widely different from the zeal and enterprise which founded New England. Enthusiasts like Sir Harry Vane might indulge dreams of an ideal republic; but the men who sailed in the *Mayflower* experienced greater satisfaction and foresaw grander results in working out their feasible plan of a new nation. They were nonconformists not only in religion, but in politics; and if they and their descendants long remained loyal to the parent country, their very origin indicated that this feeling could not be permanent. Isolated from the land of their forefathers,—thrown upon an uncultivated country, with the determination to build homes for themselves "free as the wind which bloweth where it listeth,"—alive to the essential requirements of frugality and discipline,—unshackled by any prejudices save those which with their former haunts they strove to forget,—they were certainly qualified to inaugurate a new order of things. Their proclivity was, of course, towards democracy.

But, indeed, for a century and a half subsequent to the landing of the pilgrims on Plymouth Rock, there is nothing very interesting or suggestive in a historic or literary point of view. The colonists were but hewers of wood and drawers of water. They were but gathering together the materials for an erection the corner-stone of which was to be laid by George Washington. Yet they, or at least Virginia, were so far identified with literature when Spenser, in the dedication to his great work, named his sovereign as Queen of the proud American colony. Their descendants, likewise, who were contemporary with Dryden, Addison, and De Foe, had their sympathy strengthened when an occasional vessel brought the poem or the essay from the old

country; but they were nevertheless the ancestors of those who scouted Grenville's Stamp Act, and who fought and bled at Lexington and Concord.

Thus the early Republicans were peculiarly situated. They had created a democracy; but their associations still clung to the old country, with its aristocratic government and remnants of feudalism. They felt their common heritage in Shakspeare and Milton. They recognised new stars of song whenever any appeared in the firmament. They knew at the same time that all political connexion was severed: but they were aware, too, that America and England possessed a common language—a language destined in after-days to link them together inseparably in intellectual pursuits, yet to render more bitter any disputes and feuds between them. Time had altered several relationships, but not that of speech; and their minds and conversation were improved by the instructive intercourse.

When the *Mayflower* weighed anchor Bacon was yet alive, Shakspeare had been only four years dead, and Milton was in his twelfth year; ere the banner of Independence was unfurled in America, philosophy, the drama, poetry and prose had passed through many forms. The year in which Congress declared the colonies free saw the last of Hume and Adam Smith; and these names suggest to every mind vast progress in two directions—history had taken another shape, and political economy had come into being. What the colonists were occupied with meanwhile it is not difficult to guess. Viewing every event in the light of a great ordinance, and prayerfully ascribing glory to God for even the slightest manifestation of providential favour in their every-day labours,—esteeming themselves a chosen and peculiar band, destined to work out some grand scheme of regenerate happiness and enlarged faith,—knowing in their puritanic hearts no cankering fear of men and no ignoble obeisance to mere worldly dignities, but rather facing with a terrible earnestness and trust the presence and decrees of the Almighty,—they threw aside all humiliating notions of inequality, all thoughts of worldly splendour and pomp, and resolved, guided by the rays of Divine truth, to cut out a path for themselves, and establish a nation whose chief articles of faith should be trustfulness in each other, and, at the outset, all freedom and independence compatible alike with individual effort and the safety and advancement of the community. This was their unspoken but stern resolve. For many years they closely adhered to it. Their natural sympathy for England was not, however, clouded or extinguished thereby, although they craved for unfettered and untraditional modes of thought and action. But they were still in the bondage of old world beliefs and tendencies. The yoke was easy, yet it

bore all the same on their fresh and brilliant aspirations. When it was removed it may indeed be questioned whether good or gain accrued. In the beginning the prospect was hopeful, in the end the retrospect is not altogether reassuring. The standard was high and noble. Work was the be-all and the end-all of their early existence. They had to build houses, discuss municipal laws, and frame clauses amending a constitution. Hence they had small leisure to cultivate literature. Indeed, the science of determining what to do first, or what was most immediately practicable, and the art of living, absorbed their devoted attention. Books were not at that early stage in high favour. The pilgrims had, in sooth, come forth out of Egypt despising the bookmakers and the actors, with a feeling which made the *Histriomastix* their protest against the latter. They had a preconceived distrust of arts which seemed seductive, vain, and unprofitable; they felt that One Book was sufficient to their purpose; they exorcised the devil and sought the grace of God, trusting in honest work and simple faith. Notwithstanding, there was a characteristic literary outcome of all this spirit and hardihood. What it was remains to be seen.

In the jostle and pressure of business, and in the race for political distinction, little time is left for the calm pursuits of literature. If Liverpool had her Roscoe, the fact is to be wondered at rather than expected in repetition. As a rule trade is hurtful to thought, and to the expression of thought. Comparatively few books are produced where it bears absolute sway, and these are not desiderated. This fact may lead to the anticipation in America of many feeble literary works, composed for the nonce, displaying the blemishes of haste and negligence, and devoid of polish and completeness. Works of this character are the sign-manuals of democracy. They betray a lazy unconcern, and are marred by a disguised indifference to propriety. They are sincere even to temerity, and boastful in their insipidity. This is true in the main of the literary wares or products of young democracies, but least of all of America. And why, is not far to see. The unconquerable clinging to the old home, and the influences already noted, sufficiently account for the exception. America retains a love for Shakspeare and Burns, and is still partially animated by the antiquity and nationality they inspire. The American kings of thought were crowned in Britain.

What we have said so far is borne out by the turn literary affairs have taken across the Atlantic. Everything there works in the same sort of practical groove. Literature is not exempt. From the first it has been so. The earliest things printed, about two centuries and a quarter since, were the Freeman's Oath, an

Almanack, and the Psalms redone into metre. Nothing could more variously and significantly afford a clue to the original purpose the colonists set before them, and the uniform determination which inspired them to carry it out. Following these points there is little, if anything, for at least a century meriting praise, and nothing on which we purpose at present to dwell.

The instinctive dread of indolence joined to an indifference, amounting here and there to repugnance, for general and polite literature, which they took no pains to conceal, amply demonstrated that small encouragement would be extended to literary enterprise. There was no wreath for the historian, no laurel for the poet. The ease that follows successful labour had been earned and had come, but it was ease neither dignified nor learned. By-and-by, however, even this welcome and honourable leisure was found. And as one cannot silence the songs of birds or reverse the river's course, writers of prose and verse appeared. Although uncommonly feeble, they were an acquisition. They made a start. After all, and for a long time, it was an evil, and the evil increased. The Americans were assuredly hurrying to get rich, and few could blame them; but in hastening to produce a literature, they signally defeated the desired end. A constitutional specialty of "raw haste" arising from the state of society, gave as its result a sort of *half-excellence*. In general this is indisputable. One of the brightest exceptions to this haste and half-performance was Washington Allston, with whose beautifully romantic history all are so familiar.

Yet, withal, there was no distinctive nationality. The authors, to a man, were slavish copyists. As they acted in possessing themselves of their territory, so they acted in establishing a literature. They had overrun, not settled, on the land; they now took a sciolistic cut across Europe, picking up scraps here and there, and piecing and furbishing them together. There was something comically impressive in the proposal to re-christen America, the northern part of it. Freden was to be the name of the United States, marking them out as a separate part of the continent, and in its derivative epithet announcing the splendid fact of a Fredonian nationality. But this was before the Monro doctrine had any weight.

The graver error couched in this proposal was that of supposing nationalities ready made, or to be made to order. They are not in the nature of manufactured articles at all. Mere accident of locality is no proof of what is called a nationality; the cause of this is to be found in the heart and speech, and the reason of it to be traced to a kind of co-operative instinct which underlies every mental movement. It is, notwithstanding, indubitable that simple attachment to a country fires the blood, and

has often been fruitful in momentous results. The reflection of the pristine habits of the Indians and of the primeval forest does not, properly speaking, display any remarkable *nationality;* yet it serves to distinguish in a notable degree much of the literature of the New World from that of the Old World. The prairie and the backwood are peculiar. The legends of the aborigines of America carry us away from Europe, although we seem to have been delighted or terrified with something akin to them nearer home. The stern mythology of the frozen north—the luxuriant imagery of the balmy south—the brownies and bogles of Scotland—the banshees and clauricans of Ireland—the plumed knights of the Arthurian cycle, and the Merlin of Maridunum—the rural scenes in the "Gentle Shepherd," the love songs of Moore, and the life-pictures in Crabbe's poems—are not more peculiar and indigenous than are the Indian traditions and superstitions of America. The North American savages really play no unimportant part in the New World literature. They have their whoops and yells, their war-paint and feathers, stereotyped and photographed both in poetry and prose—in *Hiawatha* as well as in Fenimore Cooper's novels.

All agree that as mere readers the Americans are unequalled by any other people in the world. They support literature, if they cannot create it. They thirst for knowledge; but, like the Jewish wanderers of old, they require a Moses to strike the rock from which flows "the well of English undefiled." Even when they construct a work of their own, the model may be found in Europe. They are often vigorous, but seldom original. Their strength is the strength of a trained athlete, rather than of a David who slays his Goliath. American literature is therefore, we repeat, characteristically imitative. Readers of Chaucer and Shakspeare, and indeed of our earlier and better literature, are backward to denounce or disparage imitation; but the authors of the *Canterbury Tales*, of *Hamlet* and *Othello*, are far above the reach of cavil or impeachment on this ground.

The influence of the German upon English poetry, if less distinctive and pernicious than upon English prose, is yet quite perceptible. Not less evident is this influence on Transatlantic poetry. The youthful minds of the country have been carried away by the thoughtful calmness and Teutonic splendour of Goethe, Schiller, and Richter, and the consequence is that much of the philosophy and sentimentalism which they have imbibed has left an ineffaceable mark on their works. Indeed, in mere translations from the Germans the Americans surpass the English. But various culture is the normal state of the higher intelligent class of Americans. Even the ladies shame our smatterers into silence. When one hears of American ladies travelling over

Europe and speaking the language of every country; exchanging opinions in Latin with the priests of the Vatican, quoting Greek epigrams to cap a French estimate of manners, criticising with niceness and technical phrase sculpture in Rome and paintings in the Louvre, debating the feasibility of the Suez canal scheme, and venturing a comparison of forms of government,—one is reminded of the days of Elizabeth and the scholarly Lady Jane Grey, of our present bright bevy of highly cultivated women, and the perils and pleasures which commingle with so much pronounced ability. Notwithstanding this national tendency, we do not think the Americans favour a Germanized poetry. Yet this influence is easily detected, and is perhaps specifically greater in Emerson's poetry than in that of his contemporaries. But Emerson's lines want flow, and the thought is too much welded together to allow of the freedom essential to verse. There is a mystic abstruseness about his poems, marring their harmony; for the interblending of philosophy and poetry is far from successfully managed. But of the leading poets we shall have something to say by and by.

There is another agency at work, and with like detriment. The Americans are over-contented with the "living present," and seek an immediate reward. Their history has too often the look of a national diary of what is done and to be done. Enough for the day is the reputation, good or bad, of the book, and it is this seeming article of callous faith which leads one to believe and assert that American literature generally does not wear a long attractiveness. Nevertheless there is no lack of ambitious scribblers. *Cacoëthes scribendi* is an epidemic. Each individual proser and versifier is audaciously conceited enough to consecrate to himself what was satirically written by Juvenal of one whom small authors might envy—

> "Ipse facit versus, atque uni cedit Homero
> Propter mille annos."

Voluminousness is indeed a striking characteristic; and this in some measure accounts for the deficiency in tone and the prevalent mediocrity. No people can ever hope to attain eminence in letters without more careful and artistic circumspection and a thoroughly sincere recognition of the graces of composition. Indeed, so far as language goes, we have no reason now to be proud of the changes introduced by Americans into the English vernacular. After all, it might have been as well if the project of the madly ingenious Mr. Thornton (who flourished half a century ago) had met with favour. His scheme had at least the merit of consistent novelty. It was literally of the topsy-turvy sort. He proposed, by way of distinction between the language of the old

and new countries, that the *e* should be inverted and the *i* under-dotted; and by way of more variety he proposed the introduction of a few original signs of the nature of those to be found in a schoolboy's first copy-book. Mr. Thornton was an M.D., and although for his happy design he received the reward due to an inventor in the form of the Magellanic medal conferred by some "philosophical society," the authorities would not allow him to doctor the language. But this successive writers have done for themselves; and we now find, especially in the newspapers, the language in an unsettled and unwholesome condition. We hear frequently of distinguished men being "interviewed," and the other day we read that President Grant had just "excurted" from Washington. Even tradesmen suffer from the infection. In advertisements a "Tremendous Come Down" seemingly refers to a bankruptcy; but no—it really means an abatement of prices. Again, "Going with a Rush!" is equal to selling rapidly. Instances of the kind might be multiplied, but these are among the most recent. Certainly this is one way of striving to become thoroughly national.

If the haste to create a literature is pardonable, the haste to get rid of the pure English language is altogether censurable. That which has been ennobled by mighty genius need not be discarded or (what is far worse) ravished by petty scribblers and penny-a-liners. Happily, the favourite authors are free from this taint. In some of them there is no trace of it whatever, in others there is an obvious effort to avoid it. Their thought and imagination may not be deep and powerful, but their style and phraseology are pure. *Laches* and immaturity are no rare symptoms of the hurry they are in to become famous. As before observed, this is their most damaging failing. How the attempt has been made to "raise" a literature we will permit one of themselves to explain. "Meanwhile," an American critic writes, "we were busy growing a literature. We watered so freely, and sheltered so carefully, as to make a soil too damp and shaded for anything but mushrooms; wondered a little why no oaks came up, and ended by voting the mushroom an oak—an American variety." No English critic would have spoken with so much boldness. For, after all, there are many oaks, although they might be finer and grander. The recent progress of literature will best be shown by reviewing briefly the number and kind of works produced during the last seven or eight years.

Beginning with the year 1861, we find only half a dozen novels (strictly), and but five volumes of poetry from the pens of native authors. This deficiency is however partly attributable to the subsidence of interest taken in general literature on the outbreak of the war, and partly to the craving for books of the

hour. Everything touching the fratricidal struggle was bought and devoured with avidity. Thus of the comparatively small number of works printed in the year, 450 referred to the war; more than one half of those were essays, sermons, and addresses on the absorbing theme, and sixty were treatises on military science. Next year the same class of works were in greater demand, and magazines were started for the satisfaction and delectation (for in magazine writing Americans excel) of those who had ceased for the time to patronise heavier and more lengthy works. In addition, an important work—a library in itself—was completed. This was the New American Cyclopædia in sixteen volumes, the largest work ever produced in the country. To it there were 375 contributors, whose labours extended over six years. But poetry still lagged behind. In what was published there was little merit, and this little must be spread over *three* volumes. Novels were not more promising. There were more of them, thirty-four, but few of them would deserve notice in a third-rate review. There were, however, over one hundred other novels ("reprints"), principally English.

Eighteen hundred and sixty-three saw a new state of things. War taxation bore heavily on all, and printers and publishers were not exceptionally treated. Their workmen had been drained into the army, and labour had become both scarce and costly. Add to this the fact that the price of paper was doubled, and it will be easy to conceive utter stagnation following the lingering and infrequent publications of the previous two years. But not so. The rod had blossomed. There was everywhere evidences of unusual activity. As if to defy prognostications and to mock increased imposts, authors and publishers conspired to make this the golden year of production, the *annus mirabilis* in the literary history of America. The effect of the war had now been felt, and to some extent realised, and doubtless this gave an impetus to the publishing movement. Well, then, 2050 distinct works, of which indeed one-fifth were for the young, were issued. Another fifth only were "reprints," the best being original American works. Poems *old and new*, made up three dozen volumes, and the novels numbered less than one hundred. Of those but few may be said to have survived the war. This was certainly a full harvest, but it was not a truly good one. It was another of the premature sort, yielding little ripe enough to be garnered for many years. And although we do not and could not expect numerous masterpieces every year, in this sudden eruption of ability, something far above the common was reasonably to be hoped for and expected. There is less chance of an immortal poet appearing once in a decade than there is of the aloe blooming every season. Yet,

when a people rises to the height of the great argument of war, it may be presumed capable of extraordinary effort and of marvellous achievements. The heart of America was indeed deeply stirred; society was mightily swayed by a terrible passion. Everywhere there was supreme excitation. Within there was no stillness, and none without. Restlessness, anxiety, hope, fear, dismay, tumult spread over the land. There was no peace, no calm, no gladness. All told of a cruel sad war. Those near contemplated it mournfully, those afar watched it with pain and the anguish of despair. Ere now amid such a spectacle of terror, bravery, and carnage, when the tread of armed men shook the earth and the din of battle rent the air, there have not been wanting poets to celebrate the glories of the triumphant host and the valour of the vanquished. No such minstrel appeared in America. Even the fire of Tyrtæus might have been quenched and his spirit awed by the sickening onslaughts between fathers, sons, and brothers. It was a civil war of the direst kind, and a war too in every respect unexampled in modern times. Milton, Taylor, and Butler, among others, redeemed the troublous age which witnessed our civil wars; America had not before her bath of blood and has not now any to rank with them. Yet the time is coming when the effects of this war will be gloriously manifested in the literature of that country; for no nation can pass through such an ordeal without attracting fresh accessions of strength, and among her poets and intellectual sons scattering the fulness of a new power intensified into inspiration.

To continue our estimate of the books. In 1864 the price of work was advanced fully 100 per cent. Yet the number of books published amounted to 2028, of which the simple reprints and republished foreign books were 434. In 1865, a year singularly prolific of works relating to the war, there were 1802 (276 reprints) published. In 1866, the number was one hundred more, and history and biography maintained their high place. In 1867, there were 2110 works, being more than in the big year already referred to. Yet withal, among native authors there were not half a dozen genuine successes. Other causes account for this wondrous fertility. English "reprints" were in extraordinary demand. For instance, "Dickens" was issued about the same date by four leading publishers, and this "in an entire series of novels (nineteen distinct works) in thirty-one different editions." The Waverley novels were also similarly issued by three publishing houses. The sale of books was no less notable. Of Dr. Holland's "Kathrina," we are assured, 35,000 copies were sold in four months; and the "Life of the Prince Consort" passed rapidly through several editions. Again, in 1868, the largest number of all was issued, namely, 2208. Yet the whole of the

works by American authors was less than ever, "reprints" being preferred. What native produce found a market did so for the most part at the author's own risk. One fact more may be set down. While in 1861 there were of poems five, novels half a dozen, and works on military science sixty; in 1868 there were only five on military science, 100 novels, and more new poems than ever. But it is now time to see what all this accumulation of letter-press really means.

Books are not necessarily literature. They are certainly the materials out of which a literature is formed, but nothing else. Many of them are not worth the cloth or full calf in which they are bound. These are as worthless as defaced type, and as ephemeral as handbills. To speak, then, of American literature, or any other, is not to speak of the mere multiplicity of writers and books. Indeed there is no true or acceptable theory anent the difficulty save the theory of selection. It is so in this case. Canon of criticism after canon of criticism has been exploded, yet our common sense and selective instinct remain to teach and restrain us. And after all, the grand object of criticism is that without fear, favour, or deceit we may pick out from the varied herd the few notable works which may with fairness and applause enter the hallowed precincts of literature; and may relegate to the limbo of abortions and nonentities the tawdry versifications and the idly miserable prosings of the conceited and temerarious. As a rule, this object is fully attained. Nevertheless, many works wholly destitute of merit secure a transitory place, and for a season darken the doorway to fame. They neither belong to the unrecognised trash nor to literature proper. They announce the fact which induces us to draw a line between ephemeral and permanent literature. They constitute the vagabond branch of the great system. They

> "Sport for a day, and perish in a night,
> The foam upon the waters not so light."

After the lapse of a few years, when we take a survey of literature, their place (for it is a casual ward) is filled by other tramps of the same order.

But it must not be concluded from this that a short-lived book is essentially a poor one. Not at all. In reading there are, as in everything else, changes of fashion. What pleases now may fail to please next month, and what is now sought for may a year hence be obsolete. Yet the same rule holds good in every instance. To meet or to lead the fashion many things are produced which are put to no use, and do not deserve to be. They are too tawdry, flimsy, or otherwise unsuitable, and they are discarded at once. They cannot be said to belong to the fashions any more

than the "Halfpenny Journal" and the Derby "Correct Card" belong to English literature. What hits the fleeting fancy is otherwise considered. Seasonableness is in itself a recommendation. It attaches works of the class (mostly novels) temporarily and partially, as we have suggested, to literature proper. And of such works there is ever a glut. Some of them, however, have qualities of solidity and permanence which render them superior to the rest, and therefore more enduring, and they become stock products rather than the objects of whimsical likings and desires.

This may seem a hard material view, but it is the true one. We cannot afford, and ought not, to countenance the impostors whose mistaken aspirations are their passports, and of whose excellence we have had no token. And in dealing with a comparatively new literature,—the growth of recent times, we must tread the field without shrinking, and separate the wheat from the tares,—not recklessly nor meaninglessly, however; for weeds are oftentimes the sign of wondrous fertility of soil out of which spring the finest crops; and it would be aught but wisdom to diminish the strength of the needful in the hazardous attempt to eradicate the useless. Inquiry will, therefore, naturally direct itself to the question of the comparative worth or worthlessness of any or all. In this way the truth will be discovered, and the real wealth and consequent power of the literature will be made manifest. The criterion is clearly neither a hard nor a high one. Yet the decision come to after anxious and scrupulous investigation and reflection may nevertheless be unfavourable. In the present case it is not quite this, but it leans this way.

There is not a score of names in American literature that may be placed in the front rank among poets, historians, and novelists; and there is not one to vie with the leading names in the Old World. To some extent we have already accounted for this. And, further, by critics of any worth or position in the United States it is freely admitted. True, Mr. Jefferson once said that it would be time enough to expect a Homer, a Virgil, a Voltaire, and a Shakspeare, when America rivalled in length of existence the nations that produced these celebrities. It may be confidently doubted whether the comparative ages of nations have anything to do with the birth of pre-eminent genius, and it may certainly be asserted that, whether or not, America is not affected thereby. Her case is singular. America, from the early settlement, has existed two centuries and a half. This period has been one of striking advancement in arts, science, and literature. Events have marched past in double quick time. Modern acquirements have stimulated zeal and

engendered ambition and perseverance. There has been no want of scope, and no lack of means. Almost within this period the acme of Britain's greatness in literature, art, science, government, and general national prosperity, has been reached. And her resplendent prestige a century ago was shared by the American colonies. Again, the glory of Italian literature shone forth on an earlier day it is true, but the golden ages of both French and German literature followed the dawn of a new world in the Northern States. Moreover, the state of the language in the several instances must be taken into account. And on this ground Mr. Jefferson's remark is peculiarly unhappy. For example take Chaucer,—a name and power he does not cite. When he wrote, the English language was in a transition stage; and, indeed, to him we may well ascribe much of its flexibility, vigour, and beauty. He lived in early times, but his genius was strong on the wing. We call him the "father of poets" and the "morning star of song," yet neither his inspired descendants and lineage, nor the constellations of song that have succeeded, have surpassed him in power, in grandeur, and in brilliance of renown. He is still worthy to receive the greenest laurels bestowed on the chief of poets. Yet he was, comparatively speaking, earlier in point of time in the *English* nation than Bryant or Longfellow was in America. Further, Chaucer was (what, with barely an exception, no American poet has been) distinctively national and unmistakeably original. But indeed it would be idle to comment more on Mr. Jefferson's ill-considered opinion. History offers no data on which we can hope to establish such a theory as he propounds. There is no uniform law of progress in literature. At one time a nation may advance with all the splendour of success, at another time as suddenly recede with all the disaster of defeat. To say that America has not at present a poet of the highest order is not to say or to infer that three centuries hence she is sure to possess one. Barrow's maudlin epic was a poor start, and it spread a bad distemper. Trumbull's "Progress of Dullness" had the suggestiveness of its title to carry it through, and Dwight's "Conquest of Canaan" was as dreary and not so peculiarly attractive as "The Four Elements" and "The Four Ages of Man," so quaintly descanted on in verse by Anne Bradstreet, the first poetess. Let us hope, however, that Mr. Jefferson may be right after all, that the hour and the poet will come.

The Americans have so far failed to attain their share of eminence in letters. They set out on the wrong path, but they may now be said to be on the fair way to the goal. We have seen that in one direction they are far advanced,—indeed, seem to outstrip nearly every other nation. Educational and

scientific works come in shoals from their printing press. Natural science has certainly the advantage over mental science, and this cannot occasion surprise. But knowledge of every kind and degree is prized for its own sake, and is spread over the land like fertilizing waters. The distinction De Quincey originated regarding literature has a close application to any criticism on American literature. There *is* a literature of *power* and a literature of *knowledge*. And in this latter sort the Americans excel. In the highest sense knowledge is their means and end. Their vocations essentially claim technical learning and instruction. Their *kind* of genius finds itself most at home in providing for such a want. On this head there is little to regret and less to desire. It is otherwise with their literature of *power*, if the term is strictly applicable. Their power is of the feeblest character. It may elevate the mind, but it does little to strengthen it. Neither philosophy nor poetry has reached the altitude that peculiarly belongs to them. They are faint and literally weary. They may constitute in time, but do not now, a true literature of *power*.

For of the dearth of good poetry we may still complain. Of late years certainly there has been some improvement, but it has been slight and not at all significant. No great name has won its way to attention and popularity. No fresh augury of coming power has been discerned. Rather have there been signs of decadence. Volumes have multiplied, it is true. Assertion following assertion has been made in praise of the continuous and brilliant triumphs of the American muse. In all this there has been a tincture of "spread-eagleism." Any muse at present worthy of the name comes wrapped in a second edition. The American muse has apparently eaten of the insane root which takes the imagination prisoner; for there is something so stilted and mechanical about her recent flights, that one almost believes the poet now labours at a lyric or an epic on the same principle that one constructs a telestich. But to the plea of "good enough" we demur not. Poets may be good without being great. They may be more remarkable for few faults than for many beauties. That a nation may be proud of them is quite another thing.

Novels do not fare better. They are numerous but weak. In this they bear a family likeness to the bulk of their English competitors. Any works of fiction really popular are mildly called "reprints;" they are English, French, or German, that obtain the favour of American citizenship without asking or waiting for it.

Biographies are extraordinarily plentiful. They stimulate an appetite which they cannot easily satisfy. And for this the

reason is not far off. Where nearly all aspire, many want to learn how to take the proper road to success. This, biography usually teaches. It raises hope, cheers the despondent, and flatters the vain. These qualities indicate, if they do not fully denote, its immense value. How exceeding great, then, must be the attractiveness of biography in a country where the avenues to distinction are freely open, and where at times the merest accident has led to the highest honours. But there is a still more marked peculiarity about American biographies. They fluctuate in numbers according to a known rule. The turn of the tide comes with the contest for the Presidency. In election years, candidates and probable candidates for the chair and vice-chair have their antecedents raked up, and their virtues extolled in volumes of all sizes. Nor are these works all, or nearly all, trashy publications: some of them already take rank among the choicest works of the class. The "memoirs," "lives," and other titled biographies of the late President Lincoln would almost fill a library. And very many of these were published in his lifetime. Again, as a subject General Grant has been nearly done to death. Before 1868 eight lives of him had been published; and during the year more than thirty others were issued, the aggregate sale within a year being about a quarter of a million copies.

The craving for historical works is as strong, general, and accountable. Folks at home ever desire to know not only what is going on around them, but how the world beyond wags. When they suppose they have learnt all about themselves and their ancestors, they think it high time to become acquainted with the march of events and the differences in character elsewhere. Oftentimes, indeed, they are indifferent, comparatively speaking, as to their surroundings, while they devour with eagerness and relish every item of intelligence from afar. To all countries books of travel have this alluring feature. To some extent in America foreign history usurps the place of this sort of historical adventure. We have it on the authority of a most competent critic, Mr. Russell Lowell, that for one who studies American history there are fifty who study European history, ancient and modern. And it is remarkable enough that with the exception of Mr. Bancroft, Mr. Greeley, and other historians of the war, the historians of America have chosen—we had almost said have been forced to choose—foreign subjects. The two foremost writers of this class, Mr. Prescott and Mr. Motley, have written on subjects of an European nature and interest, or on subjects relating to parts of the great Western Continent outside the United States. With the exception of Gibbon and Grote, it has been otherwise with our greatest historians. Hume, Hallam

for the most part, Macaulay, and Froude have been content with an English field, and at this day they claim a formidable share of popularity in America. The recent completion of Mr. Motley's careful, exact, and eloquent work worthily approves the high reputation he has long borne.

Judging from the division in his "Arte of Poesie," old Puttenham would have classed Mr. Bancroft under the head of *Ornation* and Prescott under that of *Proportion;* for this distinction clearly marks out their styles. While we admire the ingenuity, fulness, and patriotism of Mr. Bancroft, we reprobate most heartily his excessive partisanship. No historian should bow the knee to this Baal. Every opponent Mr Bancroft paints is a wilful daub, and his intentional portraitures of favourites are inartistically drawn and improperly and imperfectly finished. But Mr. Bancroft takes a keen interest in politics, and in narrating the vicissitudes of parties and the fluctuations of principles he notably exhibits his real strength. Like the chroniclers of the late war, he values too much, we repeat, the exigency and prejudices of faction. Thus what renders his works most attractive makes them most worthless. It is not so with Mr. Prescott. He never assumes the attitude of a mere partizan. He never swerves from the facts before him, and it must be allowed that he is not more patient in his search for them than candid and impartial in his relation of them. Not only is he, moreover, one of the most dramatic of historians, but he has followed a wise and expedient plan in confining himself to special reigns, in moving in a circle large and suggestive enough to a man of his uncommon talents. Indeed the days and dreams of Sir Walter Raleigh are alike gone for ever, and the history of the world must now be written in chapters. In these times we set much value on the merest fact or incident of past centuries, and we look to qualified historians to educe from these lessons of wisdom and morality, that we may approach the future fortified by invaluable experience, and conscious that history will be philosophy teaching in vain by example, unless we are suited and prepared to follow the good and shun the bad example.

The literature of the arts and sciences unquestionably takes a high place. It is well and far from startling that this is so. For among the chief requisites are the technical instructions and practical guides which indicate the best, at any rate, the readiest way to develope America's various resources. The Americans have not been slow to seek, or satisfied with seeking, such enlightenment and guidance. They have done far more. They have signalized themselves by rare and ingenious discoveries, and have made their name synonymous with inventiveness. It is in this way and into this soil that their originality has run to

seed. As in the war of Independence they acted their epic, so now they work their philosophy. Their career as a people is characterized by nothing more strongly than by their efforts in this field. From Franklin to Hoe is a significant progression. Nor is their best energy at all misdirected. Opportunity and encouragement are given to those qualified to fulfil the tasks set before them. Scientific men engaged by the Federal or State Governments explore and survey vast tracts of land, and record the results of their observant travel in volumes which are highly prized and sought after. It is easy to see, that for a majority of the people such works have an especial attraction. They treat of subjects local and scientific, and they indicate from year to year the increasing wealth and gradual expansion of the Republic. And for these reasons they constitute a separate and distinctively national literature, forasmuch as here the foreigner avails not, and cannot be had in "reprints."

A word as to these same "reprints." This term, it may be observed, is a charming euphemism; for with few exceptions these reprints are issued without the sanction of the author and without any consideration being offered to him. In this country the struggle for assured and extended copyright was long carried on before authors were enabled to establish a modified claim to their rightful property. Now here, as well as in the United States, authors are fully encouraged and protected. This is as it should be, but more is still wanted. Since the passing of the International Copyright Acts, England has entered into treaties with France, Prussia, and other nations, for the due, complete, and mutual protection of literary property. America has refused to be so bound. In this respect she warily perceives how advantageous our common language is, and has all along been to her; and she unworthily improves the opportunities it affords. She is prepared, accustomed, and mean enough to filch what she will not buy. She allows—without treaty—free trade (or rather open appropriation) in books between Old England and New England, for the same reason that she insists on protection when her native industries are likely to suffer. To the full she assuredly obeys the hardened law of self-preservation. The Americans are admittedly the chief of readers, and English authors are thankful to them for their patronage and appreciation. But surely it would be more honest as well as more grateful to buy outright that which they receive with so much pleasure, instead of thus continuing to lie under the reproach and stigma of supporting a race of literary freebooters. The licence to plunder accorded to their publishers is hurtful to America no less than to England. It unnerves native genius, and is the surest dissuasive American authors feel. Many of the

American publishers demand, and every writer desires, International Copyright. Why should they not have it? Here in England such a necessary treaty would be hailed with delight and satisfaction, and in the United States poets and novelists would derive fresh impulse from it. How soon will the day come when the following lines may be pronounced unveracious?

> "You steal Englishmen's books and think Englishmen's thought,
> With their salt on her tail your wild eagle is caught;
> Your literature suits each whisper and motion
> To what will be thought of it over the ocean."

All this betrays a reprehensible weakness, of which a great nation ought not to be capable. To imitate may be pardonable, nay, even defensible and advisable, but an utter plagiary of intellectual power and labour is wholly beyond excuse. Nor can it be denied that both on account of the prevalence of this pilfering mania and because of the sincere yet slavish imitation of foreign writers, the growth of a superior literature is retarded. It will be well for the Americans to study their own wants and inclinations in the light of enlarged experience, and when need be, to graft new branches of thought on their tree of knowledge instead of transplanting an entire forest. And lopping and pruning, too, will do much, although a pollarded literature is no fine sight.

But let us now endeavour to form some opinion of the bulk of American verse. And first, let it be understood that American Literature is singularly and characteristically deficient in long poems. There are, it is true, many of considerable length, to speak comparatively, but the longer they are the worse they are; and it is obvious at a glance that although the genius of the country occasionally mounts high, it cannot soar long. Keats has observed with much truth that "a long poem is the test of invention," and were one to accept this as a critical dogma, the deduction drawn from our observations would be nigh fatal to American poetry. Poe's theory, on the other hand, contradicts this, and is American from necessity,—viz., a poem to be true, to be pleasing, to be effective, must be short. A long poem he ventures to declare a contradiction in terms, and we are made to feel that his countrymen in the main coincide with him, or are constrained not to differ from him; for the *dii minores* who hurl their "lines," "idyls," and "sonnets" (worst of all) at every reader outdo even the rank brood of English poetasters. In a land of equality every man has of course a right to essay whatever he pleases, buoying himself up with the faint hope that he may pass in the crowd, or may even be singled out when all or nearly all are so commonplace. Ardent democrats we may be, yet it

occurs to us that the creating all men equal politically and socially did not imply also an equality in intellect and genius. All men may vote by ballot; but all men cannot write poetry. Even were the afflatus as all-pervading as the longing after it, circumstances would immediately cool it; for there have been many "mute Miltons" from necessity—many whose high-souled principle, zeal, and unquestionable poetic enthusiasm have been altogether stifled or diverted—made subservient to other purposes of less ennobling tendency, narrowed and overwhelmed by the practicality of the age.

For, in communities where thrift, money-making, and equality are the leading or sole ideas, there is but little hope or scope for poetry. The genius is practical, not theoretical or idealistic. There is a restless activity for ever marring the finest conceptions of the poet. His mind is so imbued with the maxims of utility, that it is next to heresy to indulge dreams which a worldly thought may dissipate. His happiest fancies become a sombre figment. Imagination is cramped. Animated expression, if ventured, falls on a listless ear. The poet may, indeed, revel in the scenes around him, and depict them for the attentive and appreciative few; but after all, wiseacres will say he ought to have been better employed. Or, he may rashly go to the other extreme and indulge in lotus-eating. Then he becomes an object of ridicule and invective, contemned by the busy and pushing folks as an idler in society. Cultivate the muses as he may, his reward will either be a derisive comment or an exasperating rebuke. He must either seek vernal retreats and warble his wood-notes wild to the unpeopled solitude, or he must content himself with flights that would evoke the admiration of the poet who "does" for Hyam or Moses. This is small encouragement, i'faith. Hence the faculties essential to the poet are consequently too often misapplied, and while the poet's genius is thus diverted from Parnassus to the New York El Dorado, his labours in verse-making are abortive, or issue in a spawn of idle nothings or bombastic filigree.

Fortunately, there have been a few in America venturesome enough to disdain unfavourable comment, and to hew their way through the thicket of prejudice. They have regarded their act more than the commentary on it. Yet even their works are not devoid of the seeming newness which imparts a gloss to everything around them. They have peculiarities which stamp their productions just as the manufacturer uses his trade-mark. They realise the truths of poetry in the abstract, and creating books which may endure for many ages to come, try hard to labour according to their highest conception. They are the giants in Lilliput. When they sing, it is not of individuals but

of man, a truth observed long ago by M. De Tocqueville. Apotheosis is obviously beyond the moon, so far as they are concerned. Heroes they seldom court. Deeds they laud and celebrate. It is the principle, not the doer or the practice, which they glorify in song. Now and then a glimpse of the centuries big with old world history brings fresh inspiration and material; for they have of their own no associations inwoven with remote cycles of history, and causing the heart to vibrate at the mention of noble deeds and valorous chieftains.

Properly speaking, their art has had no infancy. They have sung out of time as well as out of tune. In general, the warrior and the poet—the minstrel and his theme—precede the orator and the statesman. In America it was not so. Poetry flowered late. It was the outcome of the war of independence, the etherealised spirit of fierce contention assuming a poetic form. But the white heat of passion had grown cool, and inspiration had vanished. Those near the sanctuary of battle and the conflict of great opinions were sheerly incapable. They were premature, and the eternal chord had not yet been touched, and there was no loud harmonious vibration of song. The presence of the "imperial faculty whose throne is curtained within the invisible nature of man," had not yet been felt. The so called poets of the hour were unworthy of any place save a niche in the Dunciad.

Taking these apparent facts in connexion with the observations we have already offered, it is clear that many difficulties remain to be surmounted before the poets of North America will confer befitting honour on their mother land. They have much to contend with which does not beset the poets of other countries. They have not only to erect their temple, they have to clear the ground for it. As Shelley well remarks, "the cultivation of poetry is never more to be desired than at periods when, from an excess of the selfish and calculating principle, the accumulation of the materials of external life exceeds the quantity of the power of assimilating them to the eternal laws of human nature." It is this momentous duty they have before them. Hitherto they have barely been able to fulfil and enforce it. They have yielded too much to the fleeting blandishments of the multitude, and have neither withstood nor gainsayed the prevalent false notions of their art. With fewer excellences than their English contemporaries, their blemishes are more numerous and more conspicuous. Materialism must ever vitiate poetry, and poetry thus vitiated may be the timely outcome of the age, but it is neither the masterpiece of genius nor the enduring recollection of giant days. It is commonly the weakling of an iterated task, the fantastical toy of a fancy and imagination frittered away.

So soon as poetry is the offspring of such laboured effort it loses its ethereal and perennial charm. Like a modern drama or burlesque, it has merely its "run" of so many hundred nights. The mistake is visible, and not atoned for. Poets should never write for the public. If they are conscious of such a purpose they cease to dwell within the hallowed circle of the Nine. Their gift is a pearl of too great a price to need the gaze and admiration of the vulgar to enhance its value. The highest and noblest poets have lavished their wealth of thought and splendour of imagination without knowing, or seeking to know, the gracious, acceptable, and immortal service they rendered to mankind. To them, to feel was to do. They struck the harp and hymned the praise of all creation, touching a keynote which resounded through the world. With them poetry was truly an inspiration, with us now-a-days it is too often an aspiration and a care. Even the greatness of our latter-day poets is a greatness of another kind. A few bright and genial exceptions irradiate the haze and gloom of the vast wilderness of versification. And what is more than remarkable, the present poets content themselves with an altered name and fame. In the words of an astute critic —"Instead of sounding a trumpet in the ears of a nation, they play on the flute before a select auditory." And harsh, unmusical, and most melancholy are many of their performances.

Of those American poets who have really and through force of genius attained high rank, it will be well to say something.

Longfellow's name is a household word in England. Not one of his contemporaries here has had a wider or longer supremacy on this side of the Atlantic: and for this we may account chiefly by a reference to the very diffusive nature of his genius, and generally to his near assimilation to everything English. He is German in a different sense from that which we ascribe to Emerson. The country, more than its poets, influences him, although his translations of the poetry of Europe lead us to expect a varied and active principle of borrowed thought. His sight is neither feeble nor restricted—reaching from the splendour of the East to the midnight snows and frosts of the northern wolds. Yet there is the limpid glide of virtue, serene and beautiful, everywhere manifest. Longfellow dignifies and adorns charity; and both as poet and scholar he is supreme in his modesty. He is the saunterer (in a strict sense) among the poets of the New World. His fancy is not mewed up in the backwoods or on the loamy shores of the Potomac. He is far-travelled, and in his wanderings he has divested himself of many Yankee predilections which find no favour out of the parent states. Every line he has written is silvered over with thought gleaned in the affluent realms of foreign literature. There is a finish

and polish about most of his works quite unusual in contemporary productions; and the tone of his poems is unexceptionably chaste and elevated.

Longfellow has studied hard to give the hexameter a permanent place in English—or rather, American—literature; but his aim has been frustrated as completely and deservedly as was Harvey's in the sixteenth century. Nevertheless he has animated it with the spirit of a music deep and sympathetic. To our taste, with the exception of "Hiawatha," and some of his shortest poems, he has written nothing more tender and exquisite. "Evangeline" never for a moment dispels the enchanting truthfulness we discover in it at the outset, and the attention thus won never flags. For in description, both of scenery and of the homely life of old people in a new world—and in the sustained narrative of incidents revealing much nervous power and delicate feeling,—Longfellow has risen far above the common level of poets. Ill-fated Evangeline, in the heyday of comfort and hope, and in the vicissitudes of her piteous wanderings, is a picture full of sorrowful beauty.

Longfellow's genius bursts forth, dazzling like the gorgeous lights streaming in the north, when he paints in weird colours "The Skeleton in Armour." We seem to have the ghastly form before our eyes, and can fancy the maiden for whom his spirit yearned roaming abroad on the hoar wolds and by the verge of the frozen deep. The clank of his armour still rings in our ears. Contrast with this the calm music of the "Voices of the Night," a series of beautiful pieces—a string of real pearls, of which the finest are "The Prelude" and the "Psalm of Life." Who does not feel the truth and influence of the latter in his every-day struggles? Then there is the "Spanish Student" and "Hiawatha." The first has little to recommend it as a drama, although the action is neither weak nor halting. Longfellow was not destined to ennoble the buskined stage or dignify the learned sock. Yet the subject he chose affords room for a display of his acquaintance with *Victorian's* country and the gipsy economy; and there are many passages which for ethical point and varied beauty yield not to anything else he has written. "Hiawatha" is the very opposite to all this. In it we have some earnest of a national literature, and no mean indication of the occasional exercise of power of the very highest order. It is the first permanent contribution to the world's *belles lettres* made from Indian authorities. It has the monotony inseparable from ballad poetry, and it has all the unreal excellences and drawbacks one expects to find in a professedly Indian poem. It is childlike as Indian life itself, yet possesses the vigour and daring of the Tecumseh and the Mohican. The strong fibre of legend which joins and

runs through the series of idyls of which it is made up, unites like a cable of fancy the weird and pagan traditions of the frozen north of Europe and America. Longfellow's later works are worthy of his reputation. The "Tales of a Wayside Inn" was patiently looked for and popularly appreciated. Since then we have had, among others, "Victor Galbraith," and the sonorous ringing of the "Bells of Lynn." With all his admitted shortcomings, Longfellow must be pronounced the chief of American poets. The compass of his power is not great; but if his pitch does not reach the diapason, his variations attract and win perhaps a better and more approving audience.

Next to Longfellow, the American poet most popular in this country is the erratic and ill-fated Virginian, Edgar Allen Poe. Poe's life was not reflected in his poetry, else few but readers of morbidly sensational works would read it. Indeed, nothing is more opposite than the debasement of the one, and the purity of the other. Now and then there is a fierce sternness in his poems; but they are oftener characterized by a spirit like that which pervades the "ghoul-haunted woodland of Weir," or that which animates the sombre versification of "The Raven." This latter work we think is an ominous reflex of the poet's character; but its rhythm flows more smoothly than did the current of the author's life. It is the measured roll of the waves of a majestic river, heard on an eerie night. In much that Poe wrote there is evidence of the insanity of genius, the waywardness and fitfulness of great power prostituted, and the maudlin dreariness of a wasted and hopeless existence. But least of all is this seen in his poetry. When worshipping at the shrine of the muses he was devout enough. He was invariably on his best behaviour when he entered their presence. Consequently the best of his life was infused into his poetry. He locked Caliban in the closet before he wrestled with the spirit of purity and harmony.

Poe's "Philosophy of Composition" imparts an insight into the workings of his mind. He knew the power of words—"the hidden power of words and might of magic spell." To him, when properly marshalled, they appeared a brilliant phalanx, and it is no cavil to say that he generally paid more attention to them than to the thoughts which they were meant to express. This is manifest whether we look, on the one hand, at his incoherent "Al Aaraaf," or, on the other, consider with what dexterity, pith, and variety he has rung the wild and mirthful music of "The Bells." His poetry was indeed laboured; and the reader soon detects its lack of spontaneity. Yet where would we seek for a piece of more unforced and softer music—a sweeter tale of passion and fancy, than "Annabel Lee"? The name suggests the pleasant moments spent in perusing it, and recalls the intense sensa-

tions of delight and thankfulness experienced at the time. But withal, there is nothing in Poe's works which might not have been written in England, or anywhere. He belongs to no constellation of song. He was a comet, and it will be long ere his fellow appear. Indeed, Lowell has well remarked, that one Poe is quite enough, and that the world could not endure a second.

N. P. Willis and Dana now claim a passing comment. The former, it may be said, moves in the world around him—takes note of its ongoings, and reports progress in melodious and finished verse. The latter has more of a didactic turn of mind, albeit he deals now and then in the terrible and unreal. Dana aims at preaching a high philosophy; Willis at illustrating the different phases of every-day life. The descriptions in N. P. Willis's poems are exact and finely touched; and he has drawn with an expert pencil a sketch of the manners of the age. His mood is hearty, and his sympathies are broad and lively. His poetry as a rule evinces much *verve*, is full of amiability and tenderness, and embellished by tasteful and pleasing characteristics. Moreover, his dramatic poems have been the most successful in America. In Dana there are "the makings" of a great poet; but the elements have been carelessly strewn. He is endowed with some of the very highest qualities, and he exercises them to some purpose; but there is wanting the spark which kindles all into a blaze of true genius. Yet he has done much, and nobly too. He is unlike most of his contemporaries in one respect—he is more subjective. His works are mostly versified reflections. The inner man and not the outer world engages him; and his poetry is the thrilling record of a deep and anxious contemplation. And for this reason he is less lyrical and fanciful. Indeed, Dana is one of the few poets in whom we recognise the holy blending of poetic genius and strong religious fervour. He has, however, though not very perceptibly or offensively, traits of exaggeration and incompactness, but these do not lay waste his uniformly facile and striking expression. In their *local* poems both Dana and Willis are essentially American. These reflect the very peat-smoke of the log huts.

We have left until now the most American of all the poets—William Cullen Bryant. Bryant is not national merely through his choice and treatment of themes. He is national in a fuller sense. He seems to have grown from childhood with the growth of the nation. His works mirror its feelings, passions, and desires. Unlike Longfellow, the word *old* has no charm for him. He is content to be the reporter of natural and local manifestations, the portrayer of purely national features. And he is fitted so to be. His simplicity is the simplicity of first impressions. His poems are mere thinkings aloud in praise of the enchanting

beauties of character and scenery around him. Yet all the while he is conscious of the secret of his country's power, and he pines for liberty as a fond mother does for her absent child, and with a like tenderness. But he is not strongly passionate. He has more of a pensive melancholy, and he loves to commune in solitude with the spirits of the forest. In some of his best poems we seem to hear the solemn music of the "Dead March in Saul." Indeed, at times his fancy appears to hover over the glorified departed laid to rest in some shaded necropolis. Bryant is emphatically the man of the woods; or, as he himself would express it, one of "the sages and hermits of the solemn wood." His true orison is the "Forest Hymn." He ever manifests what we may term the druidical spirit of poetry. He loves the woodlands, for there he may worship God in secret and with uninterrupted fervour and consolation. "The groves were God's first temples," he sings, believing that they are worthy still to be so. Yet if he were less austere, if he shook off the melancholy which is really oppressive, he would become at once greater than he is. Even in a poem on "June" he cannot forget the darksome ways of life. There he chants of—

> "A cell within the frozen mould,
> A coffin borne thro' sleet,
> And icy clouds above it rolled,
> While fierce the tempest beat."

And all this although Mr. Bryant has long been an active editor of a partizan newspaper. Embroiled in politics he has, however, never ceased to cultivate and consort with the muses. His love of rural life is too sincere to allow him to become urban even in thought. His verses about the city are failures. He is in the city, but not of the city. He prefers to stroll by green fields and rivers and through woods already reflected in his verse, to hear the silvery music of tinkling streams in his own vernal retreats. It is this longing, and liking, and doing, which have imparted its charm to "Thanatopsis," the very essence of all that can be said in a deep and fervent admiration of nature, and one of the finest and best poems in every sense in the English language. Had Bryant written nothing else, this poem would have embalmed his memory. Wordsworth has written nothing of the same sort to surpass it. There is a different presence in "The Ages." This, if not his best, is one of his best poems. It is a mournful retrospect of change, decay, and death. It is a sincere amplification of the truth that "thro' the ages an increasing purpose runs," though here that purpose visibly lingers in the Valley of the Shadow of Death. In "The Indian Girl's Lament" and "An Indian Story" there are

touches of life and character peculiar to America, showing us how sure is the aim (whatever the effect) to create an indigenous section of literature; and confirming what we have said as to the depth, breadth, force, and general happy variety of Bryant's truly national genius.

In so rapid a survey we cannot hope to pay even moderately fair tribute to the few poets whose names are worthy to be selected; and for the present, at least, we must pass over Lowell, in whom the youthful fun and freshness of the nation seem typified, and Holmes, the most cultivated wit, if not the chief humorist America has produced. The "Biglow Papers" and the "Autocrat of the Breakfast Table," among other of their works, have gained for them here, as well as in their own country, a meed of praise as hearty and universal as it is merited and esteemed. The humorists of America are not the least national and characteristic of the race; and it would be idle and far from just to treat them lightly or within the compass of hurried and cursory observations. But a word as to Whittier and Walt Whitman.

Whittier is the American lyrist *par eminence*. He has no rival, but many followers. He feels deeply, keenly, and strongly, and his utterance is aglow with the passion of which it is the form and embodiment. He is truly national in the most comprehensive sense, being violently swayed by every passing gust of New England prejudice, and at the same time rooted in a belief more fixed than tolerant. Many of his poems smack of bitterness, and too many of them are a sort of versified "heedless rhetoric." Yet Whittier has "done the state some service." Although no formally laureated bard, he was none the less the laureat of the Anti-Slavery Society. He pleaded strenuously and powerfully for the oppressed negroes, and to his constancy and warmth of advocacy may well be ascribed a share of the success of emancipation. Moreover, his delightful "Songs of Labour" constitute him the laureat of crafts and craftsmen. His tender sympathy and unvarying kindliness in all that concerns the labours and distress of mankind, attract and secure our approval more than his froward, needless, and valueless partizanship in verse repels us. He is, further, a Quaker of the Quakers; and almost the only subject he has chosen from the old world he turns to good account in favour of the sect.

> "Up the streets of Aberdeen,
> By the kirk and village green,
> Rode the laird of Ury;
> Close behind him, close beside,
> Foul of mouth and evil eyed
> Pressed the mob in fury."

The laird of Ury, Mr. Barclay, being unpopular solely on account of his faith, is in danger from the crowd, when an old friend just returned from the German wars comes to his assistance, but Ury prefers to remonstrate with his enemies; and, after a sensible lecturing of them, moralizes thus:—

> "Happy he whose inward ear
> Angel comfortings can hear
> O'er the rabble's laughter;
> And while Hatred's fagots burn,
> Glimpses through the smoke discern
> Of the good hereafter.
>
> "Knowing this, that never yet
> Share of truth was vainly set
> In the world's wide fallow;
> After hands shall sow the seed,
> After hands from hill and mead
> Reap the harvests yellow."

"Mogg Megone" is Whittier's masterpiece, although the tender idyll, "Snow-bound," with its rare and beautiful recollections of home life, piety, thrift, and affection, is by far the most popular, surpassing in this respect every other poem in America. "Mogg Megone" is slight in construction, and in parts shows the poet at his feeblest: still, as a whole, it is a texture woven in the national loom, and each thread of it has a human and touching interest for every New Englander. It is, as the author says, a mere framework for sketches of scenery and the portrayal of the character and habits of the early settlers who dwelt on the very boundaries of the war-path. Although ostensibly an Indian tale, the aboriginal element is subdued, and we meet with none of the extravagances and imaginings that fill up the coloured pages of fiction. Again we have Whittier at his best in his pieces written during the war. He was even fierce in his earnestness and longing for the triumph of the Northern cause; hence the stern defiance, spirit, and stimulus of his martial lyrics.

Walt Whitman is altogether another sort of man, having no sectional predilections, no hankering anxieties, no portable advocacy, and little sentiment. He is a child of nature, and of nature in a rude state. He has forced himself to believe that stretched on his back beneath a burning sun is the proper attitude for the *vates* of a nation whose *forte* is confessedly "loafing and writing poems." Whitman has had the diversified, chequered, and somewhat wild career of a farmer's son—has been almost anything, from a clodhopper to a poet—passing through the stages of government clerk, printer, and editor. He has proved himself a modern Ulysses with a "bee in his bonnet"

(let it be seen whether there will not be much honey by-and-by), always roaming with a hungry heart, seeing much of men and manners, *feeling* much of climates and governments, himself far from least, and yet receiving honour from no one save a few daring friends. Ulysses surely in all but the honour that will come hereafter.

Yet it may well be asked, is he a true soul fit for the work he has set before him? We venture to say, that in all likelihood the verdict of the future will be given in his favour. He is endowed with the very qualities and capacity essential to the achievement of any original masterpiece. Over his writing-table he has pinned a slip of paper with the words on it "*Make the Work.*" This resolve he anxiously keeps before him, and in this quaint remembrancer we see the man and his lofty purpose. In "Leaves of Grass" he hopes to indicate that American genius may reach the supreme arch of song without any reliance on foreign assistance. That he has himself succeeded so far without calling for such aid is indisputable; it remains, however, to be seen, whether the "setting" of his thoughts will accord with the taste of a new generation, or whether he will be able to modify their taste to his will. At present, indeed, he is a literary Ishmael, although rich in the praise and good opinion of Emerson. Of Whitman's "Leaves of Grass" Emerson has said that it is "the most extraordinary piece of wit and wisdom that America has yet contributed." And certainly it is like everything he has written—exceptionally original, and in a sense vividly natural—fresh, hopeful, self-reliant. His mind rolls out its waves of thought, and they buffet against the conventionalism of the age. This he desires, this he aims at, and in this he succeeds.

But in Walt Whitman, as elsewhere in America, originality rushes off at a tangent. Angularities of character and eccentricities of conduct are as common there as dull uniformity is among ourselves. This eccentricity is an after-growth, and in some measure an exotic. Still, planted where it is it buds and blooms with marvellous frequency. In American female character we have the fullest and surest exemplification of its extravagance. The irritable, the bellicose, and the loquacious women of the New World all aid us in penetrating the secret. And when we find the secret, it is merely a rampant and uncontrolled ambition. While there are some appearances of an influence such as Mrs. Hutchinson or Hannah More would have exercised, there is a twin petulance and forwardness allied therewith, to which these virtuous and high-minded writers could never have condescended. From the transcendental bluestockings to the excited and irritable advocates of woman's rights, the peaceful have much to bear with in America; but it is some relief to

know that there is a pleasing and joyful sisterhood of song discouraging this pretentiousness and desperate voicefulness. The most charming is Mrs. Sigourney, whose "Songs of the Affections" fill the heart like a sudden joy or sorrow, and picture a life serenely pure and homely.

The influence of the Germans upon American prose literature is even more perceptible than upon the poetry. Contact with an age of which Goethe was the ruling spirit has had its due effect in deepening the channels of American thought. Emerson is the most illustrious of this Teutonic school; but of him, we repeat, we cannot attempt to say much at present. But this much—no Teuton could be more subjective. Emerson sits under the tree planted by Fichte. His essays sparkle with many real brilliants; and there is in his "English Traits" an ease and fluency quite refreshing, because so seldom to be met with in the sententiousness and aphoristic pith of his characteristic style.

There is the development of an opposite nature in Benjamin Franklin. In every sense he is the antithesis of Emerson. The one is the typical new man of a new nation, caring nothing and affected little by "old experience," or the history and prejudice of the past; working for the realization of his own conception of truth; defying alike systems old and new, yet drawing his inspiration from a keen contemplation of foreign *mind*. The other is the American of the Americans. His works are the index to the country's success, and the best criterion of its ability. Everywhere he was the *civis Americanus*, and by precept and example, and that without the aid or advantage of knowledge gained by regulated and scholastic training, did much to win for America an individually distinctive character. Nor did he hesitate to appropriate whatever he came across and esteemed of value. He learnt in London what he improved and converted to use in Philadelphia. It may be said that Franklin brought philosophy down from heaven, and applied it to the cutting of timber, the building of houses, and the settlement of fiscal affairs. His was the early myriad-mind of America, and utility was its leading feature. The origin of America's mechanical superiority, as of its mercenary thrift, is to be found in Franklin's everyday philosophy. When he sent forth sheets of maxims and suggestions, he looked for immediate and important results; for he knew well that such agents would materially temper the events to come. Essays, tracts, letters, almanacks, and reports were issued by him, bearing the stamp of a nationality, or at least what stood for a nationality, that he himself had mainly created.

There is another American to whom we may allude in passing. His name is venerated by his countrymen, for few did more than

Dr. Channing to foster a fine taste, to promote originality, and to purify American literature. Certainly his influence on higher thought is not to be compared with the intense and efficient influence previously wielded by Dr. Jonathan Edwards. To Edwards, indeed, the heaviest tribute may be paid. In no sense was he a charlatan or a commonplace thinker. He was the exalted type of a metaphysician and theologian in one, and while he has found no fit successor in America, he has challenged, merited, and sustained a high and abiding reputation in the Old World. But Edwards was not strictly an American. Long before the Republic had been dreamt of he had won the fame which he bequeathed as a treasure to his native colony. Channing was born under other auspices, gloried in his birth, and was proud to write a sketch of the young literature which he hopefully proclaimed the beginning of a mighty national monument. Channing's religion was the religion of common life in America. He interblended politics and religion, and breathed into his every sermon, criticism, and lecture the free and dauntless spirit of a good enthusiast and patriot.

These were essayists in the lofty sense. But as a rule, the essay is the latest product of any literary age. It is the signet in the ring of literature by which the age is characteristically impressed. It betokens leisure and polish. An age of leisure may bring with it habits of luxury and indolence, yet without it there can be no hope for the production of a permanent literature. Among the Romans, as among all the ancients, the *vita umbratica* was an acknowledged incident of pre-eminence in letters. Those who run may read, but those who write will find running hopelessly impossible. The Americans, with excellent models at hand, have given us essays of a high order. They have culled their bouquets from our trim Addisonian garden—*Floriferis ut apes in saltibus omnia libant.*

The periodical essays in the *North American Review* and the *Atlantic Monthly*, for instance, are in every sense equal to the best in our own reviews. There is an occasional tartness about them, but they are seldom deficient in knowledge, in wide appreciative sympathy and critical acumen. And this excellence is found in both the critical and creative essays. Emerson is at the head of one class, and Washington Irving is at the head of the other class. But Emerson's merits and idiosyncrasies are not to be mapped out in the few sentences we could now devote to him, and Washington Irving speaks in England for himself. From the sketches of "Rip Van Winkle" and "The Wife" to the meditations upon books and Westminster Abbey, is a *gradus* which covers much of the finest prose writing in the English language. Again, Poe and Wirt are the antipodes of each other.

Poe's essay style was keen and incisive. Wirt, on the other hand, is almost a gushing writer, with much to say that he says well, and with the true instinct of an eloquent preacher turned essayist. Wirt has written many moral essays which endow him with a reputation inferior to few since the time of Dr. Johnson.

The antecedents of the Americans, as well as their surroundings and habits of life, seem more favourable to the existence of romance and the novel than they are in reality. A new country, fresh associations, and incidental originality may appear admirable and inevitable inspirers of this kind of literature; but on reflection few will doubt that Eld is the *open sesame*, and that there is nothing but the form *novel*. The want of memories and of even the echo of "ancestral voices," most assuredly damps and painfully discourages the new-born power. And, admittedly, in our day nothing more delights Americans than the perusal of a Waverley Novel, or "Nicholas Nickleby," or "Vanity Fair:" the life depicted is so unlike theirs, they cannot but be attracted and interested. "'Chevy Chase,' 'Ivanhoe,' and the 'Orlando Furioso,'" says an American reviewer, "may be read to-day in Wisconsin; but America reads them as she reads 'Æsop's Fables.' It is true," he adds, "that we have no past, no mist, no myths. We had one hero of romance, but his name was John Smith." Nevertheless, it is natural and humanly unavoidable for any people to read without discovering somewhere among them emulative spirits ready to try a fall in the same path. But for the most part they will be wilful or unconscious imitators. So of America. There, however, the novel is somewhat peculiar and indigenous. There can be no question about either its reality or paternity: for the scenery is made wild and expansive enough, and the opinions sufficiently extravagant; and, like ourselves, the Americans have a few names who do them honour. Their libraries, like our own, are flooded with trashy ravings in three volumes courteously called novels; but their literature, like our own, is enriched by only a few true novelists.

Charles Brockden Browne has the merit of having been the first to give strength and permanency to American fiction. Yet, his works significantly betray the defects common to all novels hurriedly written for sensational effect. Although his style is graphic, he is too often verbose, prolix, and ludicrously indulgent in hyperbole. Perhaps it is enough to say, that despite appalling disadvantages he contrived to produce twenty-four volumes of fiction in ten years. In Browne's works, indeed, we reckon up, in a manner, the impatience, daring, haste, recklessness, and other conspicuous blemishes of American literature. In his "Wieland" we have the delineation of passions as they affect "a mind constitutionally excitable." This, with his "Ormond," furnishes an ample view of the character and state of transatlantic

society in his time, and of its tendency at present, if we allow for occasional wildness and eccentricity. In "Edgar Huntly" somnambulism is the theme, as in "Wieland" ventriloquism, and in other works of his and his countrymen—"spiritualism." "Edgar Huntly" is in fact an apparent effort at mental analysis, coloured by the most improbable theories and the most daring imaginings. But "Arthur Mervyn" is in our opinion Browne's most characteristic production. It is a well-written story, with characters discriminately and powerfully drawn, yet it is withal repellent in its sickening recital of the fearful days of the yellow fever year.

Between Cooper and Browne there are few marks of resemblance. Browne aims at more exactitude, and prides himself on a sort of philosophy which, if not profound, is not altogether unsound; Cooper gives fuller rein to his imagination, and revels more in fervid and elaborate description, sedulously avoiding the dreary flights of fancy so congenial to his compeer. In their treatment of Indian life the difference between them is significantly manifest. In everything Cooper has done there is an evidence of ease and something of an artist's touch—both peculiarities foreign to Browne. Hence Cooper's portraiture of Indian life and character is truer and more finished. Browne has seized the deformities, Cooper the romantic and better side of Indian character; and the impression left by Browne is that the Indian is worse than he is in reality; by Cooper that he is better and more noble. Indeed, it may be noted as Cooper's prime characteristic that he never, and can never, fail to describe the scenery, society, and life around him; for his temperament and his training alike fitted him for the enjoyable task. His spirit was thoroughly American, and to his books, more perhaps than to any others, we go to seek for all that can be rightly termed national. Yet Cooper was more of a landscape than a portrait painter. And this is not to be regretted: not merely because it was the secret of his success as a national writer, but also because American character has even now less peculiarity than has, and had the scenery, and the primitive life of the aborigines. There are, however, some exceptions to this. Leatherstocking and Tom Coffin are as immortal as any of the renowned personages of fiction. Cooper's undiminished popularity in the Old World is a certain guarantee of the breadth of power and the varied attractiveness which first won for him the applause of readers in every land.

On Hawthorn's old-world narratives and charming pictures of home life, we regret we have not space here to dwell, for a few sentences would convey but a faint and miserable notion of his excellences. Nor of Poe's (as a writer of fiction), whose tales have—

> "Much of crime and more of sin
> And *horror* the soul of the plot"—

may we now speak, for we must conclude.

As we have seen, many causes are at work to retard the growth of a truly national literature in America. But the time for it must come. Any delay should rather be welcomed than regarded as a source of discouragement and hopelessness. In the words of one of their most sensible men, there is both reason and comfort. Russell Lowell writes:—"We shall have to be content for a good while yet with our provincialism, and must strive to make the best of it. In it lies the germ of nationality, and that is, after all, the prime condition of all thoroughbred greatness of character . . . . Should we ever attain to a conscious nationality, it will have the advantage of lessening the number of our great men, and widening our appreciation to the larger scale of the two or three that are left, if there should be so many!" Howsoever this may be, one feature of the nation's life will always be more striking than the rest. Liberty is the crowning glory of that life, and the vital principle of the literature of the country. The Americans claim it as a peculiar birthright, and we may admit that they are not unworthy of it.

Art. III.—A Partial Remedy for the Pressure of "Local Taxation," arising from the Execution of Sanitary Works.

The Report of the Committee of the House of Commons on Local Taxation.

TAXATION is a subject which, if broached, is almost sure to awaken a desire on the part of nearly every one to say something, and that something will most likely be a complaint of some kind. There may, perhaps, be men who take a pleasure in paying taxes; but if any such really do exist, they surely must be very few. The greater portion of British householders have a deeply rooted antipathy to taxes. It seems as natural for paterfamilias to inveigh against the rates as it is for a cat and dog on meeting, unless they have been previously and decorously introduced to each other, to commence to quarrel. Taxation is a question which comes home to each one; and is consequently a subject in which all are interested, and on which many grow eloquent, especially at the present time, when the country is said to be over-burdened with what is technically termed "local taxation:" we therefore intend to point out one means of lessen-

ing, to some extent, that burden. But, before doing so, it may not be unprofitable to say a little on the general subject.

There are different kinds of taxation, but they all come under one or other of two great classes: all taxes are either direct or indirect. It is, however, intended to discuss some points in connexion with the former class only, and not to deal with the latter class of imposts. But in the class of direct taxation a great subdivision is also in general held to exist; for direct taxation is looked upon as being subdivided into "imperial taxation" and "local taxation." The term "imperial taxation" is generally intended to include those taxes which are founded on the annual budget of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and are levied by the direction of Parliament throughout the country, and in most instances by imperial officers, while the term "local taxation" applies to those taxes (or, as they are more commonly called, rates) which are not sanctioned annually by Parliament, and which are levied within certain prescribed areas by persons appointed by a properly constituted authority having jurisdiction for some special purpose or purposes within those areas. And it is of this latter subdivision, which, as before stated, is technically termed "local taxation," that it is proposed to treat.

But before dealing with the acknowledged system of local taxation, it may, perhaps, be well to consider whether there really is that wide, almost generic, distinction which is generally held to exist between the so-called "imperial taxation" and the so-called "local taxation," at any rate so far as the execution of sanitary works, to which our present remarks apply, is concerned.

It is true that the rates collected by local authorities are not looked upon as imperial taxes, but is this a right view to take of the matter? The answer surely must be—No! for it cannot but be held that these rates, not being collected for the benefit of any private individuals, but to meet expenditure incurred for the good of the public at large, are as much imperial as those collected for the immediate use of the State for the same object. It is also true that these funds are not administered by imperial officers, yet they are administered in a manner prescribed by Parliament, and by persons indirectly appointed by Parliament.

There is, in connexion with this part of the subject, a point which is generally lost sight of, even if it has ever been advanced; and that point is, that the so-called local authorities are neither more nor less than the agents of the legislature. There is not, it is true, in the various Acts of Parliament which create and govern these bodies, provision for direct and immediate governmental supervision of all the actions of local authorities; and, perhaps, this omission has led people to assume that local authorities are irresponsible bodies. This, however, is not a

right view to take of their position. If it were a right view to take, it would be just as reasonable to say that the Commissioners of Customs and the Commissioners of Inland Revenue are irresponsible bodies. Local authorities, like the Commissioners above referred to, derive from Parliament their powers to levy and collect the taxes which they impose; and this being so, wherein consists the real difference? It is a fact that all local rates are collected by locally appointed officers, while the so-called imperial taxes are for the most part collected by imperial officers; yet even this is not universally the case, for the officers for collecting the income and (what are generally known as) assessed taxes, are appointed by the inhabitants of the districts wherein those officers act. So that this distinction does not universally apply to the so-called "imperial taxes."

It does not appear, therefore, that there is any essential difference as to the true title which should be given to these two kinds of imposts, for they seem to be members of one family; the difference appearing to consist solely in the kind of agent which the Legislature uses to collect and dispense its imposts. Parliament urges, and urges rightly, that it cannot undertake all the works necessary for the good of the country, and so it delegates to local authorities powers to see to the execution of a portion of its public duties. It makes the local authorities, within their respective areas, its agents for the execution of work of certain descriptions. In some instances the work has reference to sanitary matters, and in other instances the work has reference to the care of the poor; and if the expenditure of local authorities were supervised (as it ought to be) by a Government Department, which should examine the accounts themselves on behalf of the Government as well as on behalf of the ratepayers, responsibility to Government would then be a reality. If something of this kind were done, and Government itself were instrumental in advancing the moneys,—a point to which reference will presently be made,—the relationship of principal and agents, as between Government and local authorities, would be thoroughly established. It would also become patent that it is a fallacy to consider as non-imperial taxes, rates levied locally for general improvement, for it must be a fallacy unless it can be indisputably shown that the good resulting from the expenditure of the money thus raised is confined within the limits wherein the amount is raised, is for the sole benefit of private individuals, and is not shared by neighbouring localities. When the benefit resulting from any works of this kind ceases to be a matter of private or mere local interest, and becomes one of public interest, it also becomes an imperial matter; for imperial concerns are in reality matters which have bearing upon the good of the whole country; and

the proper action taken by local sanitary authorities, while of paramount concern to the immediate locality, must be also of great benefit to the community at large. This being so, it is manifestly unjust to make these authorities do work which should be done by Government—for sanitary works are for the general good, and their execution should not be left to become a matter of choice or fancy—therefore it is, we repeat, unjust to make these authorities do the Government work, and at the same time impose upon them for doing it a penalty such as is now imposed. It would be equally just to compel each of the counties of England to provide separately all the necessaries for its own defence against invasion, and say that the matter is not a national one, as it is to compel local authorities to do sanitary works which intimately bear upon the country's good, and say the matter is not a national one.

Take, for example, that immense line of fortifications at Portsmouth, which must have cost thousands upon thousands of pounds, and all to insure the safety of that small portion of the country in which one of our naval arsenals stands. This, it would not be denied, is an *imperial* matter; and yet it is equally a *local* matter, with the execution of works for the drainage of the town. There is this difference, however, between them: the fortifications are to meet a *possible future* danger to the locality, whereas the drainage works are to meet a *positive present* danger to the same locality. It seems to us that the two matters are as nearly as possible identical in principle, though looked upon as being so very different.

Then again, local authorities are not free agents: they can do only certain works; they can levy only certain moneys in particular ways; and can apply the money to particular purposes only: all of these limitations being prescribed by Parliament. These are some of the reasons for advancing the doctrine that the work of local sanitary authorities is deputed governmental work, and that therefore those authorities are justly entitled to every assistance from the Treasury and from Parliament.

Let us now consider the question of the manner of raising the money which local authorities require for the execution of sanitary works; for in this matter the Government can very materially assist local authorities and relieve local taxpayers.

The present system of raising the money—if the law is strictly adhered to, but which, doubtless, in some instances has not always been the case—is, stating it briefly, that the local authority obtains permission from the Home Secretary to borrow on the security of the rates certain sums for the execution of certain specified permanent works. This consent being obtained, the authority borrows the money where it can and at what rate of

interest it pleases, for there is no limitation as to where it is to be got or as to what is to be paid for the accommodation. There is no supervision at all over this portion of the money transactions of local authorities—not even the pseudo-official supervision provided by the so-called audit of the accounts—and the ratepayers consequently have no guarantee that the money is procured in the cheapest market; but the money having been procured, and the rates mortgaged, the ratepayers must, *nolentes volentes*, find the money. What is the consequence of this? The nominal rate of interest at which the money is borrowed varies from 4½ to 7 per cent. We say nominal rate, because we suppose there are charges incidental to the borrowing which must be met in the shape of interest on the principal.

It seems that this rate of interest is a higher one than should be paid, and that a great economy might be brought about by another system for local authorities to procure the funds which they require to execute sanitary works. The percentages which are paid are, as we have just stated, varying in their rates, but the generality of the loans are procured at 5 per cent., a high rate, especially when we consider the nature of the security which is offered, and which is second to none in the country. The rates levied in a locality are charged with the interest on, and repayment of, the loans of money for defraying the cost of the works carried out in it. There is not much likelihood of the locality, as in private cases, being bankrupt, and so getting rid of a charge, no matter how equitable, but the reverse is the fact; for if one person cannot pay his quota of liability, it must be and is made good by those who can pay; the liability is a joint and several liability, and one which cannot be got rid of except by payment. This being so, no better security could in reality be offered to the capitalist for his money. And this is, to some extent, borne out by the fact that local authorities do not experience much difficulty in getting money at 5 per cent. when they want it. Under these circumstances we think, as we have said before, that local authorities do not get their money at so cheap a rate as they ought, nor at so cheap a rate as they might. It is a well-known fact that the code of rectitude of corporations is somewhat elastic, and that where responsibility is much divided the same regard is not paid to the advantages to be gained in a commercial enterprise as would be paid if private individuals were the parties concerned; and as there is no supervision over the loans, there is no guarantee for their being procured in the cheapest market. This is not as it should be, and to obviate this, and to insure for the ratepayers as little expense as possible, we draw attention to the following scheme, which, if it or some scheme like it were adopted, would be of great benefit to the country at large; for, by its

adoption, sanitary works would not cost so much, and this saving would be brought about without the least sacrifice of their goodness or utility.

The scheme which we propose may be stated in a very few words. It is this,—that Government should in every case find, either directly or indirectly, the money for the execution of sanitary works, and that it should be made compulsory on local authorities to go to the Government for their funds; for experience has taught us that a permissive power, in matters of sanitary interest, is not always used in the manner in which it should be. We therefore have no hesitation in saying that in order to secure the proper execution of any direction of this kind, beneficial as it must be to the localities themselves, the legislature must make it imperative.

Before stating more particularly the scheme we propose for thus assisting local authorities, it would be as well perhaps to give briefly the manner in which the repayment of the loans referred to is to be made.

As a rule the loans are obtained for a period of thirty years (but in some cases they are for a less period, and in some other cases the repayment is made to extend over a period of fifty years), and are liquidated in as many equal annual instalments as the loan has years to run, thus making the payment a kind of terminable annuity. Another way in which local authorities may repay the money borrowed is by means of a sinking fund formed by reserving a certain portion of each of the rates levied on which the mortgage is made. The latter mode is, we believe, seldom if ever adopted. But as our object is to suggest another method of raising, and not of repaying, the money required for sanitary works, and to inquire whether some other and cheaper method cannot be devised for administering to the pecuniary wants of those bodies who are charged with the execution of sanitary works, there is no need to discuss further the manner of repayment. The present method of borrowing of private companies and individuals is a very expensive one for the borrowers, and necessitates the payment of a much higher rate of interest for the accommodation than should be paid, and than would be paid under the plan now proposed.

The amount sanctioned by the Secretary of State to be borrowed for sanitary purposes under the Public Health, Local Government, Sanitary and Sewage Utilization Acts, has, to the end of last year, been in round numbers, nearly 8,500,000*l.* Let us see what amount will have been paid in interest for these loans by the time they are repaid. If we take the average rate of interest to be 5 per cent. for thirty years, and the mode of payment to be that usually adopted, the interest during the term will

amount to a trifle more than $95\frac{1}{8}$ per cent., or, in other words, there will be paid for this eight millions and a half, interest to the amount of 8,085,625*l.*;* and it is with this large sum that we propose that Government, by advancing to local authorities money for sanitary purposes, should deal. There would no doubt be difficulty, and we fully recognise the difficulty, in letting local authorities have funds without any consideration; but that local authorities should be compelled to be, as they are, made a market of in the execution of what is really Government work, is not just. We therefore propose that they should have the money advanced to them by Government at a maximum rate of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. So that in the advance of an amount similar to that above, the sum which would have been paid to the exchequer at the termination of the loans would be about 5,659,937*l.*, while the local taxpayers would be relieved of 2,425,687*l.* of taxation. Surely that scheme is worthy of consideration which has for its object the improvement of the health of the country, an increase of the revenue, and the decrease of the burden imposed upon local taxpayers.

The methods by which it is suggested that Government might assist local authorities, are as follows:—

I. By advancing the sums required by such authorities out of some special fund, or out of the moneys received by the Government on account of the Post Office Life Insurances, and the Post Office Savings Banks; or,

II. By borrowing the moneys as annuities terminable at the date at which the loan required would terminate.

To adopt the first of these two methods of aiding local authorities, there might possibly be difficulties of a financial nature which would have to be overcome, and these difficulties might be very great. It might perhaps be necessary to set aside, so to speak, for the purpose a portion of the revenue of the country, which might be more usefully employed. This first proposal, therefore, is not one in whose favour much experience can be adduced, and therefore little more can be said of it than that, to one not intimate with all the intricacies of Imperial finance, it does not appear an impracticable way of affording that help which would be of such undeniable benefit; and if this former of the two propositions referred to were adopted, the profit to the Exchequer would certainly appear to be greater than if the second method pointed out were followed. It must, of course, be borne in mind, that the *whole* of the amount receivable for interest would not be profit, unless the money were not required for other necessary purposes which would not bring in a return.

But should Government not see its way clear to act as sug-

* The interest is calculated at $95\frac{1}{8}$ per cent., but the real rate is a fraction of a shilling per cent. more.

gested in No. I., and, so to speak, form a fund from which money might be lent to local authorities for sanitary works, there is yet that other method, No. II., by which the requirements of these bodies may be met (and though apparently at a diminished profit to the country, still at a profit), and which is, that Government borrow the funds necessary, and lend to local authorities at a slightly advanced rate of interest.

This last plan (which we think the one most likely to be easily carried out) is, in short, that Government should borrow money on terminable annuities, to run thirty years or fifty years, as the case may be, paying interest at 3¼ per cent. (at which rate the Government can get the money, as will be seen hereafter), and should then lend it to local authorities on the same principle of payment, but at 3½ per cent, and that local authorities should be forbidden by Act of Parliament to procure their money from any other source.

But perhaps this suggestion may be met by some with a cry against giving more power to the Executive by centralization, and those who would thus cry against the system which we are now advocating, would possibly prefer to pay the extra taxation than to dispel the phantom which their heated imaginations had conjured up. The principal portion of the taxpayers would, on the other hand, recognise the benefit which must result to them by the change in the system, and would at once perceive that they must individually profit by it in the shape of reduced taxation. The benefit which must result to the taxpayer by local authorities being able to procure their funds at a comparative rate of interest of 30 per cent. less than they usually pay, and without any fees for commission and charges for mortgage deeds, will be so apparent to the generality of persons, that further time need not be devoted to discussing the point.

On the Government side also, perhaps, something may be said against the scheme and the propositions contained in it. First, Government may say that it is not possible to create a fund whence local authorities may have assistance in the shape of loans; then next, it may say that the proposal to use for this purpose the money paid in on account of Post Office Life Insurances and Post Office Savings Banks must be so fluctuating in its amount that advances could not be made out of the money received on those accounts, for such long periods as local authorities would require them. This may be so, for there are exchequer questions intimately affected, and it may be governed, by the sums which may be received under these two heads. Thirdly, Government may say that, even admitting there are these sources to draw from, still there are financial reasons why the thing cannot be so done as to enable the tax-payer to reap a benefit commensurate with the trouble which the necessary al

terations will cause. All these may be true of proposal No. I., though we are far from wishing to say that we think such is the case, or that Government would put forward such reasons for declining to give in this way to local taxpayers that relief which we are advocating for them. We merely hint that such reasons might occur to the Government why this part of the scheme should not be supported, for we can scarcely be in a position to say whether such reasons would be adduced against the proposal. But with regard to proposal No. II., this argument could scarcely be used by the Government.

Speaking of the abstract question, it may perhaps be said that Government could not lend money at any cheaper rate than private persons, if indeed it could lend it at as cheap a rate. But this objection has already been answered, even before it is raised, by the fact that Government *has* lent money for sanitary purposes at 3½ per cent.,* and that, instead of any deficiency having resulted, the Government gained by the transaction at least ¼ per cent. per annum on the amounts advanced, though very often more, for the real profit to the Government has been ruled by the difference between the price of Exchequer Bills and the 3½ per cent. The occasion to which reference is made is that of the Cotton Famine in Lancashire, resulting from the Civil War in America.

In the year 1863, Mr. R. Rawlinson, C.B., one of the Engineering Inspectors of the Home Office, was directed by Sir George Grey (then Home Secretary) to proceed to the cotton districts to inspect "the towns and their suburbs, and ascertain the character of the drainage, the quantity and quality of the water supplied, the condition of the streets, the provision made for parks or pleasure grounds for the recreation of the inhabitants, and the general sanitary arrangements of each locality." He was also directed to form an "opinion as to what works of utility, profit, or ornament were capable of being executed." The following, in Mr. Rawlinson's words, may be taken as the essence of his opinion on this subject:—he said,

"The question of loans to towns must at once be considered; loans to be made on estimates for useful works, on the security of the entire local rateable property of the district petitioning for such loan. If Government can pass a short Act (independent of the Local Government Act) to enable money to be advanced at some fraction per cent. more than will secure the country from loss, work may be found for every able-bodied distressed operative now out of work, and the districts will be permanently benefited. Property will be improved, and the sanitary state of every locality operated upon will be vastly bettered. Local rates will be reduced, and the Registrar General will find the effects in an improved value to life now and in future years."

* Some has been lent, we believe, at as low a rate as 3 per cent.

The "Public Works (manufacturing districts) Act, 1863," Vict. 26 and 27, c. 70, may be taken as the result of Mr. Rawlinson's report, for it is stated in the preamble that "it is expedient to make provisions for better enabling local authorities therein [in the counties of Derby, Chester, and Lancaster] to give employment by the execution of works of public utility and sanitary improvement." The necessity which then existed in the cotton districts for providing works and food for distressed operatives is at the present time, and pretty generally throughout the country, equally pressing for ordinary labourers; and it is a matter worthy of consideration whether, instead of shipping off to other countries cargoes of working men, occupation in sanitary works might not be found for them, on a similar principle to that in force in the cotton districts at the time of the famine. The title to the Act states its object to be, amongst other things, to authorize for the purposes of the Act "advances of public money to a limited amount upon security of local rates," and clause 3 of the Act provides that "the interest payable in respect of every such loan under this Act shall be at the rate of three pounds ten shillings per centum per annum." That this system of loans was a success is indisputable; for in the following year (1864) the operation of the Act was extended in time, and the amount authorized to be advanced was increased from 1,200,000*l.* to 1,550,000*l.*;* the extending Act setting forth, as a reason for extending the time for making, and for increasing the sum total of the advances, that "great benefits have been derived therefrom." And in not a single instance, we believe, has any delay occurred in the repayment of the instalments as they have become due. It is, therefore, quite certain that Government can, without loss, advance money for sanitary works at 3½ per cent., and that by so doing the country will be very much benefited.

Though the arguments here adduced have had more especial reference to the Loans to Local Sanitary Authorities, what has been stated with regard to these authorities holds equally good of the loans contracted by the destitution authorities—the boards of guardians—for the purposes of permanent works under the Poor Law Acts.

But the question as affecting the Metropolis is not discussed here; for the Metropolis is governed in this matter in a manner different to the rest of the country.

It will thus be seen that the present scheme of assisting local authorities is built upon a good foundation of practical expe-

* In addition to this amount the sum of 300,000*l.* was advanced by Government without going to Parliament, so that the amount lent was really more; the actual amount advanced was 1,766,515*l.*

rience, and that there exists for its fulfilment that authority so much valued by imperial officialism,—precedent; for the course of action which we are now advocating has been pursued with reference to a part of England, and with success. And this being so, one is led to ask, why should not the same principle be acted upon with reference to other parts of the country? It has been shown that during the cotton famine in Lancashire, Cheshire and Derbyshire, when pauperism and poverty were very rife, the scheme was practically carried out; that many works of public utility were executed which, but for the facilities afforded by the Government would perhaps not have been done; that legal pauperism was reduced in amount; and that the populations received food, not in idleness or doled out as charity, but in money as wage worked for and earned, and that they were thereby enabled to keep themselves and their families from becoming a burden on the poor rates. Why then, one is led to inquire, when all this was accomplished during a short time, in a portion of England, is it not to be done for the rest of the country and done always? Why are Lancashire and Cheshire and Derbyshire to get money for their public works through the instrumentality of the Government at one rate of interest, and why are other parts of the country compelled, for want of that assistance, to obtain their money for the same description of works at a comparative increase of 30 per cent. in that rate?

It must surely strike one that Government, having tried this scheme which is now being advocated, of assisting local authorities to procure money at a low rate of interest, and found it successful—both as regards the Government and as regards the taxpayer—cannot consistently make a retrograde movement, or refuse to advance along the road on which it has made so successful a start. It has been proved that Government could with profit lend money at 3½ per cent., and at a time when there was much panic and scarcity, and therefore it becomes, we venture to submit, the duty of the Government to recommence and continue a course of action which will be so beneficial to the country—(for it has undoubtedly, by enabling sanitary improvements to be made, increased the health of the country and saved many persons from sickness and death)—a gain to the Exchequer, and a relief to the over-burdened taxpayer.

In order to show the enormous sum which will have to be paid before the subsisting and previously-existing loans will have become liquidated, we give the following figures, which represent, sufficiently near for the purpose, the amount which will have been raised for those works only which had been undertaken up to the end of last year.

	Principal.	Interest.
Under Public Health, Local Government, and Sewage Acts .	£8,500,000	£8,085,625
Under Poor Law Acts	8,204,000	7,804,055
Totals . . .	£16,704,000	£15,889,680
Total principal		16,704,000
* Total cost of works		£32,593,680

CONCLUSIONS.

The points sought to be brought into prominence are:—

I. That, from the taxpayer's point of view, there is no difference between the taxation called "Local" and the taxation called "Imperial," and that the taxpayer may therefore reasonably expect the Treasury of the country to assist local authorities in executing the sanitary works which Parliament has directed them to carry out.

II. That by the present system of so-called "local taxation," much needless expense is imposed upon localities:—

(*a*) in the execution of permanent works under the Public Health, Local Government, Sanitary and Sewage Utilization Acts, and

(*b*) in the execution of permanent works under the Poor Law Acts.

III. That, by an alteration of the present system under which local authorities (local boards, vestries, boards of guardians) borrow money, Government may, without risk, beneficially employ some of its funds, and at the same time relieve local taxpayers of a considerable amount of taxation.

IV. That Government might advance to local authorities the money required for permanent works of a sanitary kind on the present system, but at the rate of 3½ per cent. interest, the rate of interest hitherto paid having generally been 5 per cent.

[N.B. Had this course been adopted from the first, there would have been a saving to taxpayers, under the Acts above referred to, of 4,766,904*l.*; and at the same time there might have been a profit to the Exchequer of 11,122,776*l.*]

and to suggest—

V. That Government might utilize, for the proposed purpose,

---

* It must be remembered that this sum does not include any of the expenditure under the Metropolis Local Management Act, nor the expenditure in Lancashire, Cheshire, and Derbyshire, under the Special Act referred to. We cannot give the amount under the former Act, but in the latter instance it was 1,766,515*l.*, exclusive of interest.

the moneys received on account of Post Office Life Insurances and Post Office Savings Banks, or

VI. That Government should for this purpose lend, as it did to places in Lancashire at the time of the Cotton Famine (*i.e.*, on terminable annuities) money borrowed by it, or on its guarantee.

The report of the Committee appointed by the House of Commons, in consequence of the outcry against the present system of local taxation, is scarcely the one to give satisfaction. Although the reference of the House of Commons was a very narrow one, the public were not prepared to have proposed to them that the relief sought should be afforded by shifting a portion of the burden from one pair of shoulders to another. By all means divide the burden; but it is equally, if not more, important to lessen the total burden which has to be borne. This part of the question was not dealt with by the Committee, their consideration having been principally given to the question whether the householder or the house-owner should be the payer of the local taxes, or whether the payment should be divided between them. In our opinion, the primary point to be decided is, in what way the amount of local taxation can be reduced; and, in this sense, we put forward our scheme, which, if carried out, will be one means of affording relief to the payers of local taxes.

Art. IV.—John Wesley's Cosmogony.

1. *Wesley's Sermons.*
2. *Watson's Institutes of Theology.*
3. *Third Wesleyan Catechism, for the use of Youths and Adults.*
4. *Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures.* 1st vol.
5. *Minutes of the Wesleyan Conference.*

It is interesting to trace the impetus which has given to self-styled orthodoxy its antagonism to modern science. But it should be remembered that the former term is only comparative. Discoveries in various branches of science have from time to time necessitated small concessions, so that the less extreme among evangelical thinkers are always in the act of giving way. These bear about the same relation to the more rigid, non-conceding divines that the Conservatives of Disraeli's school do to the old-fashioned country Tories! And, just as we have a remnant of the latter who are only too ready to recall Protectionist and

other notions when they suppose the modern theories are giving way—so do we meet with stern, plenary-inspiration believing evangelists who are first to cast stones at the glass houses of scientific theorizing. Perhaps their quondam associates, on such occasions, are only too ready to hand the missiles, even if they are not caught in the assault!

It is a melancholy fact that, disguised under the semblance of devoutly standing by the truth, there has always been a section of human nature eager to resist all progress, unless first of all it be submitted to a certain method. This is the case just now with scientific deductions and evangelical thought. The former are regarded by this school with the utmost suspicion, and every opportunity is taken either to shirk conclusions or unheedingly to pass them by. The spirit which animated the ancient Hebrews when they ignored the superintendence of Jehovah over the affairs of any other nation than their own, is far from being extinct. The truths of science are regarded as belonging to another order than those of religion, and a civil war is thus continued which threatens never to end. Perhaps among no body of evangelical writers and preachers is there exhibited such a horror of science and free inquiry as among the Wesleyan Methodists. In ascertaining the reasons of this objection, we in reality come to deal with the dislike to scientific research manifested by modern Evangelicalism on the whole. Methodism may be said to be the very citadel of orthodoxy, and in giving to it this place we are well aware that its members will estimate it as the highest compliment which could be passed. It was their boast, during the Colenso controversy, that it was impossible for "unsoundness" to exist within the pale of their church. This we do not doubt; and, as it will throw much light upon the continued hostility of this section of Evangelism to modern science, we purpose first of all to give a brief sketch of the polity of a church so essentially conservative in its tendencies.

The keen nostril for anything "unsound," enjoyed by the older Methodist ministers, is almost ludicrous. To such an extent is it carried that evangelical works written by members of any other sect are approached with the greatest caution, until the word has gone forth that they may be safely read. The machinery for detecting heterodoxy, at the service of the Wesleyan Conference, is as elaborate as any ever employed by Jesuit inquisitors. Methodism has already thrown off many healthy shoots, in each of which we find the family credit for theological soundness sacredly upheld. The marvellous rousing which the Evangelical movement under Wesley and Whitefield gave to Protestantism—is matter of ecclesiastical history. From that day to the present this energetic sect has exercised a very large influence upon the various branches of modern orthodoxy.

Perhaps that influence is now somewhat on the wane, but it is still strong enough to make itself felt for many years to come. But, whatever may be the varying shades of opinion as to modern science outside Methodism, the very charter of its foundations necessitates that it shall always be opposed to new interpretations. Its strong point, as our readers are doubtless aware, is its preaching power. A man possessing natural powers of elocution is, among the Methodists, always sure to obtain a "good circuit"; so that a premium is held up for successful extempore discoursing. Each town or city in Great Britain, according to the strength of the members of the Wesleyan church, is divided by the Conference into one or more "circuits." The outside country villages are dependent upon the preaching power furnished by these centres. Two or more paid or "itinerant" ministers are appointed to each circuit, whilst a complement of lay or "local" preachers is at hand to assist them, and to the latter is chiefly given the village preaching. The Methodist liturgy is very simple, except where the fashionable congregations in large towns have impinged upon the services of the Established Church. The mainstay is the sermon, and as this is always extemporaneous, public speaking is more cultivated among this sect than perhaps among any other. There is consequently an ambition to excel in this, common to all, from the most recently introduced "local preacher" whose name figures on the plan, to the newly-fledged "reverend" fresh from the last Conference ordination! Seeing that preaching is the great forte of Methodism, it is absolutely necessary that those to whom it is committed be "sound" in their theology. The test of this is contained in the various theological works which constitute Methodist divinity—chief among which are Wesley's Sermons, Journal, and Commentary on the New Testament; Watson's Institutes of Theology; and the Catechisms published by the Conference. These are the "Law and the Testimony," and to their infallible utterances every new idea advanced by a preacher, lay or itinerant, paid or unpaid, is referred. Let him be able to prove his ground from these, and he is safe—let him advance anything not borne out by these dread authorities, and his pulpit privileges are in danger, if not absolutely at an end!

The means of bringing an offender to task among the Methodists are second in their elaborateness only to the machinery of tests applied when a young man is anxious to commence preaching, to discover whether he be "sound in his views," and gives proof of "genuine conversion." Let us take the latter method first. The young man, we will suppose, has been a member of the church for some time, a Sunday-school teacher, and perhaps a "leader" at prayer-meetings. By this means his religious fervour has been brought up to high-pressure pitch. He feels he

has a "call" to the ministry, and mentions the matter to the superintendent minister of his circuit. The latter investigates the case, and if it be satisfactory, perhaps allows the aspirant for pulpit honours to "take duty" for a sick lay preacher at some out-of-the-way village. An experienced local preacher is told off to accompany him, his duty being to "report" at the next local preachers' quarterly meeting. Should his report be satisfactory, the young man is put on the "plan" under the heading of "on trial." At the next quarterly meeting he has to undergo a strict examination in his scriptural knowledge, doctrinal views, and spiritual experience; as well as to his intimate acquaintance with the catechisms and Wesley's sermons, especially those on "Original Sin" and "Justification by Faith." Should he pass this test, he is then promoted to the dignity of an accredited local preacher. It is from the ranks of such as these whence are draughted the recruits for the paid ministry. Should our young "local" give signs of unusual ability, or be distinguished for religious fervour, then he may be sounded as to his desire of promotion. As this is frequently the great object of a young lay preacher's ambition, we have the secret of the continued zeal displayed. There is rarely any demurrence on the part of the youth, and so he is gradually passed through the necessary stages. Perhaps he is sent to one of the Wesleyan colleges or institutions at Didsbury or Richmond, where regular tutors are kept to drill the students in theology and elementary classics, &c. Or he may be appointed for a term as a sort of *aide-de-camp*, or assistant to some popular and over-worked preacher, in whose house he stays, and under whose supervision his studies are directed. He eventually makes his appearance before the Conference, in company with other young men on a similar errand. By this time he is supposed to be well grounded in Wesleyan theology, as well as in such accepted orthodox works as Pearson on the Creed, Butler's Analogy, and recently also some knowledge of general literature. Throughout every stage of the examinations which have to be passed before ordination, the utmost care is taken to ensure "soundness" in matters of doctrinal theology, so that every germ of dissent from orthodoxy is ruthlessly nipped. It follows that those who may have honest and intelligent difficulties in the way of accepting all the dogmas, have no chance of admission within the ministerial pale. The "subscription" is no loosely worded one, into which critics like Dr. Lushington and Lord Westbury could break. It is rather after the proverbial law of the Medes and Persians. Nor is the subsequent process of inspection less strict than the initiatory test. For some time after his ordination, the young minister is under tutelage. His spiritual experience, his preaching, his doctrinal views, his general reading, as well as his success as a preacher, are all carefully noted down. Even in years

afterwards, should he show signs of "unsoundness," he is summoned before the magi of the district meeting, and unless he recant is afterwards handed over to the tender mercies of the Conference, whose tribunal of "the Legal Hundred" is as dread as any of Mediæval Venice! Should he maintain his heterodox views, however slightly they may be at variance with the Methodist "Law and Testimony," then he is provisionally exiled to some poor out-of-the-way circuit, where he cannot do much harm, or else he is totally suspended from preaching. The latter is usually found effective enough, for it is rare indeed that a Wesleyan preacher is able to take to any other occupation. He consequently swallows his peculiar notions as best he can, or never airs them except in secret. We have personally known good, honourable, and intelligent men who have been forced to extremes of this kind. Should a minister be bold enough to adhere to his heterodox opinions, then there remains only martyrdom, in the form of expulsion. He is uprooted as a weed which threatened to defile the pure and unsullied orthodoxy handed down from John Wesley!

It will have been seen, from the above brief sketch, that the groundwork of Methodist orthodoxy is its literature. Therefore, fully to understand its influence on the deductions of modern science, it is necessary to examine those particular ideas contained therein which clash most with recent discoveries. In this we shall have the secret of the general opposition and dislike to science undoubtedly manifested by the Wesleyan body as a whole. As that religious sect is now constituted, we have no hesitation in affirming that it is next to impossible for a man to be a strictly orthodox Wesleyan, and to entertain the deductions of modern science as well. This ultra strictness is not in the spirit of their founder. John Wesley was liberal for his time, and had his followers caught the temper with which he was willing to examine and utilize any new discovery, modern Evangelism would hardly be now in such a state of hostility to modern science. Nevertheless, he had a good deal of the Pope in his composition, although this love of power was greatly aggravated by the circumstances which administered to it. He did all that man could for the church he founded. His idea was to surround his original lay and itinerant preachers, few of whom were educated men, with an encyclopædic literature on what he deemed all necessary branches of human knowledge. His sermons became their text-book of theology, and his "Journal" a test of progress in the spiritual life. He found time to draw up French, Latin, and Greek grammars; a treatise on Natural Philosophy, and even a work on kitchen medicine! Possessed with such an intellectual universality, it is no wonder that he gave way to the fashion of the time, and sketched a cosmogony as well. This,

however, is not treated in any particular work, but crops out in his various sermons, several of which are specially devoted to it. At any rate, this cosmogony is firmly believed in by far the majority of his modern disciples, and even to doubt it openly, on the part of young ministers, would be to entail suspicion, if not open reproof. Should any of the latter inquire of his older brethren about the moot points between Wesley's cosmogony and the widely different doctrines taught by modern science, it is most likely he would be put off with the equivocal reply that his "duty was to save souls!" We believe there is in young Methodism a tendency to a more liberal spirit of inquiry, but still we cannot absolve them from the charge of dishonesty which attaches to their method of treating or of ignoring the results of modern science. As before remarked, it is in the "Sermons" more particularly that we are to look for Wesley's ideas as to the physical universe. These still afford material for uneducated lay preachers to draw from, and it is more than probable these antiquated views will be propounded from hundreds of Methodist pulpits next Sunday! We cannot wonder, therefore, that scientific men should be suspiciously regarded, or that the name of science should only be another term for all sorts of opprobrium.

The great bugbear of John Wesley's life was Original Sin. There is, perhaps, more curious information brought together in his treatise on this subject, than in the single work of any other divine. The devil haunted Wesley everywhere; and in his cosmological theories he never hesitated to ascribe every phenomenon in the physical universe, which did not quite agree with his own notions of what ought to be, to diabolical agency! If not directly to this, he certainly is plain enough in his declaration that the whole universe became sinistrally contorted and unhinged at the fall of man! Whereas science is now largely influencing theology, Wesley and his followers made theology to account for science. No other evangelical writer has so thoroughly preached the Gospel according to Milton, in this respect, as he. In his sermon on "The Cause and Cure of Earthquakes," in his characteristically laconic manner, Wesley begins by declaring at the outset that "Sin is the *moral* (sic) cause of earthquakes (whatever their natural cause may be)," and goes on to declare that this cannot be denied by any one who believes the Scriptures! He thus boldly takes the matter into his own hands, and casts the *odium theologicum* on all who differ from him! In the same sermon, a little further on, he repeats this statement by asserting that "Sin is the cause, earthquakes the effect, of God's anger," and tells us that they are "the effect of that curse which was brought upon the earth by the original transgression." No doubt Dr. Daubeny, Mr. Malet, and Mr. Scrope would have been at a loss in applying

this evangelical formula to seismology! Although, as before stated, this branch of Wesleyan cosmogony is held with the same reverence as the moral doctrines of theology, one cannot help seeing how poor,—nay, how *irreverent* it is, when compared to the views which geology offers in its stead! This science plainly shows us that earthquakes have been in operation from the very beginning of our planet's history, ages before man's appearance, and, therefore, long before any possible "fall." It traces to the rents and fissures resulting from their action, the origin of those mineral and metal veins whose contents are so necessary to modern civilization and progress! But Wesley, in the above sermon, tells us they are "God's strange works of judgment; the proper effects and punishment of sin!" And, notwithstanding that science plainly shows how these so-called "judgments" are physical mercies, in relieving the pent-up forces of the earth's interior, yet the majority of evangelical writers adhere to the older view with characteristic tenacity, chiefly because St. Paul declared the "whole creation to be groaning and travailing in pain together until now."

Before dwelling further on this subject, let us examine another of Wesley's sermons, entitled, "God's Approbation of His Works." In this we have a good idea of what the venerable founder of Methodism imagined a perfect physical world ought to be, and, indeed, really was in its paradisiacal state. After showing how the world was composed of the four elementary substances then believed in,—an error which belonged not to the man but to the age,—Wesley very elaborately enters into the wisdom of such a primitive arrangement. Now that chemistry has broken down this crude idea, one cannot help feeling that such finite notions of teleology are anything but safe to reason from. And there can be little doubt that the bare statement of the four elements in this sermon retarded the acceptance of the more complicated facts of modern chemistry among a certain class. Even now, it is not at all uncommon among ardent and half-educated Methodists, who are generally speaking "men of one book," to hear Mr. Wesley's chemical views put before anyone else's. This is the harm of which we complain;—that utterances far more dogmatic than the wildest speculations of science, should be unhesitatingly accepted because they are wedded to foregone theological notions! To return, however, to the subject-matter of the sermon now under consideration. Speaking of the newly created world, Wesley says,—"The earth was good. The whole surface of it was beautiful in an high degree." Even Mr. Ruskin would assent so far, and few geologists would be inclined to differ. But what about the context? The author goes on to say, "It was in no way deformed by any rugged rocks; it did not shock the view

with horrid precipices, huge chasms, or dreary caverns, with deep, impassable morasses, or deserts of barren sand!" He admits, however, there were doubtless mountains from which charming paradisiacal views might be obtained! But he qualifies this concession by informing us that "we need not suppose their sides were abrupt, or difficult of ascent." So much for the surface of the globe, which Wesley has laid out like a Dutch garden. *De gustibus non est disputandum!* But we cannot help thinking that opinions might differ, even among divines, as to the landscape arrangement of Eden. As regards the *interior* of the globe, Wesley had antedated Hopkins, who has given it a thicker crust than any other geologist! He gravely tells us that before the "Fall" there were "no agitations within the bowels of the earth, no violent convulsions, no concussions of the earth, no earthquakes; but all was unmoved as the pillars of heaven. There were then no such things as eruptions of fire; there were no volcanoes or burning mountains!" This was scarcely fair. Other cosmogonists thought it necessary to bring water enough from somewhere before they could drown the world by a deluge, and accordingly they found it within the earth's interior. But Wesley never attempts to account for the molten matter, the heat, which he must have known was actually and not theoretically there. Speculating on the sea and its paradisiacal physical geography, he tells us that the "element of water was then mostly confined to the great abyss, and hence it is highly probable there was no external sea in the paradisiacal earth." Surely, no hypothesis was ever introduced to excel speculations like these. The "Vestiges of Creation," Oken, Darwin,—all are left behind! And yet, whilst the stronghold of evangelical opposition to science is the complaint about theorising, there are actually being held opinions which compare well in fertility of imagination with the myths of the Middle Ages! It would scarcely be worth while comparing the cosmogony of a worthy man who lived so long ago, with the results of modern science, if it were not that such a great number of his followers reverence his views on this subject with the same profoundness they do those on more spiritual matters. Many of them have not the slightest idea they do not wholly agree with every department of knowledge, whilst they are well aware they fit in admirably with the doctrines of the "Fall," and others of a similar character. Unfortunately, physical science cannot take these into account. All that it has to deal with are facts, and nothing but facts. If there is one truth more prominently shown forth than another by geology, it is that mountains are in every case the effects of upheaval; that the sea and land have always been in equable counterpoise,

although in different areas; that the upheaving force has been slowly but admirably adjusted to the wear and tear of the surface caused by ordinary meteorological action; that volcanic rocks are to be found in the oldest stratified formation known, and even there in conglomerates, indicating a still older formation, whose included volcanic rocks had been broken up to form them; and that the entire seventeen miles in vertical thickness of rock formations, all of them deposited along old ocean floors, are nothing but sepulchres of extinct animal and vegetable forms! We know, from the wonderful life-scheme thus built up by science, that death is not a *curse* but a *law*, concomitant with life, and that without its aid our world would never have been the beautiful thing it is! Nay, every physical benefit a man has to thank his Maker for, is more or less connected with forces which are regarded by most orthodox people as consequences of the "Fall!" When shall we learn that before everything, even before religion, should come the truth? The latter has come among its own, and its own have not received it. The magnificence of the Divine glory, as revealed in the physical universe, must give precedence to the figments of a cut and dried theology, which now scarcely retains anything of the odour of the original plant!

A very common opinion, held with the utmost tenacity by evangelical thinkers, is that death and physical pain are the direct results of Adam's transgression. Many of them hold that these agencies made their appearance then for the first time. Others, of a more scholarly education, endeavoured to reconcile geological facts with this important doctrine, and display consummate skill, but hardly a regard for truth, in their attempt. Thus a recent evangelical writer (1863), replying to Colenso and the "Essays and Reviews," acknowledges that "the testimony of the rocks shows us death, the ultimate issue of countless ages;" but he declares this does not in any degree invalidate what is written —"that *death resulted from sin!* We know," he continues, "we know that sin as well as death existed before the creation of man, for when man walked in Eden, the serpent was there!" It cannot be denied, that if science were to put forth such a weak hypothesis as this against theology, the latter would disclaim it, and be only too ready to hurl ridicule and contempt on the aggressor. The same writer, a little further on tells us, we may see that to the mysterious power of Satan "the phenomena of death may in all cases be traced!" The real conservatives of the orthodox school, however, repel any casuistry of this sort as distinctly as science does. Among the Wesleyans, at least, we have no weakness of this kind. However unscientifically true their doctrines as to death may be, they are logical from their pre-

mises. There is a good deal of the ludicrous, however, in some of them, especially when regarded from a natural history point of view. Thus it is stated that the carnivorous propensities of animals were suddenly developed—far more rapidly than even the author of "The Vestiges of Creation" demanded, much as he was held up to ridicule—by the expulsion from Paradise! Comparative anatomy must bow before such dogmas as these, notwithstanding that it finds no difference in the general construction of the extinct animals which preceded man from that now existing. What matter that it recognises a unity of plan, from the earliest fossils upwards and onwards? In the sermon last mentioned we find Wesley speaking on this subject, and telling us "Such is the universally disordered state of the universe at present, that innumerable creatures can no otherwise preserve their own lives than by destroying others. But in the beginning it was not so."

In his sermon on "The Fall of Man," of course we have a fuller statement of this doctrine. Here we find him ascribing all the miseries, pains, hardships, deaths, &c., in the world, to the first transgression. A common idea is, that the agonies of child-birth especially attach themselves to women on account of the first mother acting in her well known imprudent manner. And this is still held, notwithstanding that physiology traces in the sutures of a child's skull an arrangement which cannot but make child-birth easier! Wesley, in his sermon on "The General Deliverance," gives a picture of the perfect bliss of the paradisiacal state, and this is placed, for effect's sake, beside another describing the carnage now going on among animals, the latter of course thus suffering from Adam's sin. In his sermon on "The New Creation," this is plainly stated, the author declaring that "the whole animated creation, whatever has life, from leviathan to the smallest mite, was thereby made subject to such vanity as the inanimate creature could not be. They were subject to that fell monster death!" It is, however, somewhat satisfactory to be informed a little further on, that "the horrid state of things which at present obtains, will soon be at an end;" that "on the *new* earth no creature will kill, hunt, or give pain to any other. The scorpion will have no poisonous sting, the adder no venomous teeth. The lion will have no claws to tear the lamb, no teeth to grind his flesh and bones." So that in any future geological formation it will be impossible for an Owen to found a system of odontology. There is an archaic tone about this doctrine which, if not scientifically correct, is very interesting from a literary point of view, as indicating how impossible it is for such traditional ideas to be uprooted. Thus in the apocryphal "Revelation of Moses,"—a work which was undoubtedly current in the second

century, if not before—we read that Eve saw her son Seth struggling with a wild beast in the neighbourhood of Paradise, towards the confines of which, with true womanly hankering after what had been lost, she had wandered. She cries out to remind the animal that it was formerly subject to the image of God. The wild beast replies—"Oh Eve, not against us thy upbraiding, but against thyself, since the beginning of the wild beasts was from thee! How was thy mouth opened to eat of the tree about which God had commanded thee not to eat of it? For this reason also our nature has been changed!"

The immediate followers of John Wesley handed down, with greater or less ability, the doctrine that about six thousand years ago, only a few weeks after the first human pair had been placed in Eden, the whole universe was suddenly transformed into a fearful hell through their indiscretion! Perhaps the most able and scholarly of the early Methodists was Dr. Adam Clarke, whose studies indeed brought him under the suspicion of his less educated colleagues. His mind was naturally broad and receptive, as was indicated by his reply to the Conference that "he would go with the devil as far as he was able," when he had been blamed for quoting from a work on the Epistle to the Romans, written by a Unitarian divine, Dr. John Taylor, of Norwich. In his well known "Commentary," in the first few chapters of Genesis he closely follows Wesley in ascribing a change in the physical universe as resulting from the "Fall." In one of his sermons Wesley had revived the ideas of the schoolmen as to the nature of the Serpent before the curse was inflicted on him—"On thy belly shalt thou go," &c. And we find Dr. Adam Clarke following up this quibble, and wasting a great deal of ingenious scholarship, cuttle-fish like, in bringing in an explanation of his own, to the effect that the creature which tempted Eve was nothing more nor less than an *ourang-outang!* This monkey had just then been introduced to the notice of Europe, and Buffon had written a memoir upon it. Dr. Clarke was well up in current events, so that we can understand how he was desirous of incorporating modern science as far as he could with his theology. Would that his evangelical brethren had always adopted the same spirit, if not the same plan! There would then be less open hostility between theological and scientific thought! That passage in Genesis which speaks of "thorns and thistles" coming on the earth to curse human labour, is generally interpreted in a strictly literal manner. Dr. Clarke makes an elaborate calculation as to the seeding powers of the common kinds of thistle, with a view towards proving that their fecundity is of supernatural origin!

Next to Wesley, the most voluminous writer of his sect is

Richard Watson. He did not possess the scholarship of his chief, nor do his writings exhibit such a clear, nervous style of English. On the contrary, Watson is frequently very ponderous and verbose, so that the reader becomes wearied by the undeviating heavy rhythm of his style. Watson's "Institutes" is the *vade mecum* of Methodist theology. It is a regular body of divinity, in which we find every branch treated upon. In the chapter which treats on the "Fall," the author closely follows the idea given by Wesley. Speaking of the serpent, he says in a foot-note—"We have no reason at all to believe that the animal had the serpentine form in any mode or degree at all before his transformation. That he was then degraded to a reptile, to go upon his belly, imports on the contrary, an entire alteration and loss of the original form." The various legends extant on this subject, now interpreted by Fergusson as proofs of the once cosmopolitan "Tree and Serpent Worship," are, as might be expected, referred to by Watson as incidental proofs of the "Fall!" The Evangelical theologians regard the serpent form as one essentially *degraded*, whereas naturalists can trace as admirable an adjustment to circumstances, in its case, as in any other animal. Unfortunately for the theory which originates this peculiar form of reptile so orthodoxly, the remains of an extinct species of *Python* have been found in deposits of as old a date as the Eocene—ages before man appeared on the stage of Creation! Geology was just being born when Watson wrote, and some of its then startling ideas were coarsely made the most of by the vulgar, uneducated sceptics of his day. This accounts somewhat for the dead set he makes against this particular science. But who will explain to us, even allowing this bit of special pleading, the reason why edition after edition of Watson's "Institutes" should be issued from the official press, without even a foot-note or word of appendix to put the author right in what we now know to be his erroneous science? The most recent and important discoveries of geology are passed over in silence, and arguments nearly a century old are continually being warmed up to answer them! The consequence is that young ministers who have been so busy with their theological studies that they had little time to enter into its elementary parts, in after years, when they find themselves for the first time face to face with its grand deductions, are utterly powerless to make their theology comport with it. Nothing then remains for them but to sneer at and preach down such a dangerous science, which they so little understand. The edition we are about to quote from, is dated 1865, and it is not one whit different from that published at the beginning of the present century! Such a system cannot be termed otherwise than *dishonest*. The facts

of science should be as sacred to the truth seeker as the facts of Revelation, and he is an enemy in disguise who thinks to advance one at the expense or suppression of another!

In that chapter of the "Institutes" devoted to answering "miscellaneous objections," Watson openly objects to the "day" mentioned in Genesis, being amplified into meaning a period of time, as Mantell and others had suggested, for the sake of reconciliation, that it might be. He will not have the word "forced," as he calls it, and so sticks up manfully for the literal four-and-twenty hours day. He is equally opposed to those who, like Dr. Chalmers, had imagined a vast lapse of time between the first verse in Genesis and the context. Making allowance for the ill-temper exhibited in his remark that geology was not then half a century old, we pass on to notice the quasi-scientific authors whom he quotes to support his anti-geological position. Chief among these was Granville Penn's "Comparative Estimate of the Mineral and Mosaical Geologies." This author accounts for stratified rocks and their fossil remains by endeavouring to prove that at the Deluge, when "the fountains of the great deep were broken up," the sea and dry land shifted places. Hence we are living on the antediluvian ocean-floor, and the fossils we see are simply the creatures which lived and died before the Flood! He forgets, however, that one of the existing rivers—the Euphrates—is mentioned in the second chapter of Genesis as watering the Paradisiacal earth! Kirwan's "Geological Essay" is another book quoted by Watson, and in this we have the old theory put forth accounting for fossil remains by the agency of the Deluge. The work most largely borrowed from, however, is Gisborne's "Testimony of Natural Theology"—a book long since forgotten, as indeed are the two previous. The following is a quotation, repeated in every edition of the "Institutes," as well as in the third catechism of the Methodist body: "To overspread the plains of the arctic circle with the shells of Indian seas, and with the bodies of elephants and rhinoceri—what conceivable instrument would be efficacious enough but the rush of mighty waters?" This of course refers to the Deluge. Now, in the first place, there are no "Indian shells strewn over arctic regions," and the elephants and rhinoceri found there belong to extinct species, which were covered with long woolly hairs, to protect them against the glacial cold of the epoch in which they lived. This, the latest geological formation of the "Northern Drift," has proved wonderfully fruitful in the hands of geologists in accounting for the distribution of animals and plants, and in the formation of those subsoils without which agricultural operations could not have been carried on with their present success. Indeed, had it not been for this particular

agency, mankind would have been doomed to a far greater "sweat of their brow" than they are at present! But the Wesleyan Conference can afford to ignore all these facts, and bring forth edition after edition of a work, in which the strongest arguments are quotations from long-forgotten and never authoritative books! Nay, we see that whilst such teachers of "youths and adult persons" are eager to throw discredit on the science of geology, they themselves seize the fact of occurrence of fossil shells, &c., in order to make them do duty as evidences of the Noachian deluge! We venture to say, a more casuistic or dishonest course could not have been adopted, nor, so far as the Wesleyan youth are concerned, a more fatal one. For, as soon as the latter discover that geology is not the empty, sacrilegious science it has been represented, they will naturally believe such representations to have been made specially to prevent their investigation of the facts.

It was John Wesley's weakness, in his love of system and method, to elevate the physical science of his day into as well-defined and rounded-off a scheme as he did his theological doctrines. And they are unfortunately so arranged side by side that one set is more or less committed to the other. A recent Wesleyan writer on the "Mosaic Narrative," in speaking of geology, tells us that he "had read copiously on this subject, and examined with much attention the remarkable specimens exhibited in the British Museum, as well as in the Museum of Practical Geology, and that his reading, reflection, and observation had carried to his mind the most solemn conviction that *six thousand years* are quite sufficient to account for all the phenomena brought to light by geological science!" Such is the way in which ignorant dogmatism confidently sets itself up against the confirmed inductions of hard worked science! This ignorant, though frank, confession is however the natural result of allying a system of science with one of theology, and of making them stand and fall together. The same author may be considered to give expression to a little *personal* feeling further on, for we find him saying—"When we see those mistaken friends of the Bible uniting to fabricate a modern and fashionable vehicle called geology, to carry the Ark of God into a place of safety, it is enough to provoke Balaam's ass, were it alive, to stand forth and reprove them!" And yet, this very writer, in the same little book, does not hesitate to "fabricate" a curious cosmogony of his own, illustrated also by diagrams, to show the special work of each of the creative "Days." He is ready to pull down other theories in order that he may build one of his own on their *débris*, which shall have the merit of being strictly orthodox, if not strictly scientific. It will have been seen that the above writers have a great friend

in the Deluge, to enable them to escape from geological facts. No one can read the narrative of that event in Genesis without perceiving that the Hebrew writer has coloured the details with all the vigour and force of an oriental imagination. What shall we think, therefore, of sober English writers who endeavour to out-herod Herod, and to make the Noachian Flood do a thousandfold more duty than its original narrator ever intended? As Coleridge long ago pointed out, the Deluge could not have been the great catastrophe it has been made out, for the narrative tells us how, when Noah wished to discover whether the waters were abating, he sent forth a dove, which returned with "an olive-leaf newly plucked off." The deduction drawn by the venerable patriarch from this, in the most matter-of-fact, not *miraculous* way, was that the waters were going down. So that the rise and continuance of this event, according to the account itself, had not been sufficient to destroy a feeble olive tree, which remained growing undisturbed on the mountain side!

This inherent antagonism to scientific teachings exhibits to us anything but a flattering side of human nature. It shows how firmly religious and even high principled men will shut their eyes to facts if the latter interfere with old-established opinions. The subterfuge of keeping a discreet silence, and of ignoring such facts altogether, is dishonest in the highest degree. The question is, not whether geology interferes with any system of theology—but whether it is true! If geology be untrue, then it must be proved false on scientific, not theological grounds. What we object to is that after a fact has been proved true on scientific principles, it should be deemed necessary to bring it to a theological analysis as well. What we want is "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth!" But so long as evangelical adherents imagine they are doing God service either by ignorantly refuting those who endeavour to find out His wonders in the earth, or by sneering at the results of their labours, science will always be sceptical, and the grandest natural illustrations of the Divine character be lowered by stooping through the strait gate of controversy. Let facts in science and facts in religion be regarded with equal reverence. Geology plainly shows that the physical system of our globe has always been carried on upon the same plan as the present. That the volcanoes which belch forth their fires, and earthquakes which shatter our planet's crust, are only so many safety-valves to ensure its perpetuity! We know, further, that had it not been for these upheaving forces the ordinary laws of atmospherical wear and tear would long ago have reduced every prominence to a dead level. As it is, all our admirable system of meteorological action is mainly due to those mountain chains, themselves

the effect of plutonic action, which Wesley and other modern cosmogonists have uniformly regarded as a physical curse, wrought in a moment as the punishment of one man's transgression! J. E. T.

Art. V.—Ancient Japanese Poetry.

1. *MS. Treatise in Portuguese on the Japanese Language.* By the P. João Rodriguez Giram.*
2. *Man-yō-shiu; or, Collection of 10,000 Leaves.* Edition of 1805, published at Kioto in 20 volumes.
3. *Wa-kan-san-sai-dsu-ye; or, Sinico-Japanese Encyclopædia.* In about 100 volumes.
4. *Ko-kin-shiu; or, Selection of Poems Ancient and Modern.*
5. *Reports of the Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften of Vienna for the years* 1852-1854.

An æsthetic tendency inherent in man has prompted him, in all ages and in all countries, to some form of metrical expression of his recollections and his impressions. At first mere events, more or less striking in themselves or in their surroundings, and traditions which were regarded as real histories, were so recorded; partly because of the greater ease with which they were thus remembered, and partly from the almost innate sense possessed by mankind of the intrinsic dignity of certain events, and of the propriety of handing the memory of them down to posterity in some set form less loose than that of ordinary speech, but not as yet upon the stricter model of prose, which was always the creation of a comparatively late civilization, when the use of written characters had become tolerably common.

* Died at Macao, at the age of 74, in the year 1633. M. Léon Pagés, in his excellent "Histoire de la Religion Chrétienne au Japon," lately published, page 798, tells us that the Père Rodriguez was the principal author of the great Japanese-Portuguese dictionary printed at Nagakasi in 1603, as well as the sole author of the above-mentioned treatise on the Japanese language, which was printed in 1604. He adds in a note, that the abridged translation into French, made by the Père Landresse—with which most students of Japanese are familiar—is very imperfect. Indeed it is almost worthless; and we are glad to be able to state that M. Pagés is devoting himself to the preparation of a revised translation of Rodriguez's great work—by far the best extant on the language and literary style of the most interesting and most progressive people of the extreme East.

At a later stage only in the progress of communities did true poetry originate; when the necessity was felt of expressing in harmonized numbers mental states that, dimly felt by all, were distinctly recognised by but few, and that were induced by a contemplation, at first mainly unconscious, of the varying aspects of nature, or of the changing passions and fortunes of men as individuals, as members of a family, a clan, or a nation. The ancient epic may be regarded as a combination into which versified history or tradition largely enters, yet is always subordinate to some main idea or motive of a more or less truly poetical character, and diversified, as well as greatly heightened in effect, by the frequent introduction of a lyrical element. In its higher flights however, poetry makes only an illustrative or metaphorical use of history or tradition, or even of the facts of Nature, and appeals to our more elevated sensuous and intellectual faculties, aiming at awakening the mind to the most comprehensive employment of its powers. Even when natural or organic beauty is the theme, the merit of the effort lies in its "suggestiveness," in its capability of arousing in us our associative activity, of stimulating the creative part of our intellect, of giving us sensuous and intellectual conceptions covering the greatest extent of individual sensuous and intellectual notions that the mental conditions of humanity render possible. To such poetry, when restricted in each outburst (every true poem is essentially an outburst) to the illustration or development of one main idea, we would confine the term "lyric"; and we rank such on the whole higher than epic poetry, because of the greater breadth and comprehensiveness, and more elevated scope of the former variety.

In Chinese literature no epic poem, so far as we are aware, has been yet discovered, unless, indeed, the Li-tsao, dating from the third century before our era, be so regarded.* At this, for reasons which we have no space to detail here, we are not astonished. But that the literature of Japan should be in like manner deficient is more difficult to understand. The Japanese are a highly imaginative and warlike people. In early days, and even up to quite a recent period, they were divided into a number of virtually independent small states constantly at war with each other. The stories and traditions current in the land of the lives and deeds of its antique heroes are innumerable, and the character of the country and the political and social history of the people must have given birth to a continual succession of romantic incidents. The myths of the Kamis or original gods show quite as fertile a power of invention as the far more

* Lately translated into French by the Marquis d'Hervillе de St. Denys.

famous legends of ancient Greece. Yet such traditions and myths are all related as short stories or as isolated brief poems, and nothing in the nature of epic poetry has yet been discovered. To make amends, their store of lyrics, songs, and minor pieces is sufficiently extensive; and though their poets cannot rank with Homer, Pindar, or Catullus, their productions are not without considerable merit. In their best efforts we are struck by a certain plaintiveness, a mystic wailing tone, in which those who have wandered among the pleasant hills and dales of fair Nippon seem to hear again, borne over ten thousand miles of sea and land, the whisper of the evening breeze sweeping darkly up the fertile valleys, over the autumnal rice-fields, mingling with the hoarser rustle of the upper winds among the pine trees that fringe the hill outlines with rugged spectral shapes black against the waning sky, and massed with the fainter and fainter growing hum of village life in a wide harmony, flecked, so to speak, by the distant irregular tinkle of the bell of some rural temple.

But let us now, after some brief account of the metre, give the reader such notions as the following examples may convey of the spirit of the poetry of Old Japan. And first, we wish to admit our obligations, as to much of the information contained in the following pages, to the only good treatise on the Japanese language with which we are acquainted, that namely published in Portuguese by the Père Rodriguez in the 17th century, a manuscript copy of which rare work we have been enabled to consult through the generosity of the well-known French Orientalist, M. Léon Pagés. For the translations here submitted to the reader of Japanese poems, extracted from that work and collected from other sources, and never before, so far as we know, rendered into any European language, we ourselves are alone responsible.

Of Japanese poetry there are two kinds, "Shi" and "Uta," the former being essentially Chinese in its origin and structure, and following the rules established in that language as to the arrangement of the tones, even though these are not preserved in the Japanese pronunciation, but presenting no trace of rhyme, a prominent feature of even the earliest verse of the antique Middle Kingdom. With "Shi," however (represented by a sign of which the elements signify "discourse" and "temple"), as being merely imitative both in form and essence, the present article has no further concern, and "Uta" alone (denoted by a sign of which the elements may be taken to refer to excellence in playing on wind-instruments) will form the subject of the following pages. For although resembling in its alternating lines of five and seven syllables the earlier Chinese poetry, it is distinctively

Japanese, admitting when classically pure no words of Chinese origin, and preferring archaic expressions of the ancient Yamato dialect to modern forms. Under "Uta" are included songs, popular poetry, mythological and pastoral pieces, poems of which the subjects are the aspects of nature or the passions or fortunes of men; while under "Shi" might be arranged most didactic, philosophical, and satirical poetry. Much of the metrical literature of Japan might come under either category, still it is sufficiently near the truth to define "Uta" as synonymous with lyric and (to some extent) epic verse, and "Shi" as inclusive of all other poetry, the chief distinction being that the former term, when used in a strict sense, refers to poetry of an essentially archaic character, into which no Chinese compounds are admitted.*

In "Uta" there is neither rhyme nor alliteration, and the metrical arrangement is, we are inclined to believe, quite unique; but akin, perhaps, to that in use among Semitic races—a point, however, in which we do not feel competent to judge. "Uta," whatever be their length, are usually divided into stanzas, each of which is complete in itself as to meaning, and consists of two portions called the upper verse and the lower verse respectively. The upper verse is further divided into three parts or lines, the first having five syllables, the second seven, and the third, like the first, five syllables. The lower verse is in like manner arranged. in two lines, each consisting of seven syllables; or each stanza may be regarded as a couplet, of which the first verse would possess seventeen and the second fourteen syllables; but in Japanese books the above detailed arrangement of five lines to the stanza is generally adopted. By poetical license an extra syllable or perhaps two, especially when these are mere particles, are allowed, but no elision is ever permitted. To help out the metre, certain words having no definite meaning may be sparsely

* It may be well to remind the reader that the present Japanese language, like the languages of most of the peoples in the vicinity of the Chinese Empire, contains in its ordinary literary and vernacular form innumerable derivations from Chinese, or, more strictly, Chinese words or compounds under an altered pronunciation. The pure Japanese language is very harmonious in sound, and is capable of being inflected to a considerable extent, while Chinese is dissonant, and quite devoid of inflections. Hence it will be readily understood that the former has been unable to assimilate the words of the latter language imported into it, and is much less harmonious and much less capable of development than it would have been had it never been stiffened, so to speak, by such an influence. Indeed it may be doubted whether the effect of the Chinese language, literature, and civilization has not been entirely evil upon the neighbouring island-Empire, and whether but for the deadening influence of Chinese Buddhism and philosophy upon their natural tendencies, a far higher position in the world than that they now occupy would not have been attained by the people of Dai Nippon.

introduced. Such words are termed "makura-kotoba," "pillow-words,"—that is, words not to be considered as parts of, but as mere supports for the distich. "Uta" are recited or read in a peculiar high-pitched falsetto, each syllable being clearly enunciated without regard to quantity and with very little to accent, or are sung to the accompaniment of a "sammishen" (sort of banjo or guitar), or "koto" (kind of clavecin), or to that of some wind-instrument, generally a species of flute. To European ears the Japanese method of reading "Uta" is at first as disagreeable as their music, though after a little time one may discern in both a strain of melancholy, not without a certain charm.*

Very frequently an ode is composed of a single stanza, as in the following example (pointed to show the accentuation, and literally translated), which may serve as a specimen of the archaic dialect and metre made use of by the Kadosha or minstrel-poets of Japan. In it the author celebrates the depth of his affliction at the loss of his liege lord—his tears never cease:—

"Mína-gáwa nó†	"Of the River of Mina,
Kyóki nagáre nì	In the clear flowing stream
Susugité shi	Have I cleansed my raiment.
Korómo no sóde wò	Alas! the sleeve of my dress
Máta wa kégasàshi."‡	Is again soiled (with my tears)."

Such stanzas are termed Ko-uta—minor or impromptu pieces—and collections of them are very popular among all classes. Here are other instances of which the seasons form the theme:—

"Joyous greet thee all mankind,
Spring that duly com'st to-day—
Ah! how slowly roll the mists
Off Miyoshino's hill-side,
Hiding still from our longing eyes
All ye blooming Sakura flowers."§

* In the sixteenth volume of the great Sinico Japanese Encyclopædia, Wa-kan-san-sai-dsu-ye, or Illustrations of the Three Powers (Heaven, Earth, and Man), a somewhat meagre account of the varieties and origin of "Uta" will be found. We are there told that Izanagi and Izanami were the creators of Japanese verse, at first rude and unstable in its metre, but afterwards improved and polished by the wife of the demi-god Achiski táka-hikóne no Kami, and that the invention of the stanza of thirty-one syllables was also the work of that famous poetess, of whose genius an example is given that appears to be a sort of address to her husband, but of which the meaning is too obscure to permit of translation.

† The vowels to be pronounced as in Italian, the consonants as in English; but "g" always hard. The ode is given in Rodriguez's grammar; but like all or nearly all the quotations from Japanese authors there contained, is not accompanied by a translation into Portuguese.

‡ Japanese scholars will see that if for "kégasàshi" we read as we might do "kegasaji," the meaning of the stanza will be other than that I have given, but as I conceive with far less point.

§ Rodriguez.

In the above allusion is made to the custom of making excursions into the country at the commencement of spring to view the Sakura or mountain cherry-trees in the fulness of their blossom. A like allusion is contained in the succeeding lines:—

"Should the mountain-cherry cease
In the spring-time of the year,
With its mass of new-born bloom,
Mortal men to cheer; alas,
Would the heart of Spring be gone,
And its brightness fade away"*

The next is a complaint of the Hótotógis, a kind of cuckoo or goatsucker, fancifully supposed to wail through the summer nights until its eyes become suffused with blood:—

"Should'st thou seek in gentle sleep,
Thro' the tranquil nights of summer,
Daily labours to forget,
Ever piercing through the air,
Shalt thou hear the Hótotógis
Shrilly plaining till the dawn."†

Contemplation of the calm moonlit nights of autumn induces a feeling of melancholy:—

"Over wood and over lea
Sheds the moon her pallid light;
High o'er drifting clouds exalted,
In autumnal radiance;
As I watch the changing shadows
Sadness slowly o'er me steals."‡

The snow-laden trees of winter time are likened to the wild plum-trees in full blossom:—

"Icy flakes are falling fast
Thro' the chilly air, and now
Yonder trees, with snow-bloom laden,
Do assume the wild plum's guise,
With their mass of snowy flowers
Gladd'ning winter's dreary time."§

The following are longer specimens. Some of them are taken from Dr. August Pfizmaier's very remarkable contributions to the study of ancient Japanese poetry, contained in the reports of the Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften of Vienna for 1852 and 1854;

---

* Rodriguez.
† Rodriguez. Comp. Anacreon—τι σοι θελεις ποιησω.
‡ Rodriguez. § Rodriguez.

and a few among them deviate from the classical Uta style in admitting words of Chinese origin.*

"Darkening the wintry air,
Clouds are gathering in the sky,
Rain-drops sparsely patter down,
And the frozen tears, melting,
Drip from yonder willow-tree,
Through the chilly vapours seen,
Sadly bending o'er the stream.

"Mínamóto Yóshitsúne
Driving Káwadsúra Hôgen
Vanquished from the land, now deigns
By our Yoshino to pass.
And the hearts of men are glad
'Tis the happy month of Growth.†
And the ridges of the hills,
And the slopes of all the valleys,
Hidden as by fleecy clouds,
Gleam with snowy Sakura bloom,
And the smiling host of flowers
Greet our Lord where'er he turns,
While the fragrant winds of Spring
Bear with them where'er they blow
Our hero's glory forth."

In the next, taken from the Ko-kin-shiù,‡ the allusion is to the grief of a faithful retainer who sees his lord depart on an expedition and is not allowed to accompany him. The disappointed vassal likens himself to the solitary recluse of some neighbouring convent or hermitage drifting past the castle-walls in her lonely skiff:—

O'er the restless ocean waves,
Tho' the storm winds wildly blow,
See'st thou Ise's saintly nun
Drifting in a frail skiff past,
In self-contemplation wrapped,
Sorely harassed and oppressed,
Till the tears of her grief
O'er her sorrow-flushed cheeks
Flow ceaselessly and mournfully?
So men may at this cheerless time

---

* Pfizmaier has given translations, which, however, are very incorrect—a circumstance not to be wondered at, when it is recollected that twenty years ago hardly anything was known in Europe of the written Japanese language, the lore of the Jesuit and other missionaries having become either inaccessible or buried in oblivion.

† The third month (parts of April and May) is so called.

‡ Quoted in Rodriguez.

Gaze on autumn's ruddy tints
Through the streams of falling rain.
And in solitude apart*
Scattered o'er the land must dwell,
Ignorant of hope or aid.
Bitter is the parting time
When a friend bids us farewell,
Bitterer still the moment is
When with bursting heart a vassal
Doth receive his lord's adieu ;
Beck'ning through the empty air
Long he gazes wistfully,
Only the wild duck's mournful scream
Piercing the distant sky
Faintly echoes in his ear."

In some "Uta," more especially in those of modern date, Chinese compounds are admitted. Nevertheless, the tone is essentially Japanese, as will appear from the following example taken from Pfizmaier :—

"Heaven above from earth below
Long ago the God hath parted.
Now aloft in th' sky hath set
His divine abode, and now
In the Realm of Endless Joy
Inly pondering muses he,
Walking in the world of dreams,
Viewing thro' the evening shades
Our Nippon's pleasant shores,
Leading in his dreamy vision
His divine twain offspring towards
Yon the hoariest of shrines,
And within the rock-hewn portal
Of their vast abode that ne'er
Hath the Utter Darkness known
Of Primæval Chaos deigning
God-like symbols there to leave."

In the above allusion is made to the myth of the creation of Japan, which is briefly as follows :—After the separation of chaos into earth and heaven (an idea borrowed from China, and interwoven in the legend with the purely Japanese story) the god Izanagi and the goddess Izanami, descendants of the original primeval god, stood on the Bridge of Heaven,† and with a staff made of coral stirred up the ocean lying far beneath. The drops of brine as they fell from the staff, on its withdrawal congealed

* Because of the chill autumn time, when men do not travel, and friends at a distance cannot visit.

† The milky way.

and became land, and thus was created the main island of Nippon, the other islands of the Japanese empire being after-creations, concerning which various legends are extant. The two deities then descended upon the island, according to some in the province of Ise, and there begat children and erected a shrine. The "symbols" may refer to the silver mirror given by Izanagi to his descendants when the god ascended again into heaven, or possibly to the three treasures of the Emperor, duplicates of which are kept in every temple devoted to the ancient Shinto or god-worship—namely, a mirror, a sword, and a jewel—the symbolical meaning of which we have not space to explain.

The evil of this world, that inexhaustible theme, is not unfrequently the subject of an "Uta," as in a lament quoted by Rodriguez, which may be thus rendered:—

"When the end of things shall come,
And this troublous world shall cease,
Shall not men be glad at heart,
Hail the term of their unrest;
For 'tis a world of misery,
Ever evil are the times;
As to man's benevolence—
As to human sympathy—
Momentary joys are they
In an age of bitter pains;
Fleeting as the passing wake
Left by yonder skiff impelled
By some early fisher-boy
O'er the bay at break of dawn.
Is this world a van'shing dream
Or a sad reality?
Vain the question; never may
Mortal men the answer say."

The most extensive, and at the same time most ancient collection of Japanese poetry now extant, is the Man-yō-shiu, or "10,000 leaves," compiled about the commencement of the 9th century of our era, and containing doubtless many poems of a much older date. The style is that of pure Uta entirely free from Chinese compounds, and full of archaic forms and expressions. The copy in our possession is in twenty volumes, and was printed at Kioto in the year 1805. The characters are the Chinese signs used phonetically in the old Yamato alphabet, mingled with Chinese signs used in their proper individual signification, each column being accompanied by a transcription into the modern Japanese syllabary called Katakana. The Man-yō-shiu has formed a model for every Kadōsha or poet from the time of its compilation to the present day. The poems are by various authors—reigning Mikados, Mikados that have thrown

off their dull sovereignty and retired, doubtless gladly enough, from their irksome grandeur; Kugè, or noblemen and noble ladies of the Imperial Court, and priests or recluses of rank and renown. Many pieces are mere Ko-uta, consisting of a stanza or two only, and in these, as well as in the longer pieces, a play upon words is very commonly introduced with more or less effect. Others are of considerable length, and among them some are found to be arranged in Strophe and Antistrophe. Few are amatory, the greater number being simply narrative, or descriptive of the changes and beauties of nature. Some are congratulatory, some bemoan the evil dispositions of men, or lament the cruel reverses of fortune; but we have met with very few motived by the mere idea of military glory, or disfigured by sentiments of hate and revenge. Yet in Japan rank has always been of an essentially military character, and vengeance is inculcated almost as a duty in the heart of every Japanese gentleman. Possibly strife was too common an element in the ancient life of the people of Dai Nippon to be deemed worthy of the exalted ecstasy and lofty language of the poet—a personage always held in especial honour by the two greatest nations of the extreme east. A trial of poetic skill among the courtiers, where each read out his own compositions and demanded the judgment of the Mikado upon their merits, was a common diversion at the Court of Kioto, in which the divine Emperor himself often deigned to join, submitting his own productions to the doubtless favourable criticism of the assembly; and to such poetical tournaments many of the pieces in the Man-yō shiu owe their origin. Nor, if one can trust contemporary accounts, have the Muses even now entirely forsaken the classic land of Yamato, but the birthplace of Japanese literature is no longer one of their favourite haunts, and they do but inspire cold imitations of the ancient poetry of the Man-yō-shiu, in which the fervour of original genius is lacking, and the vigorous grace of the antique language is but rarely found.

Of the longer poems called "Choka" and "Tanka," the metre differs slightly from that of "Ko-uta." The lines are alternately of five and seven syllables; the commencing one being of five, and the two last of seven syllables each. As in "Ko-uta," elision is never permitted, but irregularities and "makura-kotoba" are not infrequent. The examples we have chosen, which, like those preceding, are here for the first time, so far as we know, rendered into English, are translated with as much fidelity to the original as possible;* and must suffice to

* It is not pretended that the translations here given are in all cases absolutely correct. The inherent difficulties of the text, the antique words and expressions, the frequently obscure allusions, and the somewhat disjointed style of

indicate the nature of the contents of the most famous and most ancient collection of Japanese poetry extant.

"Peace-assuring Lord of men,
Mighty Emperor, before thee
Humbly doth thy servant bow.
Though but barren moorland ours,
Yet the clear streams amid
Yonder hills upspringing shall
Cheer thine Imperial heart.
There the mountain cherry-tree
Fails not yearly bloom to show:
There Akitsu's far-famed shrine
Uprears aloft its massive columns,
And there the dizzy waterfall
Flashes 'mid the hill-side bowers.
Never shall the sacred child
Weary of the pleasing murmur."*

The "sacred child," lit. "child of the shrine," is the name given to the eldest son of the Mikado, who is himself supposed to be lineally descended from the gods, and is afterwards deified and worshipped. The following, similar in character to the preceding, was addressed to the Mikado on an imperial progress by the Ason Kakimoto, to whom many of the pieces contained in the Man-yō-shiu are attributed:—

"Tranquilly contemplative,
Mighty Lord divinely sprung,
Quit thy godlike solitude!
Sweet the limpid waters are
Of our streamy Yoshino.
May your Highness deign to view them,
Our shrine's high roof to climb,
And your pleas'd eye let wander
O'er the valley spread beneath;
Lo green Awokaki's mount
Yonder towers many-ridged,
And the god whose home it is
Tenders you his humble tribute—

ancient Uta poetry, render it, even to native commentators, not seldom almost impossible to fathom the real meaning. Sometimes, too, a slight amplification has been found necessary, and epithets not existing in the original have been occasionally but very sparsely introduced, partly for metrical, partly for other reasons. It is claimed, however, that no additions or alterations of importance have been made; none other, in fact, than such as are absolutely indispensable in conveying ideas so different from our own, and allusions of which we should be unable but for some amplification to transfer the sense from one language to another, especially when such essential dissimilarity exists between them as between the languages of the island-empires of the west and east.

* Man-yō-shiu, vol. i. p. 19.

Aye in spring-time you shall pluck
Flowers from the blooming trees,
Aye, in autumn you shall gaze
On the ruddy-tinted woods.
And the Yuugawa's god
Shall your daily feast provide;
In the river's upper stream
Cormorants shall fish for you,
Where the lower waters glide
Shall the nets be hauled for you.
All our mountain streams shall flow,
All our mountain gods shall strive,
For the pleasure of your Highness.

ANTISTROPHE.

"All your streams you say shall flow,
All your gods you say shall strive
For my pleasure; tell me yet
On your rapid waters may
Safely glide a fragile skiff."*

The bloom of the wild cherry and plum trees whitening the hill-sides in spring, the red tints of the mountain maples that give a ruddy glory to the autumn woods, and the prospect of creek or bay alive with fishing skiffs busily hauling the nets, are especially attractive to the simple people of Nippon, who take a keen delight in the pleasures of country life; while to drift aimlessly along in a solitary boat, wrapped in a sublime contemplation, is supposed to be a lofty happiness reserved for the poet, the priest, or the philosopher. Here is an ode addressed to a recluse living within view of Fujiyama, the "Peerless Mountain," on the lofty peak of which the early autumn snows have fallen:—

"Heaven above from earth below
Long ago the gods have parted,
Henceforth hiding far from men.
Round the hoary peak sublimely
Towering o'er Surúga's land,
Fuji's venerated mountain,
All the wide-arched azure sky
Though thou search with wistful gaze
Of the hast'ning sun's bright track,
Not a glimpse shalt thou enjoy;
Nor of gentlier beaming moon
Hail the shadow-fringing shimmer;
Fleecy clouds are hovering,
Hovering round the high bare summit,
Veiling it from mortal ken.

* Man-yō-shiu, vol. i. p. 25.

Hath thereon the white snow fallen?
Would'st thou of the lofty gods
Know the annals, only Fuji
Can the secret story tell thee.

ANTISTROPHE.

"By Tago's wooded shore I dwell,
And when in pensive mood I wander
Forth amid the lonely hills,
I love to gaze on Fuji's peak,
Monarch of the mountain range,
That the early fallen snow
Wraps in spotless gleaming mantle."*

In the above, allusion is made to the mythic origin of heaven and earth. Originally all was chaos; matter existed, but rude and formless. Divine influence penetrated the cosmic mass; a process of differentiation ensued, and the whole assumed an ellipsoidal form. Next the grosser parts became concentrated towards the centre, and the foundations of the earth were laid; while the more subtle portion receded, and enveloped our globe with an ethereal fluid, of which the more delicate exterior layers constituted the sky, and those nearer to the earth's surface formed the firmament.† The notion of the existence of space apart from matter seems utterly strange to the philosophy of China and Japan, which besides never attributes the creation of the materials of chaos to any Divine First Cause; but owns, though impliedly rather than expressly, the self-existence of primæval unorganized matter and of some divine influence, not seldom, indeed, supposed to originate within and from the elements of Chaos itself, by which the original substance of the universe is forced to differentiate itself into elementary earth, air, and sky. From such a divine influence spring a multitude of powers personified as innumerable genii, who are the immediate creators out of the already partially developed materials of chaos of the animate and inanimate objects of nature, and to whom are entrusted the government and regulation of the phenomena and laws of the universe.

The eldest son of the Mikado, on a hunting excursion into the country of the poet, is welcomed in strains that combine praise of the attractions of the latter's sea-girt and well wooded native province with admiration of the lofty humility of the imperial visitor, who comes unaccompanied by a burdensome retinue, and

* Man-yō-shiu, vol. iii. p. 27.

† It may be remarked that modern philosophy, by a somewhat curious coincidence, tends towards an explanation of the origin of solar systems in many points very similar to the above theory of the creation of our universe.

without requiring the observance of the strict ceremonial of a state progress:—

"Piercing the lofty sky,
Yonder Amakagu soars;
From whose brow the mists are lifting,
In the fullness of the spring;
Rustling 'mid the pines the wind
Ruffles yonder pool's smooth bosom,
And of every grove and thicket
Are the dark-massed shadows flecked
By the mountain-cherry's bloom;
While along the strand are heard
Shrilly cries of circling gulls,
Mingling with the whirring din
Of a flight of early wild-duck;
And there cometh o'er the waters,
In a rudderless frail bark,
Onwards drifting oarless urged,
In uncheered solitude,
Our Emperor's mighty heir."*

The Ason† Kanamura laments by implication the forlorn condition of the empire, in lines full of a hopeless melancholy:—

"Lofty Ashibiki Hill,
Limpid waters leap adown thee,
Streamy falls of Yoshino.
Pensive by the river standing,
Search I long the clear depths,
Listening to the shrilly cries,
Echoing through the streamy land
Of the snipelets up the river,
Calling down the river sharply,
Calling on their absent mates:
Yet of yonder busy flock
Each must perish in his turn,
Lying dead upon the ground.
As the joyous scene I view,
Ah, what sadness fills my soul,
Endless as the wild vine's creeper—
Generations thousands ten
Pass away like morning rime.
Let us pray to gods of earth,
Let us pray to gods of heaven,
Ever dreaded be the gods!"‡

By an untranslateable play upon words, the original expres-

---

* Man-yō-shiu, vol. iii. p. 16. † Vassal of the Mikado.
‡ Man-yō-shiu, vol. vi. p. 12.

sion rendered in the above as a "flock of snipes," may also signify "the Council Hall of the Mikado's nobles," or the "Nobles" themselves. The wild vine referred to is a species of Kadsura very common in the woods of Japan; and the simile is one not infrequently met with in the Man-yō-shiu.

In the last of the "10,000 leaves" that we shall submit to the reader, the martial sentiment of the poet will show that the people of the Rising Sun Land are not insensible to the spirit-stirring, but also, too frequently false, claims of military glory:—

"Our Lord Imperial—
High exalted Lord of all,
Uttered his supreme behest
To our hero fearless:—
'From our Tskushi's fertile land
Drive thou far the harrying foe;
Up, and utterly destroy them—
Let not one from henceforth pester
Thine own country's sacred soil.'
Barren marsh-wastes fence our land,
Where ne'er a sound the drear silence
Save some snipe's shrill cry doth break,
And our hero fearless,
Famed through all the Eastern country,
Forth to meet the foe departs,
Nor a lingering look behind
Casts, but with a valiant heart
Prays the gods for noble war."*

Although the present essay is headed "Ancient Japanese Poetry," the following specimen of the modern "Uta" will, perhaps, not be considered altogether out of place, and may be interesting to the reader on the score of contrast, if not in itself attractive. It is taken from the eighth volume of the "Magazine of Loyalty,"† a popular dramatic romance founded on the historical episode of the "forty-seven Rônins," whose story has been so pleasantly told by Mr. Mitford in the pages of a recent number of the *Fortnightly Review.* It cannot be considered as an example of pure "Uta" style, for it abounds in Chinese compounds. In metre, however, and in all other essential points, it is distinctively an "Uta." Word-plays turning upon the names of the places passed by the travellers are continually introduced into it with more or less effect, but are seldom capable of being conveyed in the translation. On the stage of a Japanese theatre it would be sung or recited in a high falsetto voice, and

* Man-yō-shiu, vol. xv. † Chiu-shin-gura.

would be accompanied and emphasized by appropriate gestures arranged so as to form a sort of continuous slow dance to the sound of flutes and wooden drums. It describes the journey of Tonase and her daughter Konami from Kamakura, the eastern capital of Japan, at the time when the story is laid, to a village hard by Kioto where they hope to find Rikiya, the son of Yuranoské, the hero of the story. Rikiya had been affianced to Konami, but the events which had ended in the "harakiri" of his lord Yenya had made outlaws (Rônin) of the whole clan; and Yuranoské the Karo or chief minister of Yenya had retired into obscurity with the view of maturing his plans for avenging the cruel death of his master upon the haughty Moronawodeb,* to whose willing instrumentality it was justly attributed. Notwithstanding the fallen condition of the family of the bridegroom, Tonase, instructed by her husband Kakogawa, who was influenced by considerations which appear in the story but which cannot well be detailed here, to do her utmost to bring about a consummation of the union between Konami and Rikiya, determined to take her daughter to the latter's residence, and endeavour to persuade him to make her his wife. Hence the journey which mother and daughter shall now describe in their own words :—

"KONAMI.

"Who first on thee, O fleeting world,†
Thy name bestow'd, O Aska‡ stream, I pray
Thee tell me who art onwards whirl'd
'Mid shifting sandbanks, so changeful is the way
Of Life to us from happ'ness hurl'd—
A wavelet§ now hath touch'd thy well-known strand
Whom Yenya welcom'd as the bride
Of his esquire who long had sought her hand,
Low-fall'n with Yenya's fall her pride!
She was betroth'd and Kakogawa's child
Fond hope deep in her being bore,
But adverse Fortune ne'er upon her smil'd,
No bridal gifts exchang'd,|| no more
By lover sought, her soul is sad."

* Those who have read the article in the "Fortnightly," above referred to, will easily recognise the real personages who are the originals of the characters in the story. But the journey itself is imaginative, and Tonase and Konami are purely fictitious.

† The name generally given by the Japanese to the universe.

‡ A stream flowing through flat land and constantly changing its bed. Hence the evanescent character of the sandbanks amid which the river threads its way, and the propriety of Konami's address to it.

A pun on the speaker's name "Ko-nami," child-wave, little wave.

After which a marriage is looked upon as almost complete.

"TONASE.

"Peace, Daughter, peace, thy mother bids thee haste
Towards Yamashina, where glad
By bridegroom thou shalt surely be embrac'd.
Alas! a bride-train thus forlorn
Hath never yet in all the world been known;
With doubt and grief my heart is torn,
Without attendant, mother and child alone,
On foot must urge their weary way
And strive Yamato's far off land to gain."

"KONAMI.

"My body's white as snow, men say,
The chilly winds with crimson hue it stain
Such as the wild-plum's flow'r make gay,
My fingers all are sore benumbed with cold,
Apt name Kogoye* pass is thine;
O'er Satta's ridge our further way we hold,
Thence gazing back† the curling line
All pensive watch of vaguely erring smoke
That issueth from Fuji's peak
And van'shing in the lofty sky is broke;
How sweet if 'twere the bonfire's reek
At threshold lit‡ my welcome home a Bride,
How 'twould our sadness charm away!
With pines o'ergrown Matsbara's§ plain so wide
Now travers'd crowded in the way,
The sea-coast way,|| by some great Daimio's train,
I know not whose, how blithe and gay
They seem, ah! when shall we know joy again.

"TONASE.

"Oh would that Fortune smiling were
Upon us, proud thy bridal train should be;
Than thee, none happier, none more fair;
Now yonder may we Sur'ga's Fuchiu see,
The omen¶ cheers thy mother's heart,
Her child shall yet the marriage pledge exchange,
By husband yet be led apart,

* A double pun here—Kogoye meaning, 1st, to freeze, congeal; 2nd, the transit or traversing of a child.

† They are travelling westward, leaving Fusiyama behind them.

‡ Alluding to the custom, probably borrowed from China, of carrying the bride over a flame into her husband's house.

§ That is, the "Plain of Pines."

|| The Tokaido—"eastern sea-way"—the high road between the capitals of East and West Japan.

¶ Fuchiu is a considerable town in Sur'ga, but the phrase "sur'ga fuchiu" also means "the completion or crowning of one's efforts."

In bridal bower sweet vows to interchange
In tender whispers heard by none.
Narrows the path* thro' th' briars hardly seen,
To parent as to child unknown,
Fain would'st thou now on lover's strong arm lean."

" KONAMI.

" On Mariko's sunny bank we stand,
His rapid stream shall bear our griefs away,
Dear mother; now on our right hand
High Utsu's hill we leave behind, O say
Shall I my lord's new pillow† press,
Half-sleeping, by a bridegroom's arms embraced,
What mighty cares my mind distress.
Ohoi‡ river, thou whose waters haste
In rapid tumult onwards sped,
As fleeting often is the love of man,
Yet 'tis not fickleness I dread
In him I love, but 'neath misfortune's ban
Our love's full flow'r can hardly blow.
Our feet upon Shiradska's bridge now stand:
Past Yoshida we further go
To Akasaka; our wearied limbs demand
Repose; the beck'ning women cry,
That throng the door of every inn, 'Fair Bride,
To Kyōmid's far-famed temple nigh,
To Otowa's roaring falls choose you a guide;
Say, lady, will you not delay,
Adore the temple's deity and view
How to the god the Pilgrims pay
With sacred dance and music homage due,
And join in the applauding shout,
And share the merry throng's loud happiness.'
'Ah, no; I cannot linger; doubt
And fear us restless towards the city press.'

" TONASE.

" Right, daughter; were thy lover here,
Three suppliants we would Ise's§ god revere.

" KONAMI.

" Thus we our clownish verses sing;
To Nar'migáta's town we come. Success

---

* They are now passing by a place called "Oyashiradskoshirads," which signifies "unknown to parent, unknown to child." The name is due probably to some local story or tradition.

† "Utsu" is "to sleep, recline," &c.

‡ "Ohoi," vast, great, important.

§ They are now in the province of Ise, the classical haunt of the old native gods, and of the tutelary deities of Japan.

The happy name* I trust may bring.
Ha! Atsta's shrine descry we yonder—yes,
Full seven leagues across the bay.
Haul taut the sail, bend, mother, bend to th' oar,
With measured stroke—away, away—
Haste, mother, haste, far yet the further shore.
Hark! as we steer how loud the cry.
Is it the scream of some tiny súdsu fly,†
Or is it rather the chirruping shriek
Of the grasshopper that, as the old song tells, doth cry
Through the chilly nights when the hoar-frosts lie.
The even latens fast, and darksome night
Us threatens ere we have attained
Yon nearing shore, while yet the day is light.
O mother, every nerve be strained.

"Both.

'How fierce the hail drives through the windy air;
We cover from the storm our heads,
Now side by side our barques thro' th' waters tear.
Now one the laggard other leads;
Shō-kame's Hill we pass, awhile
At Seki rest, wherefrom the Eastern way
Parts stretching south for many a mile,
The road that leads through Isé—the merry play
Of packhorse bells we hear as thee
We reach, Sudsuka,‡ Ainotruchi's peak,
Rain-dimmed,§ now hardly may we see.

* "Naru-mi-gata," the place of establishment of oneself, of the success of the endeavours of one's life.

† A sort of small insect, making by attrition of its wings a somewhat pleasant sound, and for that reason often kept in little bamboo-bark cages, and fed upon bits of cucumber or melon.

‡ Sudsuka is the name given to the string of bells generally hung round the *tail* of the animal.

§ Allusion here to the old song—

"Saka wa teru-teru
Sudsuka Kumoru,
Ai-no Tsuchi-yama
Ame ga furu."

Which may be thus rendered—

Bright i' th' sun gleams Suka's peak,
Cloud-veiled Sudska's summit bleak,
Tsuchi's top between doth lie
Rain dimmed hid from traveller's eye.

Suka, Sudska, and Tsuchi, are three contiguous hills, on which the phenomenon referred to is often observed during the showery days of early summer.

Rain ever dims, men say, its summit bleak.
O Minaguchi*—the rocky vale
Of Ishite† we next fatigued toil thro',
Pass Ohods', Nii's temple hail,
The hill-side skirt, our further way pursue,
And now a petty hamlet nigh
Yamashina‡—our journey's end—descry."

Art. VI.—The Scottish Poor-Law.

1. *Annual Reports of the Board of Supervision for the Relief of the Poor in Scotland.* Edinburgh.
2. *Political Economy in Connexion with the Moral State and Prospects of Society.* By Thomas Chalmers, D.D., LL.D. Edinburgh. 1848.
3. *The Christian and Civic Economy of Large Towns.* By Thomas Chalmers, D.D., Minister of St. John's Church, Glasgow. Glasgow. 1821.
4. *Observations on the Management of the Poor in Scotland, and its Effects on the Health of the Great Towns.* By William Pulteney Alison, M.D., F.R.S.E., &c. Edinburgh. 1840.
5. *Pauperism and the Poor Laws.* The Lectures delivered in Edinburgh under the auspices of the Chalmers Association in 1869-70. With kindred papers. Edited by Thomas Ivory, Esq., Advocate, Secretary to the Association. Edinburgh. 1870.
6. *Report, Poor Law (Scotland).* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed. July 18, 1870.
7. *The Scottish Poor Laws: Examination of their Policy, History, and Practical Action.* By Scotus. Edinburgh. 1870.

THE three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland have each a separate Poor Law differing in history and character; and this difference, though not without its inconveniences, is to a certain extent more instructive than if the problem of the relief of the poor were worked out in exactly the same way

* Meaning strictly the "outflow of the waters;" but by a pun signifying "the mouths of all men," that is, common report.

† Literally, the stony place.

‡ A small village close to Kioto, where Rikiya dwells.

throughout the three kingdoms. It is to be hoped that some of the results elicited from the inquiry which has been now going on for two years into the working of the Scottish Poor Law will present some features of general interest.

The oldest statutes about the regulation of the destitute in Scotland date as far back as 1424, under James I.; and in the reigns of three of his successors new laws were made to check vagrancy and confine the permission to beg to "cruiked folk, sick folk, impotent folk, and weik folk."

The enactment of 1579 which still forms the basis of our Scottish Poor Law, though possibly copied from the 14th of Elizabeth, preceded the 43rd of Elizabeth which forms the basis of the English Poor Law. By this enactment, made in the reign of James VI. of Scotland, who afterwards became James I. of England, the impotent poor gained the right of relief, and the magistrates in town and country were empowered to raise compulsory assessments to be levied equally on the landlord and tenant as is now done under the Act of 1845. The denial of the right of relief to the able-bodied, the most important difference between the English and Scottish Poor Laws, is clearly laid down in the Act of 1579. Additional laws for the better regulation of this Act were passed during the reigns of Charles II. and William of Orange. But it is easier to copy these old laws out of the Statute Book than to find how far they were put into force. Antiquarians—a class of men abounding in Scotland where there are few antiquities--are not agreed when the parishes fairly began to make use of assessments. Certain it is that they were little heard of till the middle of the eighteenth century.*

Nevertheless the condition of the people during these 160 years was very miserable. Scotland was desolated by civil turmoils and religious persecutions. One vindictive party succeeded another at the head of affairs. The Episcopalians gave the justices and heritors the right of looking after the poor, as in the Statutes of 1661 and 1663; the Presbyterians gave a joint control to the Kirk Sessions. They fought for the bodies and souls of the poor, but left them to starve. Towards the end of the seventeenth century the condition of the poor in Scotland was so frightful that Fletcher of Saltoun, a man of liberal sentiments and a practical politician, who had travelled and knew something of the world, seriously proposed that the poor and vagrant class, so numerous in Scotland, should, for the sake

* The principal works consulted in this part of our inquiry are: "The Scottish Poor Laws," by Scotus, and a work by the Rev. Robert Burns—"Historical Dissertations on the Law and Practice of Great Britain, and particularly of Scotland, with regard to the Poor." Glasgow. 1819.

of humanity, be seized and reduced to a condition of slavery. There is no doubt that Fletcher's well known calculation of two hundred thousand people begging from door to door, "besides a great number of families very meanly provided for by the church boxes," must have been an exaggeration, since the population of Scotland was at that time no greater than a million. But contemporary history proves that at the time when Fletcher of Saltoun wrote, the condition of the poor of Scotland was extremely wretched. The resources of the country, however, improved considerably, especially after the Union. Scotland was a wide and thinly peopled country, inhabited by a hardy race who had always been poor, and were therefore contented with little. There were no large towns and few manufactories. The Scotch were well educated, for they had a national system of education. They made money across the Border and in the English colonies, part of which came home again. Trade and industry gradually increased; and the people of the lowlands of Scotland, who are now as rich as the English, can afford to laugh at the satires of Churchill. Both nations now agree in thinking poverty ridiculous. Unfortunately, besides this increasing wealth there grew a thick undergrowth of poverty. There had been no assessments, because the law empowering the levying of assessments was permissive, not obligatory; and of the two parties who had to decide upon the question, the heritors did not wish to order any assessment which must fall principally on themselves, and the Presbyterian clergy did not wish an assessment which would deprive them of the distribution of the alms which dropped into the church boxes, the only fund for the destitute in Scotland, save the primitive resource of begging and the voluntary offerings of private charity.

We learn from Sir Henry Moncrieff, a leading minister of the Church of Scotland,* that the Kirk Session—that is, the ministers and elders of the parish church, had the ordinary management of the parochial poor and the applications of the weekly collections and other voluntary donations which they received, while they were entitled to "retain in their own hands the one half of the collections made at the church to defray the expense of the clerks and officers of the inferior Ecclesiastical Courts, and to meet the demands for occasional charities not included in the ordinary management of the poor."

Attempts to relieve the destitute occasionally took whimsical forms. Some Kirk Sessions managed to raise money by insisting on the right of giving on hire a mort-cloth, as well as by the

* See his "Life of Dr. Erskine," Appendix I., p. 408, quoted in Mr. Burns's "Historical Dissertation," p. 18.

exaction of fees at marriages and baptisms, grounded, not upon law, but upon immemorial usage. In many parishes badges were given to the poor, allowing them to beg from house to house. To excite compassion cases of unusual distress were borne about in a wheelbarrow. In some places, the lads of the village used to go round asking food for old and infirm persons; in others, the poor were allowed to hang up a bag in the mill, into which the charitable dropped handfuls of meal. In the parish of Unst, the paupers were quartered on their richer neighbours by turns. In Kirkmichael, in Dumfriesshire, people who had fallen into distress invited their neighbours to what they called by the plain and expressive term of "a drinking." This is, perhaps, the humble origin of that singular institution a charity ball, where gentlemen and ladies subscribe half a guinea to the poor on consideration of being allowed to dance all night—the latter in new dresses worth a hundred times the amount. This drinking consisted, we are told,* "in a little small beer, with a bit of bread and cheese, and sometimes a small glass of brandy or whisky, previously provided by the needy person or their friends. The guests convene at the time appointed, and, after collecting a shilling apiece, and sometimes more, they divert themselves for about a couple of hours with music and dancing, and then go home."

The Scottish clergy, who had a much greater authority, religious, moral, and political over the nation than was ever possessed by any other body of ecclesiastics within a Protestant country, were not very likely to part with the influence which the distribution of these funds put into their hands. Besides their office as preachers of religion, the care of the education of the people and the tutelage of the destitute poor lay within their control, and though the results of the system of parish schools is very creditable to Scotland, this can scarcely be said of the relief of the poor before 1845. The clergy seem to have been pretty well agreed in their statements that the poor were effectually preserved from the extremity of want by this system of relief; but then statements equally confident were boldly advanced at a later period, that the system was still working satisfactorily, when it was proved on overwhelming evidence that such assertions were grossly incorrect. Are these venerable testimonials, conferred on the Kirk Sessions by their own members, of no better value than the similar statements at a later date of a cloud of clergymen of the Church of Scotland which a Parliamentary Commission scattered to the winds? There is little doubt that, as Fletcher of Saltoun has expressed it, "There have always

* Burns, op. cit., p. 299.

been in Scotland such numbers of poor as by no regulations could ever be orderly provided for." The old Kirk Session system was irregular in its action, often inefficient, a mere mockery of relief in poor parishes where it was most needed; though, under a good and industrious clergyman and in a well-to-do parish, it might have worked smoothly and efficiently.

Private charity was not idle, and no doubt did much to help the defects of the system (if system it could be called), but voluntary relief, though theoretically the best kind of relief, has an unfortunate tendency to break down when most needed, and to be dispensed in a capricious and partial manner.

According to Sir Henry Moncrieff, it was the secession of Presbyterians from the Established Church that caused the weekly collections to become insufficient. This statement, which has been copied into the work of Mr. Burns as well as into that of Scotus, seems questionable. It is notorious that the poor were wretchedly provided for in the Highlands, where Dissenters were little known until the Disruption of 1843. Dissent, moreover, commenced in Scotland with small beginnings, and was principally supported by the frugal middle-class in the towns of the Lowlands. It seems likely that the absenteeism of the Scottish aristocracy, and their gradual withdrawal to the congenial Episcopalian Church, had a more telling effect in diminishing the weekly offerings. The action of these and other causes is pointed out at some length by Scotus, who believes that the extinction of feudalism, which he assumes expired in 1748, left the poor worse provided for than before. But though it is true that heritable jurisdictions were only abolished in Scotland in the year 1748, feudalism had long been practically extinct in the Lowlands. To give the name of feudalism to the patriarchal system of clanship existing in the Highlands up to the Battle of Culloden is a misuse of words It is, however, true that the chief was expected to maintain those of his clan who had by accident fallen into destitution.

It is likely enough that the Dissenters, as well as the Catholics, in the towns had reason to complain of the partiality of the Kirk Sessions, and, considering the strong denominational spirit which has so long existed in Scotland, it does not seem reasonable that the support of the poor should have been left to the office bearers in a religious body. The Rev. Mr. Burns* says distinctly, "We ought to discriminate according to the religious connexion of the paupers," and the administrators of the old Poor Law do not hesitate to avow that they consider themselves excused from assisting those whose moral character is bad.

* See op. cit., p. 400; also pp. 318–344.

Though the feeling of the community was evidently against compulsory assessments, though they were steadily opposed by the bulk of the clergy and the General Assemblies of the Established Church, the number of assessed parishes slowly went on increasing for a hundred years. When the new Poor Act became law in 1845, two hundred and thirty parishes, principally in the towns, had already become assessed. Some of these assessments had been originally voluntary annual contributions of the heritors, which, although regularly paid for a long time, could not be strictly regarded as legally due; and occasionally, assessments after being levied for some years, were abandoned.

The amount spent in the relief of the poor was, of course, greater than that given by the Kirk Sessions, who accounted for this by the profound explanation that poverty increases with the amount raised to relieve it. The assessments, they said, were destroying the independence of the Scottish character, and were themselves the cause of the distress they sought to relieve. But the adoption of assessments made steady progress, and, as Scotus pointedly remarks*—

"If, as has been shown, the country was not subjected to assessment, if Parliament did not press it upon the country, but the country gradually and spontaneously, and therefore deliberately, adopted the method of assessment after seeing it in operation and comparing it with the voluntary system, it is reasonable to infer that this was done because the managers (who were the heritors and Kirk Sessions of the day) saw that the system of assessment possessed advantages which the others lacked."

At the same time, a number of benevolent individuals well acquainted with the miserable condition of the poor in Scotland, some of them clergymen of the Established Church, insisted upon the necessity of having an improved legal assessment and a better organized system of parochial relief. It is likely that their efforts would have sooner been successful had the people of Scotland not been discouraged by the unsatisfactory results of the English Poor Law as it was worked in the beginning of this century. Among the principal opponents of the new Poor Law were Dr. Chalmers, the celebrated preacher, and Lord Pitmilly; the latter, though a distinguished lawyer, may be passed over as the unsuccessful opponent of a beneficial measure, but Dr. Chalmers is so well known and so highly esteemed in Scotland, that his name is still appealed to as a great authority against the Scottish Poor Law, as it might be against all Poor Laws whatever. This very year a proposal has been made to erect a statue to his memory, and to endow a fund to pay some one whose name has

* P. 31.

probably been already whispered by the Committee, to deliver a course of annual lectures upon those peculiar views of political economy which were so indifferently received in Dr. Chalmers' lifetime. For the credit of Scotland the latter proposition will not be carried out. It appears that there is not forthcoming a sufficient number of men "of much money and little wit" to pay any one for preaching second-hand paradoxes.

An examination of Dr. Chalmers' work on "Political Economy" must be rather disappointing even to enthusiastic admirers of his theological writings. However anxious they may be to defend or to excuse the erroneous and incoherent speculations which the volumes contain, they cannot fail to see that time has marked many pages with its undeniable refutations, and mocked his sagacity by neglecting to fulfil his predictions. Dr. Chalmers, though deficient in historical knowledge, and too ready to make his Calvinistic pulpit his only stand-point, possessed much speculative acuteness and considerable breadth of mind. The gift of ready expression, which gave him success as a preacher, was a dangerous aid in writing on political economy, where a calm and measured style, and a carefully-balanced equilibrium between the word and the thought are necessary to the correct reasoner and the exact inquirer. Preaching from a place where there was no one to contradict him, he had insensibly got into the habit of giving his words in greater measure than his sense; like a little boy mounted on a large horse, there is a want of synchronism between the motions of himself and his vehicle. In truth, though an eloquent pulpit orator, Dr. Chalmers was a poor reasoner; nor with all his piety and elevation of mind was he above the vulgar desire of raising his own sacerdotal order to a high stage in the social edifice, whose inequalities he was ever most anxious to preserve. The feeling that the Church was in danger of being stripped of the charge of relieving the poor had, no doubt, its effect in arousing in his mind that dislike to all Poor Laws which carried his impetuous nature so far.

Dr. Chalmers was accustomed to teach that the two greatest calamities with which Scotland was threatened were the overthrow of the Established Church and the introduction of a new Poor Law. He lived to be the leader of a mighty schism in the Church, on a quarrel whose importance was scarcely worth the dispeace it occasioned; and might perhaps have been led to demand a change in the arrangement which left the funds for the poor in the hands of the Establishment which he had deserted, had this task not been accomplished by the men who after defeating him in controversy succeeded in convincing the Parliament of the wisdom of their views.

The only kind of Poor Law which Dr. Chalmers would allow

was the nepotism which has so long kept up a species of Government relief to younger brothers of heirs of entailed estates, by giving them commissions in the army and navy, or lucrative posts in the colonies. In order to "appease the mighty force of sentiment and natural affection arrayed against the law of primogeniture," of which he was a zealous though somewhat indiscreet defender, Dr. Chalmers proposed to lay a heavy tax upon entailed estates, the proceeds of which should go to maintain a larger staff of better paid public functionaries, consisting mainly of younger brothers.

Dr. Chalmers denounced the contemplated extension of a Poor Law to Ireland as heartily as he deprecated the disestablishment of the Irish Episcopal Church. The last of these measures would destroy "the best supplement for a residing gentry;" but a Poor Law would annihilate the non-residing gentry themselves, "when the population, the victims of the most insensate experiment," &c., "will remain in as great destitution, and withal in greater helplessness than ever." Had Dr. Chalmers known the real causes of the misery of Ireland, whose condition has improved slowly under the new Poor Law,* as we hope it will continue to improve without the Established Church, it might have occurred to him that the absence of a Poor Law in Ireland was an evil, both to the landlord and tenant. Had estates been burdened by poor rates there would have been at least one motive cogent enough to prove to an absentee proprietor that he could not, with impunity to himself, allow the number of cottier tenants to be increased; in order to avoid increased poor rates the larger proprietors would have conjoined to prevent the excessive subletting of land which has been one of the main causes of the misery of that ill-governed island.

Anxious to make a practical trial of his theories, Dr. Chalmers in 1819 left the parish of the Tron, in Glasgow, for that of St. John's, and devoted all his energies and influence to the task of diminishing the amount given for the relief of the poor.

• "By careful scrutiny," says his son-in-law, Dr. Hanna,† "of every case in which public relief was asked for; by a summary rejection of the idle, the drunken, and the worthless; by stimulating every effort that the poor could make to help themselves, and, when necessary, aiding them in their efforts, a great proportion of those new cases

* The Irish Poor Law, passed in 1847. From Reports of Poor Law Inspectors, of the Wages of Agricultural Labourers in Ireland (Dublin, 1870) it appears that since 1849 the wages of agricultural labourers have risen from fifty to seventy-five per cent. Their wages are now sufficient—at least for their physical wants.

† "Encyclopædia Britannica," Art. Chalmers.

were provided for without drawing upon the Church Poor collections; and such was the effect of the whole system of Christian oversight and influence prudently and uniformly maintained, that in four years the pauper expenditure was relieved from 1400*l.* to 280*l.* per annum."

From the work of Dr. Chalmers on "The Christian and Civic Economy of Large Towns," it would appear that the organization which his exertions superseded had been a very crude one. Much might have been done in a single parish by the great influence which Dr. Chalmers possessed in stimulating others to help the poor by indirect methods; nor do we know the amount of the private charity of the elders and deacons, or of the Dissenting communities who were called upon to assist their own poor.* What the influence of a Chalmers might have been in every parish it is useless to conjecture. Dr. Chalmers left St. John's in 1823. The organization which he had framed went on for a few years, but finally collapsed, like all attempts based upon exceptional energy rather than the steady exertion of average human nature.

The views of Dr. Chalmers and his party were met by Dr. Alison in a small work, the ablest treatise ever published in Scotland on the subject of pauperism. Dr. Alison was at that time the first consulting physician in Scotland, the author of some excellent works on medicine and physiology, and Professor of Medicine in the University of Edinburgh. Besides devoting a portion of his time to gratuitous attendance on the poor, Dr. Alison spent a large portion of his income upon private charity. No one was more disposed from the goodness of his heart to be the friend of the poor, and no man better gifted from his good sense and powerful intellect to devise means to check the evils of poverty, and to rate at their true value the speculations by which some tried to prevent the introduction of a measure which should satisfy the proved wants of the community. Thirty years have passed away since the publication of his "Observations on the Management of the Poor in Scotland," but while time and the progress of correct observation have refuted so many of the speculations of Dr. Chalmers, they have only confirmed the correctness of the views of Dr. Alison.

It is not to be expected that much space can be here devoted to a controversy which, were it not for the obstinate perversity of some old men, might never more have engaged public attention; but as few will be inclined to read what was written so

* "Christian and Civic Economy of Large Towns," vol. ii. p. 151.

long ago, the principal arguments used in the controversy may be here shortly noticed.

Dr. Chalmers objected that a Poor Law taxing the needy to support the pauper has a tendency to widen the evils of poverty by diverting the amount raised—which would be spent in employing labour—to the hopeless effort of relieving pauperism. He accuses Poor Laws of weakening the spirit of private charity, of engendering heartlessness of children to their aged parents, of husbands to their wives and children, and of destroying the independence, provident habits, and self-respect of the working classes. Bringing to his aid the doctrines of Malthus, he calls pauperism "the mightiest known stimulant of population," although in another place he remarks that those who do not amass a competency to meet the wants of old age look to their children for support. Unable as a Christian minister to repudiate the duty of supporting the destitute, he does not hesitate to prefer the encouragement of mendicity to a compulsory poor rate.* He pours all the force of his somewhat wordy eloquence against the English Poor Law, which was not then administered in a skilful manner. "From the unnatural scowl" which Dr. Chalmers perceived "on the aspect of the (English) population," and "the settled hatred that rankled in their hearts," he read "the omens of some great impending overflow," and "whatever reforms," he tells us†—

"may take place, whether in the political or economical systems of our land, let all taxes, and tithes, and monopolies and inequalities of right or privilege be done away with, with the continuance of this single law, the power and promise of all these expedients will utterly come to naught; and we shall have no other prospect before us than one of helpless and ever-increasing deterioration."

Most of the arguments used against the Scottish Poor Law apply to all Poor Laws, and every system of charitable relief whatever. Dr. Alison showed, by the admission of Malthus himself, that private benevolence has the same direction as the Poor Laws, and almost invariably tends to encourage marriage, and that the increase of population beyond the means of sub-

* "We do confess," writes he, "Political Economy," vol. ii. p. 339, 340, "that rather than have such a system we would sit down under mendicity in its very worst form; we would let it roam unrestricted and at large, as it does in France; we would suffer it to rise, without any control, to the height of unlicensed vagrancy; and are most thoroughly persuaded, that even under such an economy, the poverty of the land would be disposed of at less expense to the higher orders, and with vastly less both of suffering and depravity to the lower orders of society."

† "Political Economy," vol. i. p. 415.

sistence in Great Britain really came from Ireland, where no Poor Law then existed. For—

"If," he remarks,* "we could expel from the great towns in England the adult Irish who have settled there, even within the last twenty years, there would be full employment for all the native English who are able to work; and no signs of that redundant population, which we are told, is the necessary results of the laws that have been in operation there for more than two centuries."

Pointing out the absurdity of expecting a trading and manufacturing community like our own, subject not only to the ordinary visitations of famine, disease, and deàth, but to the fluctuations of trade and the varying fortunes of competition, ever to be free from a considerable amount of helpless, unrelieved poverty, Dr. Alison remarks :—

"Now, this being so, the question is, whether that large body of the poor, who *must* thus be mainly dependent on the bounty of persons higher in society than themselves, and *to whom they are individually* unknown, will have their feelings of independence more injured by *claiming that bounty as a right* secured to them by a provident and benevolent law, the application of which to themselves they can prove, or by *supplicating it as a boon,* to which they must recommend themselves as they best can, by ingenious contrivances to fix the attention, and by touching representations to move the feelings of their superiors. In which case is the greater encouragement given to deceit and imposture, or to cringing, fawning, and flattering their superiors? In which case may it reasonably be expected that the relief given will be most regular, most permanent, best proportioned to the circumstances and wants of the applicants, most compatible with exertions of industry in aid of it, and therefore most likely to maintain the self-respect and respectability, and to preserve the feeling of artificial wants in those who receive it? In point of fact, where do we meet with the greater feeling of self-respect and independence, or the higher standard of comfort—in the English pauper, who demands the protection of the law, or in the Irish beggar, who implores the compassion of the charitable? The answer to these questions appears to me so clear—I have watched the progress of so many families receiving assistance in both these ways, and am so confident of the usual results, that I have long considered the notion now in question as one of the most singular delusions which has ever prevailed on this subject."†

Dr. Alison draws a moving picture of the large amount of unrelieved misery in the country parishes, and the sufferings of the poor in the larger towns, where they flocked in the hopes of obtaining relief and employment. The influence of the Church of Scotland was much weakened by the disruption of 1843; and in 1844 a Commission was appointed to inquire into the state of

* "Alison," p. 75. † "Alison," p. 108-9.

pauper relief in Scotland. It consisted of seven members and a secretary, the result of whose labours fills seven large volumes.

"The great evil," to use the words of Mr. Crawford, "which the Commissioners found, and which, in their opinion, rendered some change in the law necessary, was the inadequacy of the relief then afforded to the poor. 'We are of opinion,' they say, 'that the funds raised for the relief of the poor, and the provisions made for them out of the funds raised for their relief is, in many parishes of Scotland, insufficient.' This observation was applied both to assessed and unassessed, and both to burghal and landward parishes. 'Throughout the Highland districts,' the report proceeds, 'and in some parts of the Lowlands also, where the funds consist solely of what may be raised by the Church collections, the amount is often inconsiderable. In many of these places it will be seen that the quantum of relief given is not measured by the necessities of the pauper, but by the sum which the Kirk Session may happen to have in hand for distribution.' In the Highlands and Western Islands, when the poor have exhausted their small crops of potatoes, which, by the kindness of some neighbouring farmer, they have been permitted to raise, they are forced to cast themselves on the charity of their neighbours, many of whom are nearly as poor as themselves."

"On the other hand, in the populous parish of the City of Edinburgh, where a compulsory assessment had been adopted, competent witnesses described the rate of allowance as 'miserably deficient,' and the managers of the poor had repeatedly urged the Town Council to raise the rate of assessment, but had always been denied."

In the North of Scotland the state of those unable to support themselves was heartrending, "the miserable pittances, in many cases not exceeding 3*s.* 6*d.* or 5*s.* a year, were utterly inadequate to afford any efficient relief to real paupers; the consequence was that the poor were driven to depend upon each other; and nothing could be more intolerable than the tyranny exercised over many of the industrious poor, who were compelled to support their idler neighbours."*

The result of this inquiry was the passing of the Poor Law Amendment Act in 1845—the first measure for the relief of the poor in Scotland since the Union. By it the right of those, unable to work, to legal relief was put on an unquestioned footing, and compulsory rating was provided for on a uniform principle, though not forced upon any parish.

The Board of Supervision gave unity and cohesion to the new system of relief, and, while watching over the interests of the poor, was always ready to give its advice and support to the

* "Seventh Annual Report of the Board of Supervision," p. 7.

different local boards in any doubt or emergency. It consisted of a chairman, the Lord Provosts of Edinburgh and Glasgow, the Solicitor General, the Sheriffs of Renfrew, Perth, and Ross, and two other members nominated by the Crown. From 1845 to 1868 the office of chairman was filled by Sir John McNeill, to whose exertions for the good of the poor Scotland has so much reason to feel grateful. The Board meets weekly. The Chairman and Secretary, with their clerks and travelling inspectors, conduct the ordinary office business.

The existing Parochial Boards were called upon to meet on the third Tuesday of September, 1845, and determine how in future they would raise the poor rates. Before the new act came into force two hundred and thirty parishes had been already legally assessed for the relief of the poor. Four hundred and forty-eight now determined to raise the poor rates by assessment out of eight hundred and seventy-eight. In those parishes which still remain non-assessed the management of the poor was left in the hands of the Kirk Sessions; but the number of these non-assessed parishes went on gradually diminishing, till from four hundred and thirty-two, in 1846, there only remained ninety-four in 1869. This fact, which in itself proves that the Poor Law Amendment Act has been accepted as a benefit over the greater part of Scotland, is naturally left out of sight by its assailants.

The new system was worked by Parochial Boards. In the rural parishes every owner of land and heritages above the yearly value of twenty pounds had a seat at the Board; to these were added a certain number, not to exceed six, of the members of the Kirk Session, together with four or five members elected from their own number by the body of the ratepayers, who possess elective votes in proportion to their rental, not exceeding six votes. In the burghal or town parishes and combinations, four managers were named by the magistrates of the burgh; four by the Kirk Sessions; and a certain number, not to exceed thirty, elected by the ratepayers. It will thus be seen that a large number of gratuitous managers were created under the new Poor Law in addition to the paid inspectors appointed in every parish, and that, though advantage was taken of the local information of the ministers and elders who composed the Kirk Sessions, the control of the funds was taken out of their hands, and given, in the towns to the ratepayers and in the country to the landed proprietors. As the landed proprietors paid one-half the rates, their influence was naturally exerted to keep them as low as possible. Complaint was made in some country parishes that the number of elected members was too small; and several parishes refused on this ground to elect representatives. In

general the body of the ratepayers in the rural parishes showed very little interest in choosing representatives, though, especially since the passing of the Reform Bill of 1867, the presence of some managers of a liberal tendency is of considerable importance, since votes are often determined by the manner in which the poor rates are paid.

In some parts of Scotland* the poorer classes took up rather extravagant notions of the benefits which they would reap from the new Poor Law. In several places of the North people gave up their work, saying that there was now no longer any need for them to labour at all. At Wick the fishermen had a difficulty of getting their nets made during the winter; but they soon found their expectations at fault, and the deserving poor were everywhere gainers by the change. The paltry allowances and paltry favouritism of the Kirk Sessions alike disappeared, and as a complete stop was put to begging, it was only those who had acquired some skill in this pursuit that found themselves losers.

On the passing of the Poor Law Amendment Act, a meeting of medical practitioners was held in Edinburgh, with Dr. Simpson in the chair, and a committee was appointed, presided over by Dr. Alison, to inquire into the complaints of medical practitioners for unremunerated attendance to the paupers under the old system. Out of 305 medical men who answered the inquiries, only ninety-four had received any remuneration for their attendance and professional outlay, and of these, ten were paid by private individuals. It was not clear whether any but one who got 60*l.* received enough to repay their outlay. Thirty-five of them got less than 5*l.* a year, and one man 3*s.* for attending on seventy constant and thirteen occasional paupers during twelve years. The rest never got any remuneration of any kind whatever.

"These gentlemen in many cases had to give wine, food, clothes, and other necessaries to the sick poor, often travelling great distances, paying tolls and sojourning at inns, losing paying cases and exposing themselves to contagion in the small, badly ventilated houses of their poor patients." "Several of the Reports complain of the inattention paid to paupers in sickness by the former parochial authorities, and of the difficulty and general impossibility of obtaining any kind of remuneration for professional services, and even for direct professional outlay."†

The amount given for the medical relief of the poor in towns was very trifling, though in the larger towns at least the sick were somewhat better cared for on account of the already available infirmaries and dispensaries. But when we compare them with the large number of such institutions at present existing, we feel

* "First Annual Report of the Board of Supervision," p. 21.
† "First Annual Report," pp. 50–55.

somewhat astonished that anyone would have the boldness to affirm that a Compulsory Poor Law relaxes the efforts of private charity. There is a report from Dr. Macdonald, of Lochshiel, which places in a very affecting light the sufferings endured by the poor people in the Highlands from the want of medical attendance in perfectly curable complaints.

The Kirk Sessions, though failing either to feed the hungry or minister to the sick, had, in their eagerness to keep hold of every possible source of influence, struggled to prevent the care of the poor passing into more capable hands. Parish doctors, who are still somewhat scantily paid, were appointed to attend those on the poor roll who wanted medical relief. In 1869 the whole sum expended for medical relief was 33,784*l*., of which 10,000*l*. came from an annual Parliamentary grant.

The assailants of the Poor Law who talk of the increased numbers of paupers on the roll ought to remember that under the new system many lives are preserved which formerly were carried away by disease and semi-starvation.

Very little care was taken of lunatic paupers under the old system, and when the Board of Supervision took up the consideration of this question in 1846 it was found that there were few establishments for the care of the insane, and scarcely any spare accommodation. In 1857 it was thought expedient to make over the charge of lunatic paupers to a newly created Lunacy Board, whose efficiency has now stood the test of a Parliamentary inquiry. As a lunatic costs twice as much for his keep as an ordinary pauper (generally about 27*l*. a year), the increased charge of lunatics formed an item in the increasing expenses of the poor rates, which is surely repaid by a more wise and generous treatment to our fellow creatures who have fallen under so frightful a misfortune as the loss of reason. The number of lunatic poor relieved in the course of the year 1869 was 7346; the increase in the cost of lunatics amounted in the same year to 11,136*l*. Although improvements may still be made, and are still making in the management of lunatic paupers, there is reason to believe that they are as well treated in Scotland as in any country in the world. The progressive increase of lunacy is more apparent than real, since it is in a great measure due to these unfortunates now living longer than they used to do, and consequently appearing in greater proportion to the rest of the population.*

It was soon found, as Dr. Alison had pointed out, that the building of poor-houses was necessary for the successful working of the

* On this subject see an Article in the "British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review," April, 1870, entitled "The Growth of Lunacy."

new enactment. This was especially the case in the Highlands, where the condition of the people, owing to causes already pointed out in an article on "Landed Tenure in the Highlands" in the *Westminster Review* for October, 1868, had long been miserable, dependent, and precarious. In Ross-shire,* for example, people gave up light farm work from the fear that this would diminish their chance of an out-door allowance. Labourers refused, or at least pretended to refuse, to support their parents. Money in the bank was shifted to other names before making an attack on the inspector. The parish boards when they met were besieged by crowds of clamorous applicants, and their refusal to submit to imposition was followed by prosecution and litigation; for lawyers were always ready to take up complaints, and in most cases it was impossible either to prove that the applicant was able to work or had some concealed means of living.

"The poor-house has put a stop to all these nuisances. A ticket of admission to that establishment is generally a *quietus* to the noisiest. Its cleanliness and order are not to be endured, and rather than oblige us by going there, the fraudulent pauper has almost vanished. It was all very well being a pauper when it led to no restraints or change of habits; it was all very well to have one's mother or sister on the roll while she brought money into the house, but her work is too valuable to be lost, and so she does *not* go to the poor-house."

It is difficult to convey to the reader unacquainted with the feelings of the class of people who are likely to apply for parish relief an idea of the thoroughness of the poor house test, yet I have never heard it questioned, and, indeed, have heard inspectors say that it is rather too thorough; that people will endure to be half starved rather than enter a poor-house, and there is no doubt that they will prefer to live in the most wretched and precarious manner, while they could get better fare, better lodging, and better treatment within the walls of the poor-house. The enemies of the Scottish Poor Law, and notably some of the lecturers whose book we have on our list, talk with the bitterest contempt of poor-houses, without furnishing any practical suggestion as to how they could be improved. It is clear that a poor-house cannot prudently be made a more desirable residence than a labourer's cottage; that its inmates must be under the control of the governor; that they cannot be allowed to go in and out as they choose; that they must be fed on a collective diet scale, and that they have no right to expect from the public, which is taxed to maintain them, anything more than what is sufficient to keep them

* See "Letter on the Establishment of a Poor-house in Easter Ross," in the Seventh Annual Report, p. 76.

in a healthy state. My knowledge of poor-houses is principally derived from one which I have several times inspected as delegate from a country parochial board. I found the lodging much superior to that met with in the hovels of the poor; the food of good quality and of some variety; the inmates clean and well cared for; something even done to amuse and instruct them, and all the children sent to school. Perhaps more might have been done to provide the inmates with employment; but it had been found very difficult to make this remunerative. I was always ready to listen to complaints, and several were made to me, but they seemed to be trifling. The most strenuously maintained was one coming from the women—that they were not furnished with tobacco.

I have repeatedly asked people who had left the poor-house in disgust for a precarious life of hawking and begging, what it was which they so much disliked, but never got a very straightforward answer. Some objected to being obliged to wash themselves too often; others to the want of particular articles of diet. Probably the main objection is the discipline and confinement, and the dismal and forlorn air of a place whose only inhabitants are people hopelessly beaten in the battle of life—all of them unfortunate, and many of them vicious.

It would appear, from observations at an open meeting of the Chalmers' Institution, held at Edinburgh, June 16th, 1870, that some at least of its prominent members hold that inmates of the poor-house should be allowed a more luxurious diet; especially that they should get tea and tobacco off the poor rates, and that they should be allowed, if not the entire liberty of going in or out as they please during the day, at least a great deal more liberty than they at present possess. It is of course impossible to reconcile those demands with the bitter complaints of the very same individuals as to the great and increasing expense of maintaining the poor. Were such suggestions adopted, the number of applications, as well as the expense of maintaining indoor paupers, would be enormously increased. To supply paupers with harmless luxuries must be still left to the efforts of private charity. Without forgetting what may be said for the separation of man and wife while they are inmates of a poor-house, I have always felt that the separation of aged couples is a piece of unnecessary severity. It must, however, be remembered, in considering this question, that relief to able-bodied people is not given in Scotland. The average cost of board per head of inmates of poor-houses in Scotland is about 3*s.* 2*d.* in the week, to which about nineteen pence must be added for lodging, salaries of officials, &c.

The expenditure for building poor-houses has been very heavy,

amounting, from 1860 to the present time, to about half a million of money. Some of these institutions are already overcrowded; but a great number have been built on a too large and expensive scale. This, however, as has been proved, is the fault of local boards, not of the Board of Supervision; and the money spent must be treated as an increase to the accumulated capital of the poor-rates.

It is to be feared that parochial boards are sometimes deterred, out of a mistaken humanity, as well as a mistaken economy, from sending applicants to the poor-house. It may appear a saving to get rid of an applicant with an outdoor allowance of one shilling and sixpence, or two shillings a week, while double that amount would be required to keep him in the poor-house; but it should never be forgotten that twenty people will eagerly claim any outdoor allowance, however small, for one who will be prepared to go into the poor-house. It seems clear that, granting the right of the destitute to claim relief from the state, which is admitted in one form or other in almost every civilized country, the only feasible way of reducing the expenses of the Poor Law is by diminishing the amount of outdoor relief. We are compelled with grief to admit that the self-respect and independent spirit of the destitute are not sufficient safeguards against wholesale imposition, any more than the limited intercourse of the wealthier classes furnishes available means of detecting fraudulent claims. There are populations whose independence of spirit has suffered so much from long-continued poverty, that indoor relief is almost the only means of testing who are really unable to maintain themselves. In some parts of the world, indeed, there are people so indolent and apathetic that they would flood any poor-house where they were sure they would get food to eat and a floor to lie upon. It would, for example, have been impossible to have introduced an extensive system of outdoor relief into Ireland; yet the Irish Poor Law has been successfully worked by stiffly holding to residence in the workhouse as a test of destitution.

In a comparison made in the year 1859, Sir John McNeill* has shown that there were five paupers in Scotland for every one in Ireland, and more than twelve paupers in the Highland counties for every one pauper in Ulster and Connaught. "For so vast a disparity," he goes on, "there must be causes that are intelligible." The tendency to rely upon parochial relief, "though attempts were made to guard it by careful scrutiny and the labour test, was not checked in Ireland until the workhouse was available. The cruelty of resorting to that mode of relief was then denounced

---

* See "Fourteenth Annual Report," p. 20.

in terms of unmeasured severity; but those who looked not to present popularity, but to the permanent welfare of the people, persevered; and it may be doubted whether there is now to be found one sincere friend of the labouring classes in Ireland who has intelligently considered the subject, and who believes that the industry, the self-reliance, and the power of self-maintenance now exhibited by the people of Ireland could have been developed, as it has been in the last ten years, if outdoor relief had there been as easily obtained as it now is in the Highlands of Scotland, or who doubts that the people of Ireland have gained far more by this development than they could have gained by a system of outdoor relief, which repressed the growth of those qualities and habits."

The number of paupers relieved in Ireland during the year 1869 was 236,544; the number who received outdoor relief was 50,103. In Scotland, during the same year, the number who received indoor relief was 8346. The number who received outdoor relief was 71,988. The boarding out of pauper children in the country, which has been for many years on trial in Scotland,* has of late engaged some attention, and seems likely to be adopted in England. It is a great misfortune for orphan and deserted children to be brought up amidst the dejection of a poor-house; and those children who have been boarded with Highland crofters, or respectable people of the poorer classes, in any of the country districts, have in general been kindly treated by their guardians, whose affections they often gain. They have been found healthy and intelligent, without the inert expression of poor-house children, and soon become able to maintain themselves. There is some danger that the value of their work may cause their guardians to be remiss in sending them regularly to the parish schools, yet it is found on the whole by the inspectors who watch over their condition, that the plan has worked well. Whether it will be found to do so, if carried out on a large scale, is a question which time will decide.

Nothing is more likely to give long life to real abuses than to lead off the people to attack imaginary ones; and if in future not more alert, Scotland may get the discredit of being addicted to unreasonable grumbling. Mr. McLaren, M.P. for Edinburgh, and some other Scotch Members of Parliament, have recently distinguished themselves by an assault against the manner in which the Civil Administration of Scotland was carried on. It was unnecessarily expensive, full of supernumeraries, and worked badly. Mr. Gladstone was persuaded to listen to their complaints, and Commissioners were appointed to inquire into the matter. The result

---

* See "Seventeenth Annual Report," pp. 3–8.

was that the complaints were found to be delusive, and the complainants on examination proved to be ignorant of the machinery of the Government they criticised. The Scottish Board of Supervision and that of Lunacy were amongst those examined, and the inquiry turned out entirely to their credit.

But for several years back a few of the old adherents of Dr. Chalmers had been trying to excite an agitation against the Scottish Poor Law. As one of the Edinburgh newspapers remarked, it appears that when a number of men set themselves to talk upon any subject, no matter how foolishly and recklessly, they are always put down in the end as authorities on the question. Last year some of these agitators gained what is thought a great compliment on the northern side of the Tweed—the distinction of being sent to London at the public expense, to be examined before a Committee on the Scottish Poor Law. The nature of their evidence, given in a big Blue Book, is thus summed up by Scotus:—

"The first impression conveyed to the mind by a consideration of the evidence recorded in this massive Blue Book is, that the promoters of the enquiry had no definite notion of what they wanted to enquire into, no definite subject of complaint to investigate; they expose no glaring defects in the law; they trace and account for no evils in administration; they have no special remedial measures to suggest; the whole appears to be an irregular, unmethodical, disconnected, hotchpotch of Poor Law information."

The assailants of the Poor Law have this year published a small book—a sobered epitome of the vehement harangues found pleasing to Edinburgh audiences—under the title of "Lectures on Pauperism and the Poor Laws." The book contains eight lectures by different authors, who agree in little but in abusing the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1845, which, nevertheless, none of them propose to abolish. Calling themselves the disciples of Dr. Chalmers, who avowed his desire of getting the English Poor Law entirely abolished, they unite in accepting the Scottish Poor Law, which he opposed; and though professing to look upon its operations with contempt, they have no desire again to put the destitute under the care of the old Kirk Sessions. These lectures have a good deal of that unpleasing mixture of weakness and vehemence which characterize the orators of the *soirée*. Bold assumptions, which have been often refuted, are put forward with a confidence founded upon a well-grounded conviction of the ignorance or carelessness of their audience. The English Poor Law is held up to contempt, without any attempt to distinguish its administration since the Act of 1834 from that prevailing at the beginning of this century; and a fancy has

wandered into the minds of some of the lecturers that the Scottish Poor Law of 1845 was intended to prevent, or ought to have prevented, pauperism, instead of being designed to relieve distress, the result of causes which it could not touch. Mr. Ivory may have had more trouble than generally falls to the lot of an editor, in correcting manuscripts and removing gross errors from the proof-sheets, but there are still some of the papers which need a revise, and perhaps the fault-finding propensities of the different contributors might have been more usefully exercised upon one another's compositions, than upon any enactment framed by able politicians, and administered by men of education and capacity.

Surely one of the other lecturers might have had sufficient acuteness to point out to Dr. Alexander Wood, who comes first, that it was not likely he would "prevent all cavil" by presenting "certain calculations, carefully made by Councillor Lewis from official returns, revised by a most careful actuary, and published in the *Scottish Reformer* newspaper," inasmuch as these calculations contained an error, which the careful actuary should have at once detected. By the help of his "very terrible table," Dr. Wood undertakes to prove that pauperism is increasing numerically in Scotland, and "advancing with giant strides;" but as the only basis of comparison he gives us is, not the number of cases appearing on the poor roll, when the Poor Law of 1845 first came into operation, but the number of cases stated as having received relief during the last year of the old Kirk Session system, which the new enactment superseded, the unwary reader, recalling that the new Poor Law, passed in 1845, would readily imagine that he may safely trust the learned doctor and his careful actuary, who give us for the expenditure of 1845 what is rather the expenditure of 1844—*i.e*, that of the year ending with 1st February, 1845. Had Dr. Alexander Wood and his careful actuary been anxious to state the question fairly, they would have explained that the returns of the Kirk Sessions, which they have copied from the "First Annual Report of the Board of Supervision," and insist on using as the basis of comparison, were a "mere approximation to the truth," that the rolls "had been kept irregularly and imperfectly, without any attempt at uniformity in the different parishes, and were not in the possession of the inspectors who had been named under the recent statute."*

The number of paupers under the old system of relief, set aside as inadequate, was 63,070; that for the year ending 1st February, 1846, when the Poor Law had been scarcely five

* "First Annual Report," pp. 22, 23.

months in operation, was 69,432; the number of paupers in 1868 was 80,032, showing an increase, by Dr. Wood's revised method, of 16,962 paupers on the roll, but really an increase of 10,600, which, considering the proportionate increase of the population of Scotland, hardly justifies the violent language habitually indulged in about the frightful effects of the Poor Law of 1845. In fact, as we shall see presently, the proportion of paupers to the population has remained stationary under the Poor Law Amendment Act. Then again, the Rev. Dr. Begg, another lecturer, who by the way proposes to have training schools for statesmen, with examinations, which all members of Parliament should be forced to pass, has probably enough of taste to warn Mr. Lewis that, to use his own phrase, he may be suspected of "moral dilapidation" in his clumsy attempt to insult Dr. Alison, whose name he cannot even spell correctly, or to caution Dr. Mackenzie, Provost of Inverness, against talking of "butter, fowls, eggs, and even milk, darkening the doors of labourers." The last mentioned gentleman somewhat imprudently admits that our labourers have doubled their wages since 1845, besides being free from the burden of supporting the paupers; "for previous to 1845 the poor supported the poor, while the rich looked on and approved." Ill-used Dives! and now they make you pay poor-rates! It appears that before 1845 "the paupers were better lodged, clothed, and fed, and led far happier lives than they do now." Before the disastrous enactment of 1845, Provost Mackenzie has seen in cottars' houses "sleeping berths reserved for wandering paupers, who were always made welcome to a night's lodging, getting their supper and breakfast with the family, to whom they were often quite unknown." These beneficent cottars, the Provost assures us, "found this arrangement so agreeable that they never then observed the weight of their burden, though it was probably twenty times as much as they now pay yearly as poor rates, nor have they felt that they are in any way better off now, though relieved of their former heavy burden." This is a problem that ought to be placed before Dr. Alexander Wood's most careful actuary—how people, whose wages are doubled, and who spend ninety-five per cent. less upon the entertainment and relief of the poor, are in no way better off. A miller of Dr. Mackenzie's acquaintance used in those halcyon days "to keep a barrel always supplied with meal for pauper visitors, to each of whom his wife gave a plateful till the barrel was empty, when he (the charitable miller) filled it again;" but ere the new Poor Law had been a year in operation the pauper's bed and the meal barrel were shut up. Surely this Dr. Mackenzie was once inspector of the poor at Gair Loch under the very enactment which he denounces so bitterly, and

resigned his office, not through his dislike to the Poor Law, but under the advice of the Board of Supervision,* owing to some complaints made by the crofters anent his anxiety to keep up the Arcadian days of the berth and the meal barrel.

It cannot have passed out of the recollection of most of our readers, that it was proved, by an overpowering mass of evidence,† that for the last thirty years it had been the policy of the landlords in England to diminish their poor rates by demolishing the cottages on their estates, and thus compelling the poor workman, whose industrious hands give its value to the land, to increase his toil by a walk of four or five miles from the nearest town or open village, or to crowd closer and closer into huts ever fouler and more dilapidated.

This was a dishonourable charge against a large body of men, well educated and in affluent circumstances, whose monopoly of the land was maintained by special laws. The only cure that Parliament could devise for the evil was to increase the size of the poor unions, so that the rates being levied upon larger areas, it would be difficult for a landed proprietor to diminish his poor rates merely by driving away the labourers from a single parish, a measure fraught with danger of relaxing the efforts of managers to keep down the rates.

A similar accusation has been made against the landed gentlemen of Scotland, though on inferior evidence. On this subject Mr. Scot Skirving, who, as an East Lothian farmer, ought to know something about the matter, is very positive. Speaking of the landed gentlemen, he writes:—"I have heard gentlemen boast of the number of cottages they had cleared out, and congratulate themselves on the fact that there were very few or no paupers in their parishes."

Mr. Skirving at the same time thinks that Ireland, being eminently a pastoral country, is still far too densely peopled, and talks approvingly of the Highland clearings; but here he comes into feud with his Gaelic fellow-lecturer, Dr. Mackenzie, of Eileanach, Provost of Inverness.

"Remembering," says the Provost, "that a vast extent of our present fine large arable farms near here, was not long ago waste moorland, over which I used to search for game, and beyond this, not worth a rent of sixpence per acre; that much of that waste land has been reclaimed by poor cottars, who were able and willing to pay any reasonable rent, and conform to any rules with proper instruction and oversight; who asked for no compensation for their improvements,

* See "Second Annual Report," p. ii., and pp. 60, 61.

† See the Report of Dr. H. J. Hunter, on the "House Accommodation of the Rural Labourers in England," in the Seventh Report of the Medical Officer of the Privy Council. London. 1864.

and would have retained their holding gladly, if permitted to do so, and who left them for a comparatively wretched life in towns, or in a hated foreign land, and when I see around me millions of acres of waste land, on an average quite as improveable as what is now cultivated, and as good soil as much of the forest and prairie abroad, if similar labour were bestowed on it, surely our landlords are anything but wise in driving away, and, to a certain extent, making enemies of their people, whose hearts are aching to be allowed to remain where they were born and bred, that they might cultivate these tracts of waste land, which uncultivated are a disgrace to a nation busily evicting those who are so sadly required at home."

There is no doubt that a slow process of evicting the crofters is still going on over a great part of the Highlands; but it is not at all clear that the desire of lessening the poor rates is the motive to these evictions. From the great size of the Highland parishes, labourers driven beyond the boundaries would be for all useful purposes fairly banished, and the expulsion from the parish of persons who must speedily become chargeable wherever they might go could not, as Sir John McNeill has remarked, effect the purpose for which it was desired to expel them. The argument, that because a great proportion of paupers in the towns were born, or had even lived some time in the country, does not appear a convincing one. Large towns do not keep up their own population, and the unfortunate nature of our landed tenure, the diminution of small farms, the turning of ploughed land into grass, and the introduction of machinery into agriculture, and the superior sources of employment in the towns, are of themselves sufficient to explain the movement of our population from the rural to the town districts. Dr. Stark, Registrar-General for Scotland, in a paper in the *Edinburgh Medical Journal*,* finds occasion to observe :—

"Great obloquy is every now and then endeavoured to be thrown on landed proprietors by raising the cry that they drive off all the old men from their estate, and thus throw them upon the towns, letting their houses to younger and more able-bodied men. The extent to which this is done—if done at all—must be perfectly infinitesimal, as the statistics of the population fail to show it; inasmuch as the proportion of aged persons in the towns is very much smaller than it is in the rural districts. In every thousand persons of the general population, 115 are above 60 years of age in the insular; 87 in the mainland rural; but only the small proportion of 61 in the thousand in the town districts."

Perhaps it will now be more prudent as well as less tiresome to our readers to leave off correcting the blunders of these eight

* December, 1869, p. 486.

champions of Chalmersdom, especially as Mr. Ivory, with true Scotch cannyness, has managed to print, in small type by way of appendix, an able statement on "The Poor Law Act of 1845," by Mr. Donald Crawford, which acts as a quiet corrective to the incoherent declamation of the lecturers

The greater part of this article was written ere the work on "The Scottish Poor Law," by Scotus, came into our hands, otherwise more use had been made of it. As it is, an independent study of the question enables us the more thoroughly to appreciate the truthful, laborious, and accurate character of the book. The subject is most ably and thoroughly treated. It is a complete book on the Scottish Poor Law which Scotchmen ought to read, as the Poor Law is a most important subject, and apparently not sufficiently studied.

In England, the proportion of indoor paupers is as great, and they cost somewhat more than in Scotland; the amount of outdoor relief is much the same. The increase of expense has been going on for the last nine years more quickly in England than in Scotland.* In 1868, England spent 7,498,061*l.*; Scotland, 863,202*l.* on Poor Law Relief. The total sum disbursed in Scotland in 1869, was 931,274*l.*, which was thus spent: For relief of poor on the rolls, 659,502*l.*; relief of casual poor, 25,153*l.*; medical relief, 33,784*l.*; management, 95,626*l.*; law expenses, 7117*l.*; building, 110,090*l.* The number of paupers on the rolls was 80,334; the number of their dependents, 48,005; the number of casuals, 48,243. Even under the old Poor Law, the amount of relief had been increasing: In 1836, the sums raised from all sources were 171,042*l.*; in 1841, they had mounted to 218,481*l.*; for the year ending February, 1845 (the last of the old Poor Law), they were 258,814*l.*—a difference of 87,772*l.* since 1836.

Dr. Alison,† writing in 1840, thought that even at that time, instead of 140,000*l.*, we might make 800,000*l.* as a limit to which, judging from the experience of England, Holland, and Paris, we might gradually approach. This sum was not exceeded till the year 1867. Scotus, who devotes six chapters to the question of increased expenditure, shows clearly that the number of paupers to the population of Scotland has not increased during the last twenty years. In the words of the Chairman of the Select Poor Law Committee‡—

"While the general average percentage of all classes relieved is almost stationary, the percentage of registered poor has diminished

* "Report of the Commissioners to inquire into certain Civil Departments in Scotland." Edinburgh. 1870.

† "Observations on the Management of the Poor," pp. 177, 178.

‡ "Report Poor Law (Scotland), 1870," p. xii.

sensibly; the percentage of casual poor has also diminished, though to a much smaller extent; but the percentage of the dependents of the registered poor has increased in a marked degree."*

It has been also shown that, if the increased rental of land be taken into consideration, property is not more heavily taxed for poor rates than it was twenty years ago. The increased expenditure is owing to a more liberal scale of allowance, to the greater care taken of lunatics, and to the increased price of provisions, which according to Scotus have risen one-third. The Select Committee have this year published a second bulky Blue Book of evidence. They propose to reassemble next session, in order to agree upon their report. There is no doubt that this will be unfavourable to the views of the knot of Edinburgh agitators who have got up the inquiry, and who now wish to put the country to the additional expense of a Commission. It would appear from the draft report of the chairman, and other proposals published at the beginning of the Blue Book, that no doubt is entertained of the benefits conferred on the poor by the Act of 1845, and that the proposed changes will, instead of favouring the views of the old Kirk Session party, tend in the contrary direction. The committee will probably recommend that members of the Kirk Session should no longer have the right of sitting at the parochial boards unless elected by the ratepayers, that the qualification in respect to landed property giving a direct seat at the board should be raised, that the power of the Board of Supervision should be increased, and the workhouse test more steadily insisted upon in order to keep down the expenditure.

Owing to the exigencies of space many questions connected with our subject, such as the incidence of taxation upon landed and other property, vagrancy, illegitimacy, and the right of the able-bodied to relief, have been left out of consideration; but it is to be hoped that a clear idea has been given of the general working of the Scottish Poor Law.

An association has within two or three years been formed in Edinburgh, under the direction of a committee, the chairman being Dr. Alexander Wood, whose lecture has been already noticed, in order to visit the poor in their homes, to obtain collective information about their habits and antecedents, and endeavour to assist them in a variety of ways. To such an association every one must feel well disposed; and it is to be hoped that their leaders will understand that their task must be to supplement the action of the Poor Law, not to supersede it. Even when the principle that no human being

* "Scotus," p. 163, and "Report (Poor Law), 1870," p. xiii.

unable to work is to be allowed to die of hunger is worked out, there is still a wide field for private charity. To add a little to the pittance of the deserving, to find work and occasionally to give relief to the able-bodied poor who have fallen into straits, to help families struggling with the visitation of disease, or the temptations of dissipation and crime, to endeavour to make the richer and poorer classes regard one another with kindlier views, to make the former abate their vulgar pride of purse, and teach the latter to cease to think that the pity of the rich is something akin to their contempt: all this is a noble work, which will do good to those who set about it faithfully. In the present state of society a Poor Law is necessary. There is a Poor Law even in America; and in Australia, the youngest of our colonies, where light work is perhaps easier to be had than in any country in the world, large sums have to be spent every year on the support of the destitute. At present, the demand seems to be that these funds should be put under the direction of the Government.*

Mr. Charles Cowan, a philanthropic gentleman, late member for Edinburgh, recently made a journey to Elberfeld and other towns of Germany, to inquire into a system of poor relief in operation there, in which compulsory rating is worked along with distribution of the public charity by the hands of volunteers.

There is no space left to enter into the details which he gave, but one thing is freely admitted by him, that the cost of the poor is proportionally as great at Elberfeld as at Edinburgh, and that while the number of the poor in Elberfeld and Barmen has considerably diminished within the last ten years, the expenditure has rather increased. It ought to be kept in mind that not only are provisions much cheaper in Germany, but the manner of living of the people is much simpler.

It can scarcely be avoided that money should now and then be thrown away upon fraudulent applicants in the large towns of Scotland; but a paid and trained inspector is a much better person to inquire into cases of alleged destitution than a benevolent and irresponsible volunteer. The attitude of resistance owing to the desire to get off at the cheapest rates assumed by the inspector and the parochial boards, is often unpleasing. If the amount given is really to keep the pauper, it ought in many cases to be doubled; but then the poor have often resources which they can successfully conceal. There is no use denying the desire of the poor to be on the roll. Whether those feelings of independence which are believed to have existed in the days when

* See the Article on "Colonial v. American Pauperism," in the *Westminster Review* for July, 1870.

the amount of poor relief, regulated by the amount in the church boxes, was doled out at the rate of 3*s.* or 5*s.* in the year, were ever strong enough to stand a month's real temptation, is a question that may be left in doubt. It is possible the tough spirit of the Scotch labourers may have been weakened by the large admixture of immigrant Irish. At any rate, many of the poorer classes are as well pleased to get something off the parish for their parents as they would be to see them on the civil or military pension list. It must not, however, be supposed that they would refuse to maintain them, or are anxious to desert them. Nothing of the kind. This is a disagreeable accompaniment of any poor law or system of charitable relief; nor will it be cured, save through the operation of causes over which the Board of Supervision has no control.

No one must leave this paper with the impression that the poorer classes in Scotland are disposed to rely upon external help. Such an accusation bears more heavily upon average human nature than upon one of the sturdiest and most persevering of nations. The very roughness of the Scot is but an awkward assertion of his independence. The peasant proprietors of France are much better off than the labouring classes in Scotland; but they are much more grasping and greedy. As M. About says, they are almost ferocious in their avarice. In like manner the labouring classes in Germany, at least on the Rhine where I have lived, are hardly so independent in their spirit as those in Scotland.

The most barefaced begging and crawling servility is to be met with in India or Madeira, where there are no poor laws. Nor, as far as experience from India is to be relied on, does the danger of death by starvation without any public relief act as a general deterrent against the indulgence of the hour.

The Scottish Poor Law seems to the author to be superior to the arrangements for relieving the poor existing in France and Germany.

Art. VII.—The Laws of War.

1. *The Law of Nations considered as Independent Political Communities.* By Travers Twiss, D.C.L., Regius Professor of Civil Law in the University of Oxford. London. 1863.
2. *Kent's Commentary on International Law.* Edited by J. T. Abdy, LL.D., Regius Professor of Laws in the University of Cambridge. London. 1866.
3. *Oxford Essays: contributed by Members of the University.* "The Growth of Laws and Usages of War." By Montague Bernard, B.C.L. London. 1856.

IT is now pretty generally admitted that the great leading principles of international and personal morality are fundamentally and in outline the same. "Justice," as Mr. Mill has said, "is as binding on communities as it is on individuals; and men are not warranted in doing to other countries, for the supposed benefit of their own country, what they would not be justified in doing to other men for their own benefit." But between international and municipal law there is only a partial and qualified analogy. It is of the essence of municipal law that it should consist of the commands of a superior. It is of the essence of international law that it should consist of the voluntary agreements of equals. To enforce the provisions of the first is the recognised function of constituted authority. To enforce the provisions of the second is the self-imposed task of the parties affected by them themselves. It is the bounden duty of the government of every state to insure the obedience of its subjects or citizens to the former. It is purely optional with states, in their relations to other states, whether they will resent or permit the disregard or infraction of the latter. The sanctions of municipal law lie in an orderly course of procedure, and the infliction of stipulated penalties. The sanctions of international law lie in an appeal to arms, and a resort to the indefinite violence of warfare.

It may, however, be observed that the distinctions between international and municipal law have not always been so clearly defined as they are at present. It was remarked by Montesquieu that, "Toutes les nations ont un droit des gens. Les Iroquois même qui mangent leurs prisonniers en ont un. Ils envoient et reçoivent des embassades. Ils connoissent les droits de la guerre et de la paix. Le mal est que ce droit des gens n'est pas fondé sur les vrais principes."

More recent investigations have gone a long way not solely to prove the truth of this proposition, but likewise to explain why it is true. In the initial stages of the development of civilization, a species of international law appears to be the only form in which anything approaching to systematic jurisprudence is known to mankind. In his remarkable work on Ancient Law, Mr. Maine has shown that the whole of the evidence we possess with respect to the rudimentary social organization of our race tends to substantiate the conception of its arrangements which is commonly called the Patriarchal Theory. "Ancient Law," he tells us, "is full in all its provinces of the clearest indications that society in primitive times was not what it is assumed to be at present—a collection of individuals. In fact, and in the view of the men who composed it, it was an aggregation of families. The contrast may be most forcibly expressed by saying that the unit of an ancient society was the family; of a modern society it is the individual." The rights and obligations which are now regarded as the attributes of persons, or rather those of them which were already recognised, were then regarded as the attributes, not of persons, but of corporate bodies. The internal affairs of each corporation were entirely under the despotic and irresponsible control of its natural head—the Patriarch, or *pater-familias* of the Roman Law. The operation of the antique code was confined to the regulation of its external relations, and intercourse of each corporation with other corporations governed in the same manner and framed on the same pattern. The gradual expansion of the family into the tribe, and of the tribe into the nation, was in the ordinary course of things merely the work of time. The traditions of the Jews relate how the family of Abraham became the Twelve Tribes, and how the Twelve Tribes became the nations of Israel and Judah. Among the Germans and Gauls, in the age of Tacitus and Cæsar, and among the Scottish clans and Irish septs, in an age nearer to our own, a similar process in certain of its phases was susceptible of actual observation. Again, the records and institutions of the Greeks and the Romans leave us no room for doubt that the social expansion in question had at one period happened both in Greece and in Rome. "In most of the Greek States," says Mr. Maine, "there long remained the vestige of an ascending series of groups out of which the State was at first constituted. The family, house, and tribe of the Romans may be taken as the types of them all, and they are so described to us that we can scarcely help conceiving them as a system of concentric circles which have gradually expanded from the same point. The elementary group is the family, connected by common subjection to the highest male ascendant; the aggregation of families forms

the *gens* or house; the aggregation of houses makes the tribe; the aggregation of tribes constitutes the commonwealth."

It is clear that a number of contiguous and independent families or tribes could settle any disputes which might arise among them only by negotiation on equal terms, or by the exercise of force. As there was no central authority to which they could refer their respective claims, they were compelled, like nations in the present day, either to enter into a compromise, the result of mutual concessions, or to take the law into their own hands, and terminate their differences with the strong arm. The instinctive love of fighting, characteristic of barbarous and by no means absent in civilized, man, would probably incline them to the latter alternative in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. But besides this, in the condition of human knowledge which such a state of society implies, there could not appear to be anything absurd or inappropriate in this method of ascertaining the validity of a legal demand. Antiquity furnishes us with many examples of the decision of intertribal and international disputes by single combat, or the combat of an equal number of champions appointed by each belligerent, without any reference to the actual strength of the several forces they were commissioned to represent. Almost within living memory the law of nearly every European country preserved the primitive institution of trial by battle. Among ourselves it was not formally abolished until the second decade of the current century, and the prejudice in which it originated still survives in the practice of duelling.

On the assumption indeed that Providence, in the person either of many divinities or of one divinity, is constantly superintending and directing the course of sublunary events, it is not altogether irrational to suppose that it should make its influence more than ordinarily manifest on sublunary events of more than ordinary importance. It took a very long experience to convince even a select few of the truth conveyed in Voltaire's jest:—"Le bon Dieu est toujours du coté des plus grands bataillons." Even now we hear frequent references to the "God of Battles;" and the generality seem fully assured that the goodness of a cause has something to do with the fortune of a campaign. The King of Prussia's recent despatches have in them many more references to the designs of the Almighty than to the plans of Count von Moltké; and many well-disposed people in these islands seem to imagine that the triumphs of his arms are in a manner due to the hymns as well as to the needle-guns of his soldiery,—to the protestantism as well as the strategy of his generals. The conception of war as a judicial process is one of the oldest and most persistent of superstitions.

Alike to warriors in an age of flint hatchets and arrow heads, and warriors in an age of Armstrong cannon and Snider rifles, it has seemed and still seems—*mutatis mutandis*, to use the words of Lord Bacon,—"The highest trial of right when princes and states that acknowledge no superior on earth shall put themselves upon the justice of God for the deciding of their controversies by such success as it please Him to give on either side."

Some of the most interesting illustrations of the half legal, half religious aspect which war assumed to our predecessors, are found in the rites and ceremonies with which they were wont in classical and mediæval times to declare and commence it. It is not even customary in the present day for any formal declaration of war to precede the commencement of hostilities between belligerents. The last occasion on which Great Britain made such a declaration was against Spain in 1762, and since the peace of Paris of 1763, it has been universally held to be a work of supererogation. But in classical and mediæval times the solemn preliminaries of warfare were regarded as indispensably necessary to its legitimate initiation. "Hence," says Mr. Montague Bernard, "the Latin *fecial*, with his reiterated demands for redress and appeals to Heaven, and his lance charred and dipped in blood, emblem of the coming scourge of sword and fire. Hence a *jus legatorum* with observances rigidly maintained at home and enforced abroad. Both Rome and Greece had tales to tell of citizens delivered up by way of atonement to barbarian enemies whose ambassadors had been murdered or insulted, and the Greek, fanciful in his superstitions, traced the taint of sacrilege through two generations, believed that the generosity of the Persian monarch could not balk the anger of Heaven, and saw in the murder of two innocent men at Athens the final expiation of the crime for which their forefathers had voluntarily offered themselves to atone." Directly derived from the Fecial Law of the Romans, which survived the fusion of the jurisprudence of the empire with the barbaric codes, was the established usage of declaring war in the ages of feudalism and chivalry. Letters of defiance, under the seal of the sovereign who declared war, were despatched by a special messenger, who delivered them into the hands of the sovereign against whom war was declared. The messengers who were charged with this mission were commonly heralds-at-arms, who were the official descendants of the Latin *fecials*. But occasionally persons of greater dignity were employed, and sometimes persons of less importance. The declaration of war by Charles V. of France against Edward III. of England was delivered to the English king in his council-chamber by a valet of the French king's household. The former was indignant that so mean a channel of communi-

cation should have been selected, saying, as Froissart chronicles, that the defiance should have been sent "by a prelate or a valiant baron or knight." Philippe de Commines mentions that Garter king-of-arms was sent by Edward IV. of England to Louis IX. of France with a letter of defiance, couched in such fine terms that he questions whether it could have been written by an Englishman. The Registers of the Heralds College still contain numerous entries of similar missions undertaken by the Garter, Clarencieux, or Norroy kings-of-arms, at successive periods. The last instance of a British sovereign making declaration and proclamation of war by this means is recorded by Holinshed in the reign of Mary I., A.D. 1557. "In this season," he writes, "although the French king, Henry II., was verie loth to have warres with England, yet the queene, tangling herself contrarie to her promise in her husband's quarrell, sent a defiance to the French king by Clarencieux, king-of-armes, who, comming to the citie of Remes, where the said king then laie, declared the same unto him the seventh of June, being the Mondaie in Whitsun weeke. On which daie Garter and Norreie king-of-armes, accompanied with other heralds, and also the lord maire and certaine of the aldermen of the citie of London, by sound of three trumpets that rode before them, proclaimed open war against the said king, first in Cheapeside, and after in other parts of the citie, where customarilie such proclamations are made: the sheriffes still riding with the heralds till they had made an end, although the lord maire brake off in Cheapeside and went to St. Peters to hear service, and after to Paules, where (according to the usage then) he went in procession." But Lord Clarendon complains, as recently as the reign of Charles I., that Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, "made war upon France without any colour of reason, or so much as the formality of a declaration from the king, containing the ground and provocation and the end of it, according to custom and obligation in the like cases, for it was observed that the manifesto which was published was in the Duke's own name, who went admiral and general of the expedition"

On the continent the practice of declaring war by herald-at-arms was continued until the middle of the seventeenth century. In 1635, a French herald was sent to Brussels to declare war against Spain; and in 1657, a Swedish herald was sent to Copenhagen to declare war against Denmark. With respect to its technical commencement, Grotius draws a distinction between offensive and defensive warfare. "By the law of nature," he says, "where either force is repelled by force, or punishment is inflicted upon him who is the offender, there no denunciation is required. But as often as one thing is

to be taken for another, or the goods of a debtor to be seized for a debt, a formal demand is requisite, and still more when the goods of those who are the subjects of the debtor are to be seized, so that it may be evident that we can obtain our own and what is due to us in no other way. For this right of so seizing is not a primary right, but a secondary and substitutive right. And in like manner, before he who has the supreme power be attacked for the debts or offences of his subjects, there ought to be interposed a formal demand which may put him in the wrong, so that he may be rightly deemed to be the cause of the damage, or to be responsible for it." It was for this purpose, probably, that a few months ago the ex-Emperor of the French revived the obsolete usage to which this passage refers, and presented a formal declaration of war through his envoy to the King of Prussia. It will long be remembered how he set forth in diplomatic verbiage what Mr. Disraeli has aptly termed "a breach of etiquette at a watering-place" as the *casus belli* of the contest which has resulted in his own deposition and the humiliation of his country.

If we turn from the ceremonies which formerly accompanied the commencement of wars to the actual prosecution of the hostilities they entailed, we are presented with a very different and far sadder picture. With certain local and temporary modifications, warfare was, until a comparatively late period, regarded, even among the most advanced nations of Europe, in pretty much the same light in which it is contemplated by the Tartars and Chinese of the present day. It was accepted as a state of violence in which, as between the belligerents, all human relations were interrupted, all the ordinary ties of social life were severed, and all moral restraints were annihilated. The distinctions between combatants and non-combatants, and between public and private property, were entirely unknown or systematically ignored. To lay waste a prosperous country, to destroy its cultivated plains, and raze its industrious cities to the ground; to ravish helpless women and murder defenceless men; to kill, torture, or at best enslave prisoners; to perpetrate every atrocity and every iniquity which policy, rapacity, or mere caprice might suggest,—these were the acknowledged privileges of victory, the common accompaniments of defeat during nearly the whole of history in the past, as they now are over the greater portion of the earth's surface. We see them represented on the bas-reliefs from Egypt and Assyria. We read of them in the sacred writings of the Jews, where the Divine approval seems to be invariably accorded to them whenever their exercise appears to have turned to the real or supposed advantage of the Chosen People. They are recorded and described by Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, by Livy, Tacitus, and Cæsar. The massacres of Platæa and Melos, the execution of

Demosthenes and Nicias, the sack of Syracuse and Agrigentum, of Carthage and Corinth, the slaughter of the last defenders of Gaulish independence in Brittany and on the banks of the Rhine, were no departures from the precepts of the *jus belli* as understood by the Greeks and the Romans. As Mr. Montague Bernard says, "War supplied regularly and legitimately the innumerable multitudes of slaves which half peopled the ancient world. The slave-dealer hung about every Roman army on active service, and bought on the spot, for a comparative trifle, droves of human cattle, whom he sent to fetch their price at the great centres of wealth and trade. There they were bought in the market, ticketed with the names of the countries from which they came. The usage they received varied with the customs of the people amongst whom they found themselves, and the character of their masters and overseers. But nobody seems ever to have bestowed a thought on their previous condition of life, or to have treated them as persons who had been free. The 'human chattel,' the 'tool with a soul' of Aristotle, is mere live stock with the Latin writers on farming. They sank to the level of their condition, and became debased as a class by the habits and humiliations of slavery. Mr. Grote has well observed how the intense interest which the non-military part of the population must have felt in every great struggle, deepens the light and shade of the battle-pieces of Thucydides, and 'infuses into them an almost Homeric expression of personal emotion and suffering.' But there is something almost more impressive in the dry and careless phrases, speaking the habitual feeling of society, in which these calamities are mentioned among the ordinary incidents of a campaign—the half utterance which Xenophon gives to the numbers of men and other cattle yielded by the sack of a peaceful town; or Cæsar to the fate of a German corps intercepted after avoiding a capitulation. *Cæteros in hostium numero habuit*—'He treated them as enemies.' An euphemism of the camp which tells its own tale."

With the final ascendancy of the Roman Empire all semblance of international law passed into abeyance. A law of nations can only exist among communities theoretically if not practically equal. It demands, as the very conditions of its being, the mutual forbearance and fear of retaliation which proceed from the circumstance that the Powers acknowledging its authority, are in some degree formidable to each other. The first faint traces of the reappearance of a code of public reason in Europe must, therefore, be sought in the establishment of Feudalism under the presiding influence of the Catholic Church. After the Carlovingian Empire had been broken up, the state of European society was very similar to that which had existed in

those primitive times to which we have referred, when it was composed of independent families and tribes. Indeed the feudal system was merely the domestic or tribal organization in its latest stage of development. In the countries over which the sway of Charlemagne has extended, all royal or national authority became virtually extinct upon his death. During the ninth and tenth centuries, the feudatories among whom his vast dominions had been distributed were deprived of any superior jurisdiction to which they could look for protection, and would probably have been very backward in yielding it their allegiance had any such jurisdiction been at hand. The practice of levying private war of necessity was put in requisition again; and in process of time it came to be conducted in obedience to a body of customs, which public opinion recognised as desirable or proper. By the institution of knighthood the warrior-caste of all Christian nations was erected into one great fraternity; and even when its members met as foes in the field, they acknowledged certain duties and courtesies as due to one another. The spirit of Catholicism came in to second the spirit of Feudalism. The proclamation of the Truce of God by successive Popes, and various Councils by which, under pain of excommunication, all men were forbidden to assail their adversaries on any of the festivals of the Church, or from Wednesday night until Monday morning, the days which had been sanctified by the passion, death, and resurrection of the Redeemer, the edicts of the kings of France and the emperors of Germany, the processes and sentences of Courts of Chivalry, the formal defiances and other functions of heralds-at arms, present us with distinct indications of the gradual evolution of the laws of war in the Middle Ages. But the period came when Feudalism was destined to disappear in all but externals.

"The battle of Crecy," says Mr. Montague Bernard, "won by English archers serving for hire, and the despised infantry of Ireland and Wales, destroyed it for ever in the estimation of Europe, though it lingered on to receive its final death-blow on the field of Agincourt. A new soldiery rapidly filled its place. Then appeared the 'Companies' long the scourge and curse of France and her neighbours, the *Tard-venus*, too late for victory but not for pillage, Bretons, Gascons, English, who grew in numbers and audacity, hunted like wolves one day, bought and caressed the next, whose great chief Duguesclin began by crushing them, and ended by raising them to the highest pitch of power and importance that they allowed on this side of the Alps. Introduced into Italy and naturalized there, these irregular regulars soon showed the tendency which seems to belong to every military machine, to grow too costly and elaborate for use. Employed by wealthy and unwarlike states, and continually changing sides, the leaders of the Free Lances grew rich and powerful, founded

sovereign houses, and had reduced the wars of the peninsula to bloodless games of skill and cunning, when down came in swarms the ruffianly German lansquenets and the greedy and ruthless Spanish foot with a French militia habituated to carnage in the English and Burgundian wars, overran its rich plains, fought under different masters for the pillage of its cities, and crowned their iniquities by the sack of Rome. The civil contests which desolated almost every European country during the fifteenth century, the struggle for power between France and the Empire, and the religious quarrels of the sixteenth and seventeenth, introduced in their turn new elements of violence and disorder which found their freest and most calamitous scope in the thirty years' war. Then Grotius, full of grief and indignation at what he saw around him, sat down to compose the treatise which opened a new field of research in the debateable ground between law and ethics, became a text book in after times for princes, statesmen, and soldiers, and has acquired, by being cited and appealed to, a certain authority in the controversies of nations."

When Grotius published his great work, *De Jure Belli et Pacis*, Europe was plunged in a state of the profoundest social and political disorder. The Reformation had split Christendom into two hostile and perpetually contending camps. Catholic unity was at an end; and the spiritual power, which for a thousand years had presided over and regulated the international relations of all civilized countries, had practically lost its authority for good, although it still retained a considerable residue of it for evil. It was the object of Grotius, and afterwards of Puffendorf, Bynkershoek, Wolf, and Vattel, to supply the place which the ordinances of the Church had occupied in the ages of faith, by a system of rules more likely to be respected in an age, not, indeed, of reason, but entitled to be regarded as rational when compared with the ages which had preceded it. The *Jus Gentium*, as they understood it, was supposed to derive its sanctions either from the law of Nature or from the law of God. It was not until almost our own day that it was considered desirable to lay its foundations on a basis at once less ambitious and more secure,—namely, general considerations of utility and convenience. We may now take it for granted, however, that it is rather in the provisions of treaties and conventions, and in the evidence of long usage and established practice, that publicists and jurists seek for the warrant of their conclusions, than in the imaginary dictates of nature, or the equally imaginary precepts of revelation.

During a couple of centuries, the laws of war have been gradually divided into two distinct and often conflicting codes: first, the laws of war on land, and secondly, the laws of war at sea. But there are certain of the laws of war which are applicable to both species of warfare. Of this kind, for example, are those which relate to prisoners.

Throughout the Middle Ages it was the universal practice of belligerent states to leave to every prisoner the task of redeeming himself from captivity; and it was the acknowledged privilege of every captor to demand an arbitrary ransom as the condition for the release of his captive. Grotius explains this custom as a mitigation of the earlier one of permanently retaining prisoners of war as slaves; a mitigation due, he says, to "reverence for the law of Christ;" and he therefore recognises it as agreeable to the law of nations. But even as recently as the beginning of the seventeenth century, it was found necessary to stipulate by treaty that, after the conclusion of war, prisoners should not be detained in slavery. In 1604 it was agreed between England and Spain that the prisoners on either side should be set at liberty, notwithstanding that they might have been condemned to the galleys, when peace should be concluded. A similar article was introduced into the treaty between England and Spain of 1630, and the Treaty of the Pyrenees between France and Spain in 1659 clearly shows that the retention of prisoners of war in penal servitude was not then finally abandoned. But before the beginning of the eighteenth century this atrocity at least had become virtually extinct. We find that when Count Solms, who was serving with William III. in Ireland in 1690, threatened to transport his prisoners as slaves to the American plantations, the Duke of Berwick threatened to retaliate by sending his prisoners to the French galleys. Sir Travers Twiss mentions that Bynkershoek, in commenting on the conduct of the Dutch in 1602, in liberating certain prisoners of war whose friends had refused to ransom them instead of putting them to death, observes that "it would have been foreign to the manners of the time to do so," although he remarks that "the Dutch were accustomed to sell as slaves to the Spaniards all prisoners of war belonging to Algiers, Tunis, or Tripoli;" and that "the States-General had ordered their Admiral in 1661 to sell as slaves all pirates whom he might capture at sea." Sir Travers Twiss adds:—

"From a proclamation of Charles I. of 23rd July, 1628, we may infer two facts: first, that a practice of exchanging prisoners during war was growing up, and secondly, that the private interest of the actual captor in his prisoners had not been entirely devested at that time, as we find all prisoners brought into the kingdom by private men were to be kept in prison at the charge of the captors, until they should be delivered by way of exchange or otherwise. At a later period of the same century we arrive at greater certainty: for we find in the year 1666 mention made by D'Estrades, of a person coming to England in a public capacity from Holland, to negotiate an exchange of prisoners between England and Holland then at war. It seems not

improbable that humanity is indebted to the Dutch for initiating the modern practice of exchanging prisoners whilst war was going on."

From the Treaties between the Porte and Austria in 1791, and between the Porte and Russia in 1792, it seems that Christian prisoners of war were employed as domestic slaves in Turkey at that period. But by more recent Treaties with the Porte, prisoners are exchanged as between Christian States, and stipulations to a similar effect were made in treaties between Persia and the Porte in 1823, and Persia and Russia in 1828. In the Treaty between the United States and Morocco in 1787, it was provided that in the event of war between the parties all prisoners should be exchanged and not used as slaves, while any balance of prisoners on either side should be ransomed at the rate of one hundred Mexican dollars per man. A cartel of 1780 between Great Britain and France, after regulating the number of private soldiers to be exchanged against officers, fixes the money equivalent to be paid in default of a sufficient number of officers or private soldiers to effect an exchange. The ransom in the case of a marshal of France or an English field-marshal was to be sixty pounds, and for a private soldier one pound sterling. In the Treaty of Amiens of 1802, an article was introduced providing that, as between Great Britain and France and the Batavian Republics, prisoners on both sides "*seront restitués sans rançon.*" An Act of the United States Congress of 1817, and another of 1823, authorizes the War Department to settle accounts with any person who may have redeemed and purchased from captivity any American citizen who may have been taken prisoner during the recent war with Great Britain, as long as not more than a hundred and fifty dollars was allowed for the ransom of any one person. Wheaton says that, "the prisoners whose ransom was thus provided for were such as fell into the hands of the Indian allies of Great Britain, many of whom were retained in captivity long after the termination of the war." During the Crimean War of 1854–56, frequent exchanges of prisoners took place between the belligerents, and it was agreed by special convention between Great Britain and France, that whenever the two allied governments should effect an exchange of prisoners with the enemy, their liberation should be arranged according to the priority of their respective capture, except under circumstances reserved for the future consideration of the two governments. Sir Travers Twiss notices that—

"It seems to have been thought necessary even in the Treaty of Paris (30th March, 1856) to stipulate that the prisoners of war on both sides should be immediately released. It is advisable that such a provision should be introduced *ex majori cautela* into all Treaties even between powers which do not recognise the status of domestic

slavery. Dr. Phillimore has very justly observed that if prisoners are not released during the war, their freedom should always form one of the conditions of the peace which terminates it."

When Edward III. invaded France in 1346, he commenced operations by the sack of Barfleur and Cherbourg, and then marched on St. Lo. In a passage quoted by Mr. Montague Bernard, Froissart says:—

"'Si trouvéront le pais gras et plentureux de toutes choses, les granges pleines de blés, les maisons pleines de toutes richesses, riches bourgeois, chars, charettes et chevaux, pourceaux, brebis, moutons et les plus beaux bœufs du monde que se nourrit dans ce pays.'—The English" Mr. Montague Bernard continues, "scattered themselves over it—'ardant et exillant le pais'—and so advanced, burning and destroying—burning and destroying—over the rich flats of the Beauvoisin to the suburbs of Paris. Immense booty was taken, yet the English host when it met the power of France at Crecy, was reduced to the utmost extremity of want."

About seventy years afterwards Henry V. appeared in Normandy on a like mission to that of his great-grandfather. Already a remarkable change was manifested in the mode of waging war in an invaded territory. The English army was on this occasion provided with a regular commissariat. It was followed by stores of beef and beer imported from home. Nothing was exacted from the inhabitants of the districts through which it passed except bread and wine. Sir Harris Nicolas, in his work on the Battle of Agincourt, has published the general orders of the English commanders during the campaign. They prohibit all unnecessary bloodshed, outrage to women and wanton injury to property. The men-at-arms are directed to remain within their quarters, and to keep regular watch and ward, "on payne of smytynge of his head that departeth." Some interesting extracts from these general orders are cited by Mr. Montague Bernard as illustrations of the military discipline of the beginning of the fifteenth century:—

"That no man be so hardy to take from no man going to the plough, harowe, or cart hors, mare, nor oxe, nor non other beste longinge to labour within the kinge's obeysaunce, without louing and bedinge and grede the partye, upon payne of death, and that no man gave none impedyment to no man of labour."

"Also that no man foraie in the country appatised, but if it be haye, ottes, rye, and other necessary vitailles, nor that no man geve unto his hors no wheate, nor to gader non, but if it be only to make brede of, and if the said foraiers take any beastaill for their sustenance that they take reasonably, and to make no waste, nor for to devour nor destroye no vitailles, and also that the saide foraiers take nor stell no great oxen ne no mylche keene, but small bestaill, and that they accorde with the p'tie upon the payne aforesaide."

"Also that no maner of man bete downe housing to barne, ne non apletres, peretres, nottres, ne no other tres bering fi ute, nor that no man put no best into vynes, nor drawe up the stakes of same vynes."

"Also that no manner of man be so hardy to goe into no chamber or lodging wher that any woman lieth in gesem,* her to robbe ne pille of no goodes the whiche longeth to her refressheing, ne for to make non affray wher through she and her childe myght be in any disease or dispere, upon payn that he that in suche wise offendeth shall losse all his goodes, half unto him that accuseth him and half unto the counstable and marshall, and himself to be dede but if the king give him his grace."

"Also that no man be so hardy to take no childerne within the age of xiiij yere, but if he be a lorde's sonne, or els a worshipfull gentleman's sonne, or a capitayne. And that as sone as he hath brought him into the oste, or in to the gernyson where his is abyding, that he brynge him to the lorde, master, or capitayn, upon payn of losing hors, harneys, and his part of the same child, res'ving unto his lorde, master, or capitayn his duety so that they be not consentant unto the default, also that the said lorde, master, or capitayn bring him unto the king or counstable within viij days upon."

"Also that no maner of man have ne holde no comon woman within his lodging, upon payne of losing a monthes wages, and if any man fynde any comon woman lodginge my saide lorde geveth him leve to take from her all the mony that may be founde upon her, and take a stafe and dryve her out of the oste and breke her arme."

In these orders of Henry V. we have the elements of the substitution of regular requisitions for indiscriminate pillage in the country of an enemy occupied by an invading army. They had been partially anticipated by certain orders of Richard II., issued under similar circumstances. But in the French campaigns of Henry V. the alteration was fairly initiated, and gradually continued until it ended in the substitution of the one system for the other. It was not, however, until the end of the seventeenth or beginning of the eighteenth century that the change was finally completed. It was due also to motives of prudence rather than to motives of humanity. The discipline of troops could not be maintained while pillage was permitted. The resources of the country upon which they in the main depended for their subsistence, were destroyed by it; and besides, a great deal more could be got out of the inhabitants by requisitions regularly assessed, than by the rough-and-ready plan, the place of which they took. As Marshal Villars admonished his army:—"Mes amis, si vous brûlez, si vous faites fuire les peuples, vous mourrez de faim. Je vous ordonne donc pour votre propre intérêt et pour celui du Roi, d'être sages."

* Gesem—childbirth.

The wars in the Low Countries between Great Britain and France illustrated the system of requisitions in its fullest maturity. The Duke of Marlborough, as Mr. Montague Bernard says—

"Was employed with his French antagonist in manœuvring large bodies of regular troops upon a small field, which fell by turns into the hands of each of the contending parties, and they have left us an example of the degree to which—even where the gross pressure is necessarily severe—prudent forbearance and strict discipline may mitigate the horrors of war. According to a standing arrangement, each belligerent levied upon the country in his occupation requisitions proportioned to its means, which he enforced if necessary, by threats of military execution. If a *mandament* exceeded what in the opinion of the local authorities the district could supply, they sent a complaint to the head quarters of the friendly army, which was attended to immediately. Strong but civil remonstrances, were followed with threats of reprisals, and tart but civil replies; for those were days of elaborate politeness even among foes."

In the course of the American War of Independence, the British Government laid down the following as admitted propositions of International Law. First, an army in occupation of an enemy's country may demand provisions and raise contributions, enforcing its demands by military execution. Secondly, an enemy's country may be ravaged when there is no other means of bringing him to reason, or forcing him to fight. Thirdly, where, as in the case of a rebellion, the inhabitants are themselves principals in the contest, they may be treated as enemies.

The Duke of Brunswick, during his invasion of France in 1792, ostensibly paid for the victualling of his troops; but he paid for it in waste paper. His *modus operandi* was to take from the inhabitants whatever he wanted in the way of supplies, and to give them in exchange *Bons*, as they were called, drawn on Louis XVI., who was then a prisoner in the hands of the Republican Government against which he was waging war.

In the wars which followed the French Revolution, the system of requisitions was enforced on a gigantic scale by the Emperor Napoleon the First. By him it was extended all over Europe, and reached its height in the case of Prussia and her allies after the battle of Jena.

"Many a man now living," says Mr. Montague Bernard, "remembers how French regiments were marched lean and threadbare into a subject province, to march out again in a few weeks plump and warmly clothed from top to toe. Employed, not as a subsidiary resource, to supply those troops with immediate necessaries, but as their primary and sole means of support, it enabled Napoleon to move armies over a continent like pieces on a chess-board, and effect those grand and rapid combinations which astonished the world; whilst to the officers, high

and low, it presented irresistible, and certainly unresisted temptations to robbery and plunder. 'You take kingdoms,' said a trooper accused of marauding to Charles XII. 'Why am I to be hung for making free with a cabbage?' The question was a solecism in discipline; but such thoughts will sometimes pass through the soldier's mind, and the rough illiterate men to whom after every conquest their master threw dukedoms, principalities, and crowns, naturally deemed it no harm to help themselves (as he did) whenever an opportunity offered, to money, plate, and works of art."

In contrast with the policy of Bonaparte may be placed that of Wellington. The Duke was always scrupulously exact in paying his way, and his determination to do so, frequently interfered with his movements in the field. It should, however, be borne in mind, that the British army under Wellington was never in the hostile occupation of an enemy's country. The Peninsular and Belgian campaigns were performed in a friendly territory, and France was never entered except with professions of amity, and under a flag of truce. In the American war of 1812, and the Russian war of 1854, circumstances were different. But we still adhered to our custom of paying for our supplies, according to market prices, and not according to a tariff fixed by ourselves. The right to impose requisitions for subsistence and necessary services continues to be sanctioned by the law of nations, and would be acted upon without scruple by an invader, where the inhabitants abandoned their homes, or refused to deal equitably with him. Without any such excuse the Austrians and Prussians acted upon it in the Schleswig-Holstein war of 1864. The Germans are acting upon it in France at the present moment, to the extent of having fixed the rate of exchange between their own and the French coinage, and the price of everything they buy with it.

The other respects in which the conduct of hostilities on land in modern times may be favourably compared with ancient and mediæval warfare, are the distinctions which are made between the combatant and the non-combatant sections of the population, and between private and public property as objects for capture or destruction. Of course, all the members of an enemy's state may be treated as enemies in a public war; but they are not to be treated in the same manner. Those who are engaged in the ordinary civil pursuits of life, are excepted from the direct effects of military occupation, unless they violate the usages of war, and forfeit the immunity otherwise accorded to them. The principle proclaimed by the revolutionary government of France, but not not acted upon by it—that the peasant is no man's enemy, and that private property should be respected on a hostile as on a friendly soil, is practically accepted by all civilized nations. The

fundamental doctrine to which the laws of war are now made as far as possible to conform, is, that nothing is allowable against an enemy which is not necessary, and nothing is necessary which does not directly tend to procure victory, and bring the war to a conclusion. All damage which is done without any corresponding advantage, is therefore to be condemned.

"A belligerent," Sir Travers Twiss says, "is entitled to capture all the property of an enemy which is calculated to enable him the better to carry on hostilities, and if he cannot carry it away conveniently, to destroy it. A belligerent, for example, may destroy all existing stores of provisions and forage which he cannot conveniently carry away, and may even destroy the standing crops in order to deprive his enemy of immediate subsistence, and so reduce him to surrender. But a belligerent will not be justified in cutting down the olive trees, and rooting up the vines, for that is to inflict desolation upon a country for many years to come, and the belligerent cannot derive any corresponding advantage therefrom. When the French armies desolated with fire and sword the Palatinate in 1674, and again in 1689, there was a general outcry throughout Europe against such a mode of carrying on war. And when the French Minister Louvois alleged that the object in view was to cover the French frontier against the invasion of the enemy, the advantage which France derived from the act was universally held to be inadequate to the suffering inflicted, and the act itself to be therefore unjustifiable. A belligerent Prince, who should, in the present day, without necessity, ravage an enemy's country with fire and sword, and render it uninhabitable in order to make it serve as a barrier against the advance of the enemy, would justly be regarded as a modern Attila. The necessity of war has occasionally justified princes in laying waste their own provinces in order to raise a barrier against an enemy whom they could not otherwise hope to check. For instance, Peter the Great laid waste an extent of eighty leagues of his own empire with a view to check the advance of the troops of Charles XII. of Sweden. The Swedes were accordingly worn down with want and fatigue in their advance, and the victory of Pultowa was claimed by the Czar as the result of the sacrifice. There may be cases, therefore, when necessity will justify similar extremities in the enemy's country; but such instances will be of rare occurrence, and may be regarded as exceptional."

The great blots on modern warfare on land are, the refusal of egress to the peaceful inhabitants of blockaded cities, and the sack of towns taken by assault. It is probable that the first would not be rigorously enforced in a siege in the present day. Lord Raglan offered a free passage through his lines for the women and children in Sebastopol. Similar consideration for the claims of humanity with respect not only to women and children, but to non-combatants generally, was shown by the German commander before Strasbourg the other day. It is to be hoped, therefore, that at no distant period it will cease to be even for-

mally permissible for a belligerent to make the sufferings of civilians accidentally confined within a besieged place a means for obtaining the ends of war. In defence of the second, only two pleas have been urged: first, the impossibility of preventing it; and secondly, the necessity of holding out some reward to the soldier after the fatigues, privations, and dangers of an investment. Both of them are fairly demolished by Mr. Montague Bernard, following in the steps of Sir William Napier:—

"It is enough to say of the latter excuse," he urges, "that no object however great, no cause however holy, no argument which the mind can frame, can make it lawful to bribe men to face death by promising riotous indulgence to cupidity, rage, and lust. Whatever may be justifiable in war, this is not. As to the first, nothing is impossible until it has been tried. Difficult it would be, no doubt. 'Chose merveilleuse,' says the Duke of Berwick, of the escape of Barcelona, which surrendered at discretion, after a successful assault—'chose merveilleuse, qu'une ville prise d'assaut ne fût pas pillée. L'on ne peut attribuer qu'à Dieu, car toutes le pouvoir des hommes n'aurait jamais pu contenir le soldat.' He had bidden the besieged keep up a show of resistance till his arrangements were made, then beat the *générale*, and marched his troops to their allotted quarters without a man quitting the ranks."

The Duke of Wellington has left it upon record, that it had been his lot to take many towns by storm, and that he "was concerned to add that he had never seen or heard of one so taken by any troops that it was not plundered." Sir William Napier mentions that the stories he heard round British picquet fires in the Peninsula, from officers who had been actors in the scenes they described, were nearly equal in atrocity to those with which the prurient pages of Brantôme are filled, in his account of the sack of Rome by the Constable de Bourbon. The sack of Constantine by the French, in 1837, lasted three days; and the officers of the French army took part in it as well as the men. In order to prevent such scandals, it has been proposed by Sir William Napier that plundering should be made criminal by the Articles of War; and that in lieu of booty, an immediate gratuity should be distributed among the troops. These suggestions, Mr. Montague Bernard justly observes—

"Look practicable enough to the unprofessional mind, and the last of them would satisfy the feeling, which has helped, I suspect, to make the difficulty appear an impossibility, that restraint, if it could be enforced, would rob the soldier of his due. His due, however, it is not. Hostile property taken in an enemy's town, whether stormed or not (like the stores in Sebastopol), is by custom treated as prize, and the value of it usually distributed among the troops, but on the goods of private persons they have no claim. The true state of the

case is this. The old *droict de la guerre* survives in this sense, that an enemy has no right to complain of the exercise of it, but efforts are now made to restrain and punish pillage, and it is only to be wished that those efforts should be more vigorous and effective in future. Let them prove successful, and that which is forbidden by the internal regulations of armies will soon be proscribed by the general usages of war"

The laws of war at sea have been developed under special conditions of their own. They constitute a code which has grown up, to use the words of Mr. Montague Bernard—

"Partly amid the wild rough freedom of the blue water, partly under the care of grave judges sitting in quiet courts, and assisted by a select and erudite bar. It appeals to precedents. It is studied in reports. It has the definite symmetrical outlines of a regular branch of jurisprudence. And of the two codes, the one made by generals and the other by judges, the latter is the harshest, the latter shows least concern for those private rights which are the offspring and peculiar charge of law."

The grand distinction between them is, that while, as we have noticed, private property is as a rule respected in a hostile territory, it is the principal object of attack at sea. The destruction, or at least impediment of the enemy's commerce, is the main purpose of naval hostilities. Thus, as Wheaton has observed —although "the progress of civilization has slowly but constantly tended to soften the extreme severity of the operations of war by land, it still remains unrelaxed in respect of maritime warfare." Since this sentence was written, the provisions of the Treaty of Paris of 1856, have in some measure deprived it of its original force. The powers represented at the Congress whence the Treaty emanated—namely, Great Britain, France, Russia, Prussia, Austria, Sardinia, and Turkey, agreed to the four following articles:—1. Privateering is and remains abolished; 2. The neutral flag covers enemy's goods, with the exception of contraband of war; 3. Neutral goods, with the exception of contraband of war, are not liable to capture under an enemy's flag; 4. Blockades in order to be binding must be effective—that is to say, maintained by a force sufficient really to prevent access to the coast of the enemy. These stipulations are partially declaratory, and partially substantive amendments, in the laws of maritime warfare. We have no space to discuss their nature and import. But in concluding this paper, we will dwell for a moment on the influence they are likely to have on a question which, after having been long agitated among publicists, is at last forcing itself upon the attention of statesmen. The Government of the United States has always been honourably distinguished from that of other countries by its advocacy of the complete immunity

of the private property of an enemy at sea from capture and condemnation as prize, unless it should be contraband of war, or in transit to a blockaded port. In its treaty with Prussia, negotiated between Benjamin Franklin and Frederick the Great, in 1785, it was provided that in the event of war between the contracting parties—

"All merchants or traders, with their unarmed vessels, employed in commerce in exchanging the products of different places, and thereby rendering the necessaries, conveniences, and comforts of life more easy to obtain and more general, shall be allowed to pass freely unmolested."

The refusal of the Americans to join in the Treaty of Paris of 1856 was grounded on the prior refusal of the European Powers to entertain their proposal for the addition of a similar provision to those we have already enumerated. During the present war, however, between Germany and France, the King of Prussia has, in his character of head of the North German Confederation, accorded the same immunities to the merchantmen of the enemy which they would enjoy were they the property of the subjects of a neutral power. The Treaty of 1785 between the United States and Prussia expired in 1789, and the article we have quoted was not renewed. The war of 1870 will therefore be remarkable among other things as the first occasion on which the "Quaker Doctrine," as it has been called, of International Law, was subjected to the test of actual belligerency. It is, however, very certain that it will not be the last occasion on which it will be tried. Independently of its moral claims to acceptance, there are considerations of a practical kind which must in the end secure its adoption. As by the second article of the Treaty of Paris the neutral flag covers the enemy's goods, the general commerce of a belligerent would in future be little affected by war. Its carrying trade, however, would be virtually annihilated. Almost the whole of it would be transferred to neutral bottoms. The mercantile marines of Great Britain and the United States, as they are the largest in the world would, under different circumstances, be the greatest gainers or the greatest losers by the continuance of the existing order of things. The views of the United States in the matter are already distinctly announced. Germany has declared her policy with regard to it in the most practical of all ways. Opinion in Great Britain is visibly in process of change. We may reasonably hope, therefore, that when peace is restored, the liability of private property at sea to seizure and confiscation, will be expunged from the Laws of War as established among, and observed by, civilized nations.

Art. VIII.—Gunpowder.

1. *An Act to amend the Law concerning the Making, Keeping, and Carriage of Gunpowder and Compositions of an Explosive Nature, and concerning the Manufacture, Sale, and Use of Fireworks.* 23 and 24 Vict. cap. 139.
2. *An Act for amending an Act passed in the last Session of Parliament to amend the Law concerning the Making, Keeping, and Carriage of Gunpowder and Compositions of an Explosive Nature, and concerning the Manufacture, Sale, and Use of Fireworks.* 24 and 25 Vict. cap. 130.
3. *Sketch of the Mode of Manufacturing Gunpowder, &c.* By Colonel William Anderson, C.B. With Notes and Additions by Lieutenant-Colonel Parlby. London: 1862.
4. *Copies of the Reports of Lieutenant-Colonel Boxer, R.A.: and of Correspondence relating to the Explosion of Gunpowder at Erith, and the Condition of Magazines and Manufactories of Gunpowder.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 9th May, 1865.
5. *Copy of further Correspondence relating to the Cartmel and Colton Gunpowder Works.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 16th June, 1865.
6. *Text Book on the Theory of the Motion of Projectiles. The History, Manufacture, and Explosive Force of Gunpowder. The History of Small Arms. For the Use of Officers sent to the School of Musketry.* By Authority. London: 1868.
7. *Hand-Book of Chemistry, Theoretical, Practical, and Technical.* By F. A. Abel and C. L. Bloxam. Second Edition. London: 1858.
8. *Richardson and Watts's Chemical Technology: or, Chemistry applied to the Arts and to Manufactures.* Vol. I. Part IV. London: 1865.

It has sometimes been urged as a reproach, that while all other military manufactures have been improved, and while every arm used in warfare has occupied the attention and exercised the inventive genius of man, gunpowder, without which the most remarkable improvements would be useless, has remained where it was. The element of truth contained in this charge is very small. If those who prefer it refer to the composition of gunpowder, then must the manufacturers plead guilty, for the proportions of the ingredients remain nearly unchanged; but if they

refer to methods of preparing and purifying the ingredients, or to methods employed to produce a strong and suitable powder, we must demur. Chemistry has not yet done all it is capable of doing to clear away the difficulties of the manufacturer; and until recently the manufacturer himself had not sought the chemist's aid; but we think the time is not far distant when every maker of gunpowder will see the advantage of availing himself of the chemist's knowledge, and then many of the difficulties which now beset his path will vanish. Until lately the manufacturer's chief aim was to produce a strong powder; then sprang up another requirement, that his powder should be clean, that is, should upon combustion leave the smallest quantity of residuum to foul the gun. In attaining cleanliness, a stronger powder was obtained; and as guns were enlarged in calibre, the charges of powder were increased till at last the problem became, how to make a gun strong enough to resist the strength of the required charge of gunpowder. But all this has passed away, and powder is now made to suit the guns for which it is intended, instead of making guns to stand the force of the powder. Two great objects have been gained—a diminished pressure on the gun, and an increased initial or muzzle velocity.

The manufacture of gunpowder is, under any circumstances, a dangerous occupation. No sooner have the three ingredients—saltpetre, sulphur, and charcoal—been brought into contact, than the workman has a highly explosive compound to deal with: He may clothe himself in special clothing; may wear shoes which are known to be without nails, and these only within powder houses; may cover his floors with raw hides; use only such tools as are made of wood or copper; but either from that familiarity which begets contempt, or from the sudden breaking of machinery powerful and complicated, or from the introduction of foreign substances during the process of manufacture, it has hitherto been found impossible to prevent accidents, often of a deplorable character.

Saltpetre, which constitutes seventy-five per cent. of gunpowder, is not a simple body, but is composed of six equivalents of oxygen, one of nitrogen, and one of potassium, chemically combined. The chief supplies of this salt are obtained from the districts of Oude and Bengal, where it effloresces from the ground. After it is collected, and before it is ready for shipment, it undergoes several boilings and crystallizations, to free it from the grosser impurities with which it is mixed. When sufficiently pure for the market it appears as crystals of a dirty white colour, in which condition it is known as "grough" saltpetre, and contains from two to twelve per cent. of foreign matters, consisting chiefly of nitrates of lime, magnesia, and soda, as well as their chlorides

and sulphates. Besides the natural production of saltpetre, which is constantly going forward in the eastern provinces of India, there are artificial methods of supply which have been of infinite importance when nations have been cut off by the fortunes of war from the markets of Bengal.

The old method of obtaining artificial saltpetre is to collect such vegetable and animal refuse as contains nitrogen (the sweepings of slaughter-houses, weeds, &c.) into heaps, mixing with it limestone, old mortar, earth, and ashes. These heaps are sheltered from the rain, and kept moist by applications of urine; after lying a long time, the formation of nitrates on the surface is commenced. In Prussia these nitre-beds are so constructed that they are never quite removed. That side which is exposed to the prevailing winds is built up perpendicularly, while the opposite side is left slanting. On this slanting side the water is applied, and, as the perpendicular front dries, the nitrates form there, and are removed from time to time; fresh materials being added behind. In Sweden saltpetre is a revenue-tax, and almost every peasant possesses a small nitre plantation. To separate the nitrates, the nitrified earth is broken into lumps and placed in large troughs, having perforated false bottoms. These lumps are covered with water, in which they lie for about twelve hours, by which time all the salts are dissolved. The solution is then run off, and is frequently applied to two or more lots of earth, that a more concentrated lye may be obtained; while the earth which has been so treated, and which still contains a small quantity of nitrates, is returned to the heap. The solution is found to contain nitric acid in combination with lime, magnesia, potassa, soda, and ammonia, besides chlorides and sulphates. By mixing this solution with a strong solution of carbonate or sulphate of potassa, the nitric acid is converted into nitrate of potash. Its further purification is obtained by a process similar to that pursued at gunpowder factories, and which is described below.

Another and simpler method of obtaining saltpetre by artificial means, is by the double decomposition of nitrate of soda and chloride of potassium or carbonate of potassa. Nitrate of soda and carbonate of potassa are boiled together in due proportions, and saltpetre is obtained with a bye-product of carbonate of soda. If chloride of potassium be substituted for carbonate of potassa, the bye-product will be chloride of sodium. This method of manufacturing saltpetre is largely practised in Germany, and before the present war was declared large quantities of artificial saltpetre were imported into this country for gunpowder purposes. Since then no doubt the home consumption has been so great as to require all that could be produced. Whether natural or artificial saltpetre be used, for the best kinds of gun-

powder (and it is only of such we write), it is absolutely necessary that the chlorides should be removed, in consequence of their deliquescent nature. They absorb moisture so freely that the presence of one three-thousandth part is sufficient to cause the saltpetre to be rejected as unfit for use.

The various methods of refining saltpetre, or freeing it from its impurities, are based on the principle that it is fourteen times more soluble in hot than in cold water; while the salts which are combined with it, do not vary to any great extent in their solubility at different temperatures. The old plan was to boil the grough saltpetre, filter it—to remove insoluble matter—and then allow it to crystallize. This was repeated three times, and then the crystals were fused in glazed iron pans, and allowed to solidify by cooling; after which the saltpetre was ground to the required fineness. This method was expensive and wasteful; it was also imperfect, inasmuch as the large striated crystals always contained a quantity of the mother-liquor, and of the chlorides which remained in it. About twenty years ago another method of refining was introduced from France. In this, the solution of grough saltpetre is boiled and filtered as before; and then, instead of being run into pans to crystallize *at rest*, it is conveyed into large shallow vessels called "coolers." As the solution runs into the cooler it is kept in a constant state of agitation by men with wooden hoes, who keep the solution in motion and rake up the crystals, which begin to deposit as soon as the temperature falls. These crystals, which are very small, are lifted as they accumulate on to a large sieve, which allows the mother-liquor to drain away. From this sieve the "saltpetre-flour," as it is called, is transferred to a large washing trough, containing a cold saturated solution of saltpetre. This cannot take up any more saltpetre, but it can, and does, take up any chlorides—such as common salt and salts of lime—which may remain in the saltpetre. After lying in this solution for some time, the liquor is drawn off at the bottom, and then, to remove the last traces of chlorides, cold distilled water takes its place. When this is removed, the saltpetre is fit for use. Another method remains to be described. The principle is the same as the last—constant motion while crystallization is taking place. But instead of trusting to men, machinery takes their place. From the filter the saltpetre-solution is conveyed into a well. In this well stands an iron chain-pump, having three openings, which can be closed at pleasure, at the top. The pump takes up the solution from the well, the two side-openings at the top are opened, and the solution falls, right and left, into two large tanks. In each of these is a perpendicular shaft, armed with stirrers, which sweep the fine crystals as they fall to the bottom

through an opening into the well again, the solution being carried through by its own weight. As the crystals and the solution fall into the well, the pump again takes them up, and the operation is continued till crystallization is complete. To assist the cooling, large fans are so placed as to act upon the streams as they fall from the pump into the tanks at its sides.

When the operation of cooling is completed, the side valves of the pump are closed, and the third is opened. This conveys the crystals into the washing vessel before mentioned. The remaining part of the process is similar to the French method described above. The adoption of this method is limited at present, but when its advantages are better understood it will, there can be little doubt, quite supersede that now generally in use. Time and manual labour—uncertain and irregular—are saved, and a crystal of such impalpable fineness obtained, that practically it may be assumed to be free from any water of interposition. So fine are the crystals, that it is found necessary to produce a vacuum at the bottom of the washing vessel before the water used in washing will run away.

The next ingredient to be mentioned is the sulphur. It is obtained either from the volcanic districts of the Mediterranean, or from the iron and copper pyrites of our own country. It is freed from impurities by melting, when the earthy matters which it contains fall to the bottom; or by distillation. When purified, it is ground into as fine a state as possible, under heavy iron rollers, and screened through sieves of from forty to seventy meshes to the inch. A better plan has been recently introduced. The sulphur, ground and sifted as described, is afterwards allowed to fall in front of a rapidly driven fan. The fine sulphur is blown into a chamber by the blast of the fan, while the larger particles fall at once to the floor. The "blown sulphur," when collected together, is fit for use. Sulphur ignites at a low temperature (560° F.); it therefore quickens combustion, and raises the temperature and increases the expansion of the gases. By its non-absorbent qualities it renders the powder more durable. Although gunpowder, having a certain explosive force, can be made without sulphur, a good and compact powder, capable of bearing transport, cannot. The quantity used varies from nine to twelve and a half per cent.

Of charcoal, and the part it performs in the combustion of gunpowder, but little seems to be understood. The woods used are, for artillery purposes, alder and willow; for powder for small arms, dogwood. The two former are well known, as they grow plentifully in most parts of England; but the wood used under the name of dogwood has recently given rise to some discussion. It was generally supposed that it was the *Cornus*

sanguinea, but now it appears, on the authority of Dr. Hooker, that *Rhamnus frangula*, or buckthorn, is the dogwood of the gunpowder makers.* No doubt the transition from *Cornus sanguinea* to *Rhamnus frangula* took place gradually. The wood was always sold in sticks about six feet in length, and peeled. In this condition it requires a keen scientific eye to distinguish the two. Of late years the greater part of the dogwood used in England has been obtained from the forest and marshy districts lying between Berlin and Frankfort. The same country has also supplied us with vast quantities of alder. When the English soldier loaded his musket with fine grain (F. G.) gunpowder, obtained in the manufacture of large grain (L. G.), Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Kent, and Sussex supplied all the dogwood required by private manufacturers for sporting powder; but since the manufacture of the powder known as "Enfield rifle," for Government small arms, the supply from these counties has not been equal to the demand.

The wood intended for gunpowder charcoal should be felled in June, and immediately denuded of its bark. It is usually cut into three-feet lengths, and desiccated by exposure to the atmosphere for two or three years. It is burnt in retorts, the volatile products of the wood being in some cases conveyed into the furnace to assist in the operation of charring. It is a subject for some surprise that no chemist has as yet devoted sufficient attention to the carbonization of wood for gunpowder. At present the "charcoal-burner" is an ordinary labourer, who possesses hardly a single qualification for his task, beyond the ability to "burn" so much wood in a given time. One of the causes to which the varying results obtained from gunpowder is to be attributed, is the different degree of carbonization obtained by different men, and commonly by the same man. It is not uncommon to find scarcely two charges alike in the same man's work. The chemical questions which seem to require an answer are, what is the effect of imperfect carbonization? What if the carbonization be carried to its utmost extent, so that no trace of oxygen or hydrogen can possibly remain? What is the effect of allowing unground charcoal to lie sheltered from rain, but exposed to the atmosphere and the gases which always surround and permeate a building used for burning charcoal? Its wonderful power of absorbing gases is well known; do the gases absorbed prove detrimental to the powder made from such charcoal, or are they beneficial? Gunpowder makers tell you it is better to use charcoal which has been stored for some time. Why is it better? At present the manufacturer is waiting for

* Dr. Sheridan Muspratt asserted the same thing ten years ago. See "Chemistry as applied to Arts and Manufactures," vol. ii. p. 338.

the chemist to give him some infallible directions as to which kind of charcoal, or what degree of carbonization, will give uniformly good results, and how such charcoal can be obtained. It seems to us that some of the theories current among manufacturers are of the wildest kind.

The charcoal is ground in a kind of coffee mill as it is required for use, and sifted in a reel covered with fine gauze wire. Care is required with ground charcoal on account of the tendency it has to ignite spontaneously. If allowed to lie in bulk, and exposed to the atmosphere, it is almost certain to take fire. This liability to spontaneous combustion rendered it advisable to insert a clause in the Gunpowder Act prohibiting the storing of charcoal within twenty yards of any powder house. Charcoal in lumps can be stored with perfect safety.

So far the work has been free from danger. Keep the ingredients apart. and they are harmless: as soon as they are brought together the danger to life and property commences. The processes described have required attention and skili, the future require these and a constant exercise of care to prevent, if possible, the occurrence of accidents.

We have seen how the saltpetre, sulphur, and charcoal have been prepared, and the extreme fineness to which each has been brought. They are now weighed out in the following proportions:—

Saltpetre	75	parts.
Sulphur	10	"
Charcoal	15	"
	100	

The building in which this is commonly performed is known as the mixing-house. As soon as the ingredients are weighed a charge of fifty pounds is put into a close box in which a drum, armed with long teeth, rotates with great rapidity for a period of about ten minutes. The mixture is performed by the arms of the drum. The mass when it leaves the box is received into a bag, and is known as a "greencharge." This greencharge, if fire is applied, burns rather than explodes, but burns with such rapidity and intensity that an accident arising from a greencharge is sure to be severe. Fortunately accidents at this stage are rare; the only one we can call to mind being that which occurred at Faversham in 1867. In the mixing-house there (a bomb proof building with a high wall in front) four men were at work. Suddenly a dull rumbling sound was heard, and the building was rent to atoms. The number of charges in the building was unknown, but there was enough to destroy the

building and to kill the four men at work within it. Their bodies were buried in the *débris*. This burning rather than exploding of a greencharge arises from the imperfect combination of the ingredients. Fire a quantity of gunpowder placed on a glass plate, or even on a piece of smooth paper, and the combustion will be so complete and so instantaneous that the glass will be hardly discoloured, and the paper will not have taken fire. But try the same experiment with greencharge, and the glass will be covered with patches of fused saltpetre and the paper will be set on fire. This fused saltpetre, and the burning in of the powder, make injuries arising from greencharge explosions so difficult to overcome.

From the mixing-house the greencharge is conveyed to the incorporating mills. In consequence of the frequency of explosions here, the buildings are constructed of thin boards which are easily blown away, and easily replaced.

The object at the incorporating mill is to make the mechanical combination of the ingredients as perfect as possible. On this process the quality of the powder now depends. To obtain this intimate combination the greencharge is placed in what may be called an iron dish of some seven feet in diameter. Revolving in this dish are two immense "runners," like solid wheels, each weighing about five tons. The immense pressure of these runners and the twisting and grinding nature of their motion, exercise a curious influence on the charge. When put on to the mill it is black, and the ingredients liable to separate, but in time, a little water being frequently added, it becomes a grey and compact mass. The runners usually complete ten revolutions a minute. Four hours is the time generally given to this milling, though sometimes the best sporting powders receive ten or twelve hours. At the close of this operation the gunpowder—it *is* gunpowder now—is spread evenly over the track of the runners, within which it has been confined by certain wooden arrangements called ploughs. The "millcake" is now transferred to bags or tubs ready for the next operation. This millcake is easily broken, is dry and dusty: in this condition its explosive force is greater than after any future process.

Explosions here are very common, but it is difficult to say why. If any foreign substance should have made its way into the powder, the runners are likely to find it. Though frequent, these accidents are seldom attended with fatal results. The machinery being once set in motion the presence of men is rarely required, so that they are commonly away when the mills "blow." In 1861 one man lost his life in consequence of being within the mill when it fired. This was at Waltham Abbey Mills.

The Act of Parliament contains the following clause respecting incorporating mills :—

> "The quantity of gunpowder or materials to be made into gunpowder to be at one time under any single pair of millstones, or rollers, or runners, shall not exceed fifty pounds as respects sporting and Government powder, and sixty pounds as respects all inferior powders, and every incorporating mill or group of incorporating mills shall be provided with a charge-house for the store of mill charges properly constructed of stone or brick, and situate at a safe and suitable distance from each incorporating mill or group of incorporating mills."

The Act is defective in that, while it limits the quantity to be placed in one mill, it says nothing as to the number of mills which may be placed under one roof; nor does it say anything about the distance the buildings are to be from each other.

The operation which comes next in order is the pressing. This is carried on at the press-house. The press-house is fitted up, sometimes with one hydraulic press, often with two, and a frame called a breaking-down frame, which contains several pairs of toothed rollers. Their use is twofold. The millcake arrives at the press-house as a mixture of cake and dust. To make this mixture homogeneous it is passed through the rollers and falls on to the floor broken into dust. On the ram of the hydraulic press is placed a very strong box of wood, sometimes of brass. This box receives, first, a gun-metal plate; on this is placed a layer of the broken millcake, which is covered by another gun-metal plate, on which is placed a second layer of powder, and so on till the box is filled with alternate layers of gun-metal and millcake. Hanging over the box, and made to fit—rather loosely—the inside of it, is a large block of wood, which is prevented from yielding in an upward direction by the press cap. As soon as the press is set in motion the box begins to rise. It soon reaches the block of wood, and then the powder begins to yield. The box continues its upward motion, and as it rises the powder is compressed within it to something like three-fifths of the bulk it occupied before pressure was applied. When a pressure of about 300 tons has been attained the powder is generally hard enough, and the pressure having been withdrawn, the box descends to its original position. When the charge is drawn out it appears as a cube having a side of about two feet six inches. A few carefully directed blows with a wooden mallet cause the gun-metal plates and the cakes of powder to divide; the former are set aside for future use, the latter, called presscakes, are removed again to the breaking-down machine. The toothed rollers are set a little wider apart, and the presscake is passed through them and broken into lumps about the size of a filbert.

This broken presscake is now ready for the corning or granulating house.

The advantages of submitting the powder to this enormous pressure are twofold. When the powder leaves the incorporating mills, it is in the condition of dust and porous cake. As such it is liable to absorb moisture, and to deteriorate considerably. In addition to this a dusty powder is dangerous to handle in consequence of its liability to be blown about by every breath of air, and so to form trains which would lead to frequent disasters, especially in a battle-field. Another advantage is that combustion is retarded. An explosion of dust would be so instantaneous that no gun could withstand it; by pressure powder becomes so compact that it takes an appreciable time to consume. It was customary until quite recently to make sporting gunpowders without submitting the millcake to pressure. But since the demand has been for a powder which shall be clean in the handling and clean in the firing, quickness has been thought less of; and sporting powder, Enfield-rifle, and all powder intended for small arms, undergoes this pressure, but only to an extent of about one-half of that to which artillery powders are subjected. At present the defective part of this process is its want of uniformity. The machinery used is generally capable of withstanding almost any strain, but when it is stated that 1000 pounds of gunpowder is allowed to be put into the press each time, that the thickness of each layer depends upon the judgment of the man who loads the press, that sometimes this broken-down millcake contains less moisture than at others, and that there is no certain guide as to the amount of pressure given, our readers will cease to wonder that a powder of varying density is the rule instead of being an almost unheard-of exception, and that powder taken from the same barrel often fails to give uniform results.

The dangerous nature of the work done in press-houses may be judged of by the fact that about one-fifth of the fatal explosions occur or originate in them. In March, 1859, a press-house blew at Hounslow. It communicated with the corning-house, and proved fatal to eight men. In October, 1861, a press-house at Ballincollig exploded and cost the loss of five lives. Other press-house explosions which may be mentioned occurred at Chilworth in 1864, at Ewell in 1865, at Faversham in 1868, while the house was undergoing certain repairs, and at Waltham Abbey last June; each of the two last-mentioned causing the loss of five lives. To account for these accidents is not merely a difficult thing—it is impossible. Sometimes a cylinder gives way under the pressure, and the ram bearing the press-box filled with powder falls with an awful crash into the broken mass below, but no explosion

follows. Sometimes by the forgetfulness of a man an empty press-box is left, and by some means the pump is set in motion; the men are away at dinner; the box goes up and is crushed to a shapeless mass against the block and cap above it, and this does not produce an explosion. Other "hair-breadth 'scapes" will be called to mind by those who are familiar with gunpowder making, and they will remember accidents to machinery each of which would, if deliberately planned (if we may so speak), have been judged sufficient to cause a disaster. Some similar giving way of machinery, some omission on the part of a workman who does not survive to tell the tale, is probably the cause of most of these mysterious accidents. Having said this, we are no nearer. Take the last press-house explosion as an example. The Waltham Abbey Factory is usually considered to be the best and most carefully managed place of the kind in England. Here, at the time of the accident, the pressure had certainly been taken off. The men were unloading the press, or separating the mass of gunpowder and gun-metal plates. Instead of doing this by blows with an instrument of wood, one of the men was using a copper chisel. A spark was drawn, and five men were killed. To account for this accident it was suggested that a particle of grit, which might have fallen from a man's beard, was struck by the chisel; and it was recommended that the men engaged in powder making should be required to shave! To us it seems far more reasonable to suppose that a *glance* blow by the chisel on the gun-metal plate was the cause. We believe it is an ascertained fact that copper and copper can be made to produce a spark, but gunpowder makers are slow to believe it. It was thought that brass was quite safe, but Colonel Anderson's experiments prove the contrary to be the fact. He says:—

"I made the experiment, and found it was facile in the extreme, with a very slight blow, to ignite gunpowder placed between different substances.

"To a committee sent up to Ishapore by Government, I proved that, with gunpowder placed as follows, the results were,—

"Iron upon iron	5 misses 45 explosions	
Brass on iron	3 misses 47 explosions	With a hammer about
Iron on brass	9 misses 41 explosions	4 lbs. [illegible]ght."*
Brass on brass	20 misses 30 explosions	

The results of these experiments are not very encouraging.

* "Sketch of the Mode," &c., p. 241.

The accident at Faversham in 1868 arose while a millwright was driving out the bolt upon which the door of the press-box turned. This bolt was of iron, the drift used was copper, the hammer an alloy of copper and tin (bell-metal), weighing ten or twelve pounds. In the evidence given before the coroner it seemed to be clearly proved that the explosion occurred either between the iron bolt and the copper drift, or between the bolt and the wooden slot out of which it was being driven. If the latter, the friction caused by the motion of the bolt may have been the cause. If the former, it was probably to be attributed to the presence of powder between the bolt and the drift. A powerful man wielding a 10-pound hammer would cause great heat. Could *copper* and iron cause an explosion, as brass on iron can be made to do forty-seven times out of fifty? In the case of the accident now under consideration, the jury recommended a brass bolt in the place of the iron one, and their recommendation was, we believe, adopted.

The Act regulates press-houses in a very few words:—"The quantity of gunpowder to be subjected to pressure at one time in any press-house shall not exceed ten hundredweight," and the quantity "to be at any one time in any press-house" shall not exceed twice the above quantity, or twenty hundredweight. This is clear enough. But much less than 1100 lb. of powder is enough to kill all the men in a press-house, so that the clause of the Act could not have been framed for them. Its intention must have been to prevent an explosion occurring in a press-house from communicating with other powder-houses. But here it fails; the quantity within the house is limited, but the distance of the press-house from any other house is left to the manufacturer. As powder makers we are not allowed to have more than a ton of gunpowder in our press-house at one time, but we may put our expense magazine so near that if the press-house "goes," the magazine must "go" too, as at Faversham in 1867; or we may place a corning-house near enough to render it certain that if the press-house "blows," the corning-house must "blow" too; as at Waltham Abbey in June last, and at Hounslow in 1859. Indeed the Act will allow us so to arrange our factory that if one house explodes, all the rest must explode; as was the case at the Kames Works in December, 1863, where the granulating or corning-house led the series, being followed in quick succession by a press-house, a dusting-house, a second press-house, and then by the glazing-house! In the face of such disasters it is unnecessary to say such a regulation as that contained in the Act is absolutely useless.

The next stage in the process of manufacture is the granulat-

ing or corning—*i.e.*, the making the broken-down presscake into grains of gunpowder. This is accomplished by passing the lumps of presscake through five or six pairs of gun-metal toothed rollers. As the lumps of powder pass through the first pair of rollers, the broken lumps are received on an inclined sieve. Those which are small enough pass through; those which require further crushing pass on, and are received by the next pair of rollers; and so on to the end. This passing through the rollers can be repeated until the whole of the powder passes through the sieves. When it is granulated it consists of grains of powder mixed with a good deal of powder dust. This dust is generally removed by means of reels covered with canvas; often by means of a series of sieves worked by a crank motion. The dust which is here taken out from the powder is sometimes returned to the press-house to be mixed with the millcake and pressed again; sometimes it is returned to the incorporating mills. To return it to the incorporating mills is a useless trouble and an unnecessary risk. If the powder has had enough incorporating in the earlier stage, no after milling of dust will improve it, and it is well known that dust is more liable to explode under the mills than ordinary greencharge. Separated from its dust the powder is ready for the glazing-house.

Theoretically, the granulation of powder should be as safe as any other process. If the powder is free from gritty substances, from iron, or from anything hard, and if the machinery is and continues in perfect working order, no accident should occur. Practically it is the most dangerous of all the processes which gunpowder has to go through; and about nine out of every ten fatal accidents occur here. Whatever foreign substance may have got into the powder is sure to make itself known now, especially when corning Enfield rifle or sporting powder. The lumps from the press-house pass through the rollers again and again till every particle has been broken to the required size; so that whatever enters the house must pass the rollers. If a stone it is crushed a little perhaps every pair it passes, to the infinite danger of blowing up the house; if a nail, it may be caught in the teeth, and may stop the rollers with a sudden jerk which may break something. If they do not stop, their teeth may continue to beat upon the intruding nail for some time, or the first revolution may bring out a spark, and then of course there is an end of it. Another, and in our opinion a more frequent source of danger in the granulation of powder, lies in the possibility of some portion of the machinery giving way. There may be a fault which no eye can detect; the part may have been at work for years, but the breakage comes at last; and before any person can be aware of it, one broken portion strikes another,

and house and men are involved in a common destruction. We believe the cause of an explosion originating in a corning-house when in full work has never been ascertained. Conjectures we have had in plenty, but they have been worthless.

Sometimes accidents happen to granulating-houses when they are "still." One such occurred at Hounslow in 1857, when three men were killed; another at Faversham in 1864, by which two men lost their lives. In neither of these accidents was the cause clearly ascertained. Other accidents—working accidents as they may be called—are unfortunately far from uncommon. Sometimes they might have been avoided if the corning-house had been placed further from other buildings, as at Hounslow in 1859 and at Waltham Abbey in June of this year. Other corning-house explosions which may be referred to are one at Battle in 1859, one at Melfort in 1860, Ewell in 1863, Kames in 1863, Roslin in 1866, Faversham in 1867, Hounslow in 1869. These seven explosions involved a loss of thirty-two lives. This seems to be a large number, but when we remember the dangerous nature of the employment, the number of corning-houses,* the number of men engaged in them, and the quantity of powder made, we may wonder that so few fatal accidents occur.

The Act of Parliament regulates this powder-house in the same loose way as the press-house is regulated—"The quantity of gunpowder to be corned or granulated at one time in any corning or granulating-house shall not exceed twelve hundredweight," twice this quantity being allowed in the house at one time. It is difficult to say what is meant by "granulating twelve hundredweight at one time." Granulation is a gradual process, and so far from granulating 1400 lb. of powder at once, not 14 lb. can be done. As soon as the operation is commenced, the broken presscake is lifted by small cups on an endless band and thrown cupful by cupful into the rollers. Before any granulated powder leaves the machine it is probable that 100 lb. may be in the "corning frame," some broken sufficiently, the rest having to pass through the last pair of rollers. Three or four minutes' time is required for one barrel of powder to pass through the whole. At Waltham Abbey the system is different,

---

* Lieutenant-Colonel Boxer's information on this point is incomplete as well as indefinite. Essex and Hertfordshire are returned without any information as to the gunpowder mills and magazines situated within them; yet at the junction of these two counties the Royal Gunpowder Mills of Waltham Abbey are placed. It is indefinite in that Cornwall is returned as having "a long list of powder magazines and mills," and the North Riding of Yorkshire as having a "long list of mills and magazines."—(*Reports*, p. 41.) We should put the number of corning-houses in England, Scotland, and Wales at not less than sixty. It is probable that at least 20,000 barrels of gunpowder pass through these sixty houses weekly. This would make a total of 100,000,000 lb. of gunpowder annually.

and it may be the Act was framed to suit this single corning-house. A quantity of powder—twelve hundredweight?—is placed in the house, and the machine is so constructed that when placed and the power applied, the corning-frame feeds itself. The men retire until a bell rings, when the machinery is stopped, and the men enter to remove the granulated powder and place a fresh supply. To this solitary house (there is not another constructed on similar principles in England) the Act may apply, but to all the rest it is a dead letter, except as to the quantity allowed in each at one time. Here only is the manufacturer hampered. As with the press-house, he may place it where he thinks fit.

The powder leaves the granulating-house dusty, destitute of any surface polish, and still too porous to store. It has still to undergo the process known as glazing. The glazing-house is fitted with a series of cylinders having shafts of wood passing through them from end to end. Each of these cylinders is capable of holding about 800 lb. of powder, but they are rarely more than half filled. When the powder is secured within them, the cylinders are made to rotate rapidly, and by the attrition of the grains produced by this motion a sensible heat is soon generated, and the powder, which was put into the cylinder of a grey colour, comes out a glossy black. The pores are all closed, the surface is hardened, and the powder is so clean that it would scarcely spot the whitest glove. For ordinary guns, for Enfield rifle powder, and for sporting powders, the polish is gained by attrition only. But where there is another object to be gained, a retardation of combustion, as in large-grain rifle (L.G.R.), or "A 4," for Armstrong guns, and in the new "pebble" powder, a small quantity of graphite is placed in the cylinder before glazing. This gives to the L. G. R. a bright silvery appearance, and to the "pebble," where the surfaces are larger, a dull leaden hue.

The machinery of the glazing-house is very simple, and men are not required to be in the house while the operation is going on; hence accidents in glazing-houses are very rare. We have seen that at the Kames Works a glazing-house exploded, but that was in consequence of the explosion of the press-house, 100 yards distant; and at Tunbridge, in 1864, a dusting-house explosion was communicated to the glazing-house, causing a loss of four lives. In 1863 a glazing-house blew at Lowwood, communicating with three other buildings, and killing three men; and last year gave another example of an explosion originating in a glazing building at the Hounslow Mills. Here the cylinders seem to have been loaded for the night, and the house locked up. Not a man was in the place, yet it exploded, and, communicating with an expense magazine not far off, and this

again with eight incorporating mills, caused the deaths of four men. There was nothing to account for this; it could only be surmised that "something broke."

The drying-house comes next in order. Steam-pipes are carried through this building and communicate with a boiler some distance off. The powder is placed in trays which fit into racks placed near the steam-pipes, and is allowed to remain in a temperature of 130° F. for about twenty hours. During this time it requires very little attention. Now and then it should be moved with a small rake to prevent any caking, and that is all—due care having been given to the ventilators and to the uniform degree of heat. Accidents here are uncommon. A drying-house blew at Ballincollig in 1862, killing two men; another, unattended by loss of life, at Melfort, in 1867.

The gunpowder now is a mixture of grains, varying in size, with a small quantity of dust. To separate the grains and to remove the last traces of dust, the powder is taken to the dusting-house, where it is first reeled, to remove the dust, and then passed over sieves to separate the grains of various sizes. The L. G. R. passes through a mesh of one-fourth of an inch square, and is made to rest on a mesh of seven holes to the inch. Artillery powder (L. G.) is made to pass through a mesh of eight holes to the inch, and to rest on one of thirteen to the inch. Common musket-powder passes through a thirteen mesh on to an eighteen mesh.

The final dusting and separating operations are comparatively safe, but still accidents do occur. In 1859 a dusting-house explosion at Ballincollig killed five men. In 1864 a similar accident at Tunbridge killed three men who were engaged in the house, and one who was approaching in a boat.

While describing the last operations—glazing, drying, dusting, and separating—we have said nothing about the Gunpowder Act as it bears on them. The old Act (12 Geo. III. cap. 61, sec. 6) limited the quantity of gunpowder to be dried at one time to forty hundredweight. The new Act (23 and 24 Vic. cap. 139, sec. 2) permits fifty hundredweight to be dried at once. But this does not represent the quantity which may be kept in the drying-house:—"The quantity to be at any one time in any drying-house or dusting-house shall not be more than is necessary for the immediate supply and work of such house." Practically, the quantity is unlimited. It will be seen that the dusting-house is mentioned in the foregoing extract. This is the only regulation the Act makes respecting dusting-houses, while the glazing-house and separating-house receive no mention at all.

We have thus traced the manufacture of gunpowder through its various stages; we have also named several kinds of powder,

but two kinds remain which seem to require separate treatment —"pellet" and "pebble" gunpowder. When charges of 50 lb. of powder were required, it was soon found that the intensely severe strain caused by the combustion of L.G.R. was very injurious to the guns. It was, comparatively, detonating in its action, and it has been asserted that "no other guns in the world have ventured to employ it." Be this as it may, it became a vital question whether a powder could not be made which, while as powerful or more so in the direction of the shot, should exercise a less destructive pressure upon the gun. A powder, having its grains of a uniform size and shape, of a uniform density, and slow in its action, would, it was thought, meet all the requirements, and "pellet" powder was first provisionally adopted. To procure the "pellets" the broken millcake is placed in cylindrical holes, into which closely fitting punches are forced by hydraulic pressure, so adjusted that the required density can be obtained. The powder is then glazed if thought necessary, and dried in the usual manner. The particulars as to size, &c., of these pellets are given below:—

Range of density of the pellet . .	1·65 to 1·7
Diameter of pellet	0·75 in.
Depth	0·485 in. to 0·495 in.
Diameter of cavity, or indentation in end of pellet	0·2 in. at top. 0·15 in. at bottom.
Depth of ditto	0·25 in.
Range in weight of the pellets . .	85 gr. to 95 gr., *i.e.*, about 75 to the pound.

It is obvious that it is as easy to make a pellet of one form as another: a cylinder with both ends flat is as easy to make as one which has one flat end and the other indented. Lately, another kind of pellet has been adopted: this is a cylinder with both ends convex. A large quantity of this powder has been manufactured in England for Continental use.

The results obtained by pellet powder far surpassed those obtained by the use of L.G.R., but the difficulties in making it led Colonel Younghusband's Committee on Explosive Substances to make further experiments. These led to the adoption of pebble powder, which may be said to consist of lumps rather than of grains, each lump being a rough cube having a side of five-eighths of an inch. This pebble powder was recommended by the Committee on Explosives in the early part of the present year, but, although the recommendation of the Committee was approved, it is stated, and we believe correctly, that at present our stock is "nil." The pellet form was abandoned because of difficulties in the manufacture—are the difficulties in producing

"pebble" insuperable? We have seen that for foreign governments the pellet difficulties have been overcome, and we can see fewer obstacles in the way of manufacturing pebble.

The advantages of pellet and pebble powders over L. G. R. are strikingly illustrated in the following table, which gives the comparative values of the three kinds of powder:—

Description of Powder.	Charge.	Initial Velocity per second.	Maximum Pressure per square inch.
Large Grain Rifle .	30 lb.	1324 lb.	29·8 tons.
Pellet	30 lb.	1338 lb.	17·4 tons.
Pebble	35 lb.	1374 lb.	15·4 tons.

From this it will be seen that our guns have been subjected to a strain nearly double of that which they will henceforth undergo, while the muzzle velocity will be increased. In these experiments the gun used was an 8-inch smooth bore, the shot were cylinders of iron weighing 180 lb., having a diameter of 7·995 inches.

After the gunpowder is finished, it has to undergo various kinds of proofs. 1. The "hand proof," by which its general appearance and freeness from dust are examined. 2. "Flashing" on a glass plate, which shows to a practised eye whether the incorporation is complete, and whether the powder is likely to foul the guns when fired. 3. Cubing, or ascertaining the weight of a cubic foot of powder. A cubic foot of Enfield rifle weighs nearly 54 lb., while L. G. and L. G. R. weigh 56 lb. and 60 lb. respectively. The pebble is not "cubed," but its density ranges from 1·70 to 1·82. The last proof is the firing. The old method was to place two ounces of L. G. or three ounces of L. G. R. in the chamber of a mortar, and fire a solid shot of 68 lb. The distance this ball was carried was held to be a test of the strength of the gunpowder fired. Every gunpowder maker knew the system was utterly untrustworthy, and it was only tolerated because no better method was known. Now a different and scientific method has been devised, and our English gunpowder will, we have no doubt, be quite equal to its requirements. The old and clumsy "cube" is to give way to the mercurial densimeter, and the mortar must yield to Captain Andrew Noble's chronoscope or to the chronograph.

Only last year the Navez-Leurs's electro-ballistric apparatus was thought to meet every requirement in the proof of gunpowder, but it was quickly superseded by the chronographs of Captain Schultz and Professor Bashforth. These only measure velocities after the shot has left the gun, while the chronoscope

invented by Captain Noble measures the time which a projectile occupies in traversing any part of the gun to the one-millionth part of a second. A series of six hollow plugs are screwed into a gun at intervals from the shot to the muzzle. Each of these plugs passes from the outside of the gun to the surface of the bore. As the ball, when the powder has been fired, moves by the first plug, it presses a cutter which separates a wire passing through the plug to the outside of the gun. This is repeated as the projectile passes each plug. Each of the wires so divided is the primary wire of an induction coil, and as each is divided, an electric spark is flashed from the secondary wires on to a corresponding thin metal disc, the edges of which are covered with white paper coated with lamp-black. These discs, which are 36 inches in diameter, rotate at the rate of about 30 revolutions a second, or about one inch of circumference in the one-thousandth part of a second. This inch of circumference is divided by means of a vernier into one thousand parts, thus giving readings to the one-millionth part of a second. As the electric spark is flashed out it is received in the edge of its disc, and burns away the lamp-black, leaving a white spot, from which calculations are made.

To determine the direct pressure exerted upon the gun, Rodman's pressure-gauge, and an instrument called a "crusher," are in use. The former consists of a number of plugs fitted into the bore of the gun, each of the plugs being fitted with a knife-edge, and a small piece of copper. The depth to which the knife is driven into the copper, registers the pressure at that part of the gun. The "crusher" gauge is similar in principle to the Rodman, but instead of a knife-edge cutting into copper, a solid cylinder of copper is crushed by a piston, which is set in motion by the pressure of the gas. A testing apparatus shows the force required to effect a given compression. This "crusher" gauge gives results far more satisfactory than those given by the Rodman gauge.

In the autumn of 1864, the question of storing gunpowder acquired an interest which it never had before. Until then it was always assumed that whatever powder-houses blew up, magazines were not liable to such casualties. But this illusion was rudely and suddenly dispelled. An area of country, having a radius of not less than fifty miles, was startled by a report which none could understand. In London, shutters fell down, windows were broken, and people rushed from their beds, thinking nothing less than an earthquake had shaken the city to its very foundations. Down the river, lying by a wharf at Erith, had been seen that morning two gunpowder barges. Some passers-by had observed smoke issuing from the funnel of one of the barges (probably breakfast was preparing), that this barge's hatches were off, and that the door of a magazine close by was

wide open. There was nothing surprising in all this. Neither barge nor magazine had ever been known to blow, and there appeared no reason why either should blow now. Some persons on the land saw a flash from one of the barges, which was followed by the explosion of the magazine, near which the barges were lying, and then by a second magazine standing fifty yards off: the three explosions followed one another with such rapidity, that the reports were mingled in one awful roar. The quantity of powder exploded was variously estimated at from 120,000 lb. to 130,000 lb.

The devastation caused by the explosion of this unparalleled quantity of powder is minutely described by Lieutenant-Colonel Boxer, in his Report, bearing date 16th November, 1864. In reading this account, it is necessary to bear in mind that there were three explosions:—First, the barge containing perhaps 45,000 lb. of gunpowder. The force of this explosion was directed chiefly against the river wall. Second, the powder in the magazine, which exploded immediately after the contents of the barge; and third, that contained in the second magazine. These two magazines were of brick; and after they were destroyed, the destructive force of the powder was exerted on the surrounding neighbourhood. What the effects would have been if the whole had been exploded at once it is idle to speculate.

About 150 feet of the river bank in front of the first magazine was carried away, and about 60 feet on each side injured. The cottages occupied by the men who attended to this magazine, and which were 70 yards from it, were thrown down, and four persons killed by their fall. At a distance of about 700 yards stood a third magazine. The walls of this were cracked, and the windows broken; a piece of iron passed through the roof and fell upon the floor. Erith parish church, 1300 yards distant, had all its windows and "sashes" facing the magazine forced in: large patches of the ceiling were brought down. At a distance of one mile all windows facing the river were broken, and five shop-fronts were completely blown in. A mile and three-quarters off, on rising ground, window-sashes and doors were blown in, walls were cracked, and ten unfinished cottages fell down on the following day. A house five miles off sustained considerable damage in the way of broken windows; and as far as ten miles distant a similar injury was sustained. Lieut.-Col. Boxer thinks this "accident was not caused by sparks from a fire on board the barge, but by the ignition of a lucifer match dropped by one of the men who were engaged in unloading."* With all deference for Lieut.-Col. Boxer's opinion, our own is that

* Reports, p. 14.

a spark from a *wood* fire on board the barge was the cause. That a fire was burning seems to be beyond a doubt; and our experience leads us to accept this as more likely than the lucifer-match theory. Without doubt the lucifer match is one of the greatest enemies that the gunpowder manufacturer has to contend with; and how to keep them out of the factory is a difficulty which he is ever striving to overcome. Lights must also be had on board barges, and the Thames Conservancy Board recommend a return to the old tinder-box. The trouble attending the use of this will always deter men from adopting it; and if they are supplied with it, they will evade its use. The safety-match —when it can be depended upon—"to light only on the box"— is the only thing which can be put into men's hands with a chance of their using it.

The Gunpowder Act has been shown to be defective in many points, some of which we follow Lieutenant-Colonel Boxer in particularizing; others we have already mentioned. The quantity to be carried at one time by land "in any waggon, cart, or other carriage," is limited to 4000 lb.; but the quantity which may be carried by railway is unlimited. As many trucks, each containing forty barrels of gunpowder, as the railway companies choose to link together, may be sent at one time; while "the conveyance of gunpowder by water is practically unregulated, as well as the description of vessel in which it is carried." When buildings are licensed, no provision is made for inspection, except at the special order of the Secretary of State; nor can the licence be withdrawn upon any alteration of the structural arrangements or violation of other conditions under which the licence was originally granted." "There is no provision for systematic inspection of the magazines, and no power to enforce compliance with the provisions of the Act;" and even in the rare cases of the appointment of an inspector to pay a special visit to any gunpowder factory or magazine, he has no power to enforce any orders beyond what the Act provides."*

In his inspection of certain magazines and mills, Lieutenant-Colonel Boxer found the provisions of the Act as to the quantity of gunpowder in each powder-house complied with in every case, and the rules relating to the construction and position of magazines observed, with certain exceptions." The "exceptions were, that a magazine was found within a few yards of the borough of Gateshead, and only five hundred yards from the borough and market-town of Newcastle-upon-Tyne." At another place he found a magazine only eighty yards from a dusting-house, the distance prescribed by the Act being a hundred and forty yards.

---

* Reports, &c., pp. 43, 44.

A third magazine he found of wood of light construction, although the Act enjoins "that such magazines shall be well and substantially built of brick or stone." In several cases he found expense magazines within the prescribed distance of forty yards, and some few without lightning conductors."*

But it is not from these magazines that the danger to the public arises. Commonly the magazines attached to factories are situated within the works (not at a safe distance, we allow), and are managed with such scrupulous care that an accident originating in one of these is all but unknown. Yet Lieutenant-Colonel Boxer thinks the most defective part of the existing law is that which relates to these very magazines, some of which contain as much as 300,000 lb. of gunpowder at one time. The chief dangers to which they are exposed arise from their nearness to powder-houses. The prescribed distance of a hundred and forty yards is wholly insufficient, as it is well known that heavy beams set in a blaze by the explosion of a dusting-house or corning-house will be hurled twice that distance, and are liable to fall through the roof of the magazine like immense rockets. In a case of this sort nothing can save the contents of the magazine from ignition. No magazine of this kind should be allowed within 600 yards of a powder-house, and an Act is imperatively required granting gunpowder makers powers to acquire land for such a purpose, and insisting upon the removal of their store-houses to this distance. With the expense magazines the case is different. The prescribed distance of 40 yards is insufficient; it should be 100 yards from any incorporating mill, and not less than 300 from any press-house, corning-house, glazing-house, or dusting-house. Many cases of explosions communicating with these are on record; but as they usually contain but a small quantity of powder, the mischief arising from them attracts little attention. Distance, then, from powder-houses is absolutely necessary to protect these magazines from dangers from without. The dangers within the buildings arise from the accidental leakage of powder barrels, the presence of gritty matter, or the lucifer match. Extreme care and the exercise of a rigid surveillance over the men employed and the clothes and boots they wear will reduce these dangers to a minimum.

The true danger to the public lies in the numerous magazines which are scattered up and down the country, the condition of which forms a striking portion of the Reports from which we have already quoted. The statements made respecting the Devon and Cornwall gunpowder magazines are enough to horrify the gunpowder-maker who is accustomed to floors covered with hides,

---

* Reports, &c., pp. 46 and 51.

shoes without nails of any kind, tools only of copper or wood, and every possible precaution. One borough had three magazines within its boundaries; persons licensed to keep not more than 300 lb. kept 1000 lb.; miners were in the habit of going into magazines with lighted pipes and lighted candles; barrels were opened with a steel instrument; on market-days Tavistock frequently had from 1500 lb. to 2000 lb. of powder warehoused in the town, to be carried out by common carriers or in market carts; and railway companies delivered gunpowder on passenger platforms. At Penrhyn, 1000 lb. of powder were put into a stone truck for conveyance to a mine; one of the barrels leaked, and when the skid-pan was put on, the powder ignited, and the carter and three horses were killed. In another place, a magazine "was not left open," but it had a hole in the door, through which the boys of the neighbourhood used to creep to fill their pockets with gunpowder. One such boy went from the magazine to a blacksmith's shop—the rest need not be told: he died a horrible death. We have written of these things in the past tense, but we doubt whether the present would not have been as applicable. To these magazines especially constant attention should be directed. Nothing short of frequent visits by inspectors will ever put an end to such a state of things. To trust to local authorities is out of the question. They are generally interested or indifferent, and unless the Government take up the question, this peril to life and property will remain, not only in Devon and Cornwall, but in all the mining districts.

We have already referred to the serious question of transport or conveyance of gunpowder. The enormous quantities which pass through London by railway, in covered vans, or on the river, are a constant source of danger. Yet no regulations exist to insure safety beyond such as are impressed upon the men in charge by the senders. If a second *Lottie Sleigh* were to explode near London Bridge instead of in the Mersey, or 1000 lb. of powder in Cheapside or Gray's Inn Lane, instead of on the road from Penrhyn, we should awake, too late, to the awful risks we run. The Erith explosion would sink into insignificance in the presence of such a calamity. Yet what is to prevent it? Liverpool did not think of its danger till the danger came, and then men wondered that such a quantity of powder should have been allowed. Let our readers carefully study the following extract, and then ask themselves whether these "quantities varying from 60,000 lb. to 30,000 lb.," do not pass through London every week, without reckoning what is conveyed through our streets or over our railways.

"At present there are no restrictions as to the shipping and landing of gunpowder at wharves, except in one or two special cases in which

the local authorities are empowered to make bye-laws. This is an omission which ought certainly to be rectified, for the public are now subjected to much unnecessary risk on this account. The powder-wharf at Isleworth affords a good illustration. This wharf is situated in the town of Isleworth, on the banks of the Thames; on an average as much as 600 barrels per week are shipped there, in quantities varying from 600 to 300 barrels: the wharf is surrounded by houses, and the sacrifice of life would be fearful in the event of an explosion. Other cases might be quoted to show the defect of the present system."*

These Reports the House of Commons ordered to be printed in 1865. Since then nothing has been done. Every little while the public is startled by an account of deaths by gunpowder. Although we do not think any legislative action will ever make gunpowder-making a safe trade, we are convinced that the appointment of two inspectors thoroughly acquainted with the nature and details of the business, would do much to diminish the dangers which attend the public generally, not only from gunpowder, but from all other explosive compounds used for mining purposes; and their reports, presented from time to time, might form the foundation of a new Gunpowder Act, which, while it should interfere as little as possible with the rights of manufacturers, and place few restrictions upon their trade, should make regulations for the guidance of the makers, the sellers, and the users of all explosive compounds, whether gunpowder, fire-works, guncotton, percussion caps, nitro-glycerine, or dynamite.

* Reports, &c., p. 50.

Art. IX.—The New York Gold Conspiracy.

1. *A Chapter of Erie.* By Charles Francis Adams, Jun. Boston. 1869.
2. *House of Representatives. Report, No. 31. Forty-first Congress, Second Session. Report of the Committee on Banking and Currency, in response to a Resolution of the House of Representatives, passed December 13, 1869, directing the Committee "to investigate the causes that led to the unusual and extraordinary fluctuations of Gold in the City of New York, from the 21st to the 27th of September, 1869;" accompanied by the Testimony collected by the Committee.*

THE civil war in America, with its enormous issues of depreciating currency, and its reckless waste of money and credit by the Government, created a speculative mania such as the United States, with all its experience in this respect, had never before known. Not only in Broad Street, the centre of New York speculation, but far and wide throughout the Northern States, almost every man who had money at all, employed a part of his capital in the purchase of stocks or of gold, of copper, of petroleum, or of domestic produce, in the hope of a rise in prices; or staked money on the expectation of a fall. To use the jargon of the street, every farmer and every shopkeeper in the country seemed to be engaged in "carrying" some favourite security "on a margin." Whoever could obtain five pounds, sent it to a broker with orders to buy fifty pounds worth of stocks, or whatever amount the broker would consent to purchase. If the stock rose, the speculator prospered; if it fell until the five pounds of deposit or margin were lost, the broker demanded a new deposit, or sold the stock to protect himself. By means of this simple and smooth machinery, which differs in no essential respect from the processes of roulette or rouge-et-noir, the whole nation flung itself into the Stock Exchange, until the "outsiders," as they were called, in opposition to the regular brokers of Broad Street, represented nothing less than the entire population of the American Republic. Every one speculated, and for a time every one speculated successfully.

The inevitable reaction began when the Government, about a year after the close of the war, stopped its issues and ceased borrowing. The greenback currency had for a moment sunk to a value of only 37 cents to the dollar. It is even asserted that on the worst day of all, the 11th July, 1864, one sale of 20,000*l.* in

gold was actually made at 310, which is equivalent to about 33 cents in the dollar. At this point, however, the depreciation stopped, and the paper which had come so near falling into entire discredit, steadily rose in value; first to 50 cents, then to 60, to 70, and within the present year to more than 90 cents. So soon as the industrious part of the public felt the curb of this return to solid values, the whole fabric of fictitious wealth began to melt away under their eyes.

Thus it was not long before the so-called "outsiders," the men who speculated on their own account, and could not act in agreement or combination, began to suffer. One by one, or in great masses, they were made the prey of the larger operators; their last margins were consumed, and they dropped down to the solid level of slow, productive industry. Some lost everything; many lost still more than they had, and there are few families of ordinary connexion and standing in the United States which cannot tell, if they choose, some dark story of embezzlement, or breach of trust, committed in these days. Some men, who had courage and a sense of honour, found life too heavy for them; others went mad. But the greater part turned in silence to their regular pursuits, and accepted their losses as they could. Almost every rich American could produce from some pigeon-hole a bundle of worthless securities, and could show check-books representing the only remaining trace of margin after margin consumed in vain attempts to satisfy the insatiable broker. A year or two of incessant losses swept the weaker gamblers from the street.

But even those who continued to speculate found it necessary to change their mode of operations. Chance no longer ruled over the Stock Exchange and the gold market. The fate of a battle, the capture of a city, or the murder of a President, had hitherto been the influences which broke through the plans of the strongest combinations, and put all speculators, whether great or small, on fairly even ground; but as the period of sudden and uncontrollable disturbing elements passed away, the market fell more and more completely into the hands of cliques which found a point of adhesion in some great mass of incorporated capital. Three distinct railways, with all their enormous resources, became the property of Cornelius Vanderbilt, who, by means of their credit and capital, again and again swept millions of dollars into his pocket by a process curiously similar to gambling with loaded dice. But Vanderbilt was one of the most respectable of these great operators. The Erie Railway was controlled by Daniel Drew, who used the mean tactics of a common swindler, too timid to risk his person. Vanderbilt acted in the interests of his corporations; Drew cheated equally his corporation and the public. Between these two men and the immense in-

corporated power they swayed, smaller operators, one after another, were crushed to pieces, until the survivors learned to seek shelter within some clique sufficiently strong to afford protection. Speculation in this manner began to consume itself, and the largest combination of capital was destined to swallow every weaker combination which ventured to show itself in the market.

Thus, between the inevitable effect of a currency which steadily shrank the apparent wealth of the country, and the omnipotence of capital in the stock market, a sounder and healthier state of society began to make itself felt. Nor could the unfortunate public, which had been robbed with such cynical indifference by Drew and Vanderbilt, feel any sincere regret when they saw these two cormorants reduced to tearing each other. In the year 1867, Mr. Vanderbilt undertook to gain possession of the Erie road, as he had already obtained possession of the New York Central, the second trunk line between New York and the west. Mr. Vanderbilt is supposed to own property to the value of some 10,000,000*l*., all of which may be made directly available for stock operations. He bought the greater part of the Erie stock; Drew sold him all he wanted, and then issued as much more as was required in order to defeat Vanderbilt's purpose. After a violent struggle, which overthrew all the guarantees of social order, Drew triumphed, and Mr. Vanderbilt abandoned the contest. The Erie corporation paid him a large sum to reimburse his alleged losses. At the same time it was agreed that Mr. Drew's accounts should be passed, and he obtained a release in full, and retired from the direction. And the Erie road, almost exhausted by such systematic plundering, was left in the undisturbed if not peaceful control of Mr. Jay Gould and Mr. James Fisk, jun., whose reign began in the month of July, 1868.

Mr. Jay Gould was a partner in the firm of Smith, Gould, and Martin, brokers, in Wall Street. He had been before now engaged in railway enterprises, and his operations had not been of a nature likely to encourage public confidence in his ideas of fiduciary relations. He was a broker, and a broker is almost by nature a gambler, perhaps the very last profession suitable for a railway manager. In character he was strongly marked by his disposition for silent intrigue. He preferred as a rule to operate on his own account, without admitting other persons into his confidence, and he seemed never to be satisfied except when deceiving every one as to his intentions. There was a reminiscence of the spider in his nature. He spun huge webs, in corners and in the dark, which were seldom strong enough to resist a serious strain at the critical moment. His disposition to this subtlety and elaboration of intrigue was irresistible. It is scarcely necessary to say that he had not a conception of a moral principle.

In speaking of this class of men it must be fairly assumed at the outset that they do not and cannot understand how there can be a distinction between right and wrong in matters of speculation, so long as the daily settlements are punctually effected. In this respect Mr. Gould was probably as honest as the mass of his fellows, according to the moral standard of the street; but without entering upon technical questions of roguery, it is enough to say that he was an uncommonly fine and unscrupulous intriguer, skilled in all the processes of stock-gambling, and indifferent to the praise or censure of society.

James Fisk, jun. was still more original in character. He was not yet forty years of age, and had the instincts of fourteen. He came originally from Vermont, probably the most respectable and correct State in the Union, and his father had been a pedler who sold goods from town to town in his native valley of the Connecticut. The son followed his father's calling with boldness and success. He drove his huge waggon, made resplendent with paint and varnish, with four or six horses, through the towns of Vermont and Western Massachusetts, and when his father remonstrated in alarm at his reckless management, the young man, with his usual bravado, took his father into his service at a fixed salary, with the warning that he was not to put on airs on the strength of his new dignity. A large Boston firm which had supplied his goods on credit, attracted by his energy, took him into the house; the war broke out; his influence drew the firm into some bold speculations which were successful; in a few years he retired with some 20,000*l.*, which he subsequently lost. He formed a connexion with Daniel Drew in New York, and a new sign, ominous of future trouble, was raised in Wall Street, bearing the names of Fisk and Belden, brokers.

Personally Mr. Fisk was coarse, noisy, boastful, ignorant; the type of a young butcher in appearance and mind. Nothing could be more striking than the contrast between him and his future associate Gould. One was small and slight in person, dark, sallow, reticent, and stealthy, with a trace of Jewish origin. The other was large, florid, gross, talkative, and obstreperous. Mr. Fisk's redeeming point was his humour, which had a strong flavour of American nationality. His mind was extraordinarily fertile in ideas and expedients, while his conversation was filled with unusual images and strange forms of speech, which were caught up and made popular by the New York press. In respect to honesty as between Gould and Fisk, the latter was, perhaps, if possible, less deserving of trust than the former. A story not without a keen stroke of satirical wit is told by Fisk, which illustrates his estimate of abstract truth. An old woman who had bought of the elder Fisk a handkerchief

which cost ninepence in the New England currency, where six shillings are reckoned to the dollar, complained to Mr. Fisk, jun., that his father had cheated her. Mr. Fisk considered the case maturely, and gave a decision based on *à priori* principles. "No!" said he, "the old man wouldn't have told a lie for ninepence;" and then, as if this assertion needed some reasonable qualification, he added, "although he would have told eight of them for a dollar!" The distinction as regards the father may have been just, since the father seems to have held old-fashioned ideas as to wholesale and retail trade; but in regard to the son even this relative degree of truth cannot be predicated with any confidence, since, if the Investigating Committee of Congress and its evidence are to be believed, Mr. Fisk seldom or never speaks truth at all.

An intrigue equally successful and disreputable brought these two men into the Erie Board of Directors, whence they speedily drove their more timid predecessor Drew. In July, 1868, Gould made himself President and Treasurer of the Corporation. Fisk became Comptroller. A young lawyer, named Lane, became counsel. These three Directors made a majority of the Executive Committee, and were masters of Erie. The Board of Directors held no Meetings. The Executive Committee was never called together, and the three men,—Fisk, Gould, and Lane, became from this time the absolute, irresponsible owners of the Erie railway, not less than if it had been their personal property and plaything.

This property was in effect, like all the great railway corporations, an empire within a republic. It consisted of a trunk line of road 459 miles in length, with branches 314 miles in extent, or 773 miles of road in all. Its capital stock amounted to about 7,000,000*l.* Its gross receipts exceeded 3,000,000*l.* per annum. It employed not less than 15,000 men, and supported their families. Over all this wealth and influence, greater than that directly swayed by any private citizen, greater than is absolutely and personally controlled by most kings, and far too great for the public safety either in a democracy or in any other form of society, the vicissitudes of a troubled time placed two men in irresponsible authority; and both these men belonged to a low and degraded moral and social type. Such an elevation has been rarely seen in modern history. Even the most dramatic of modern authors, even Balzac himself who so loved to deal with similar violent alternations of fortune, or Alexandre Dumas, with all his extravagance of imagination, never have reached a conception bolder or more melodramatic than this, nor have they ever ventured to conceive a plot so enormous, or a catastrophe so original, as was now to be developed.

One of the earliest acts of the new rulers was precisely such as Balzac or Dumas might have predicted and dilated upon. They established themselves in a palace. The old offices of the Erie railway were in the lower part of the city, among the wharves and warehouses; a situation, no doubt, convenient for business, but by no means agreeable as a residence; and the new proprietors naturally wished to reside on their property. Mr. Fisk and Mr. Gould accordingly bought a huge building of white marble, not unlike a European palace, situated about two miles from the business quarter, and containing a large theatre or opera house. They also purchased several smaller houses adjoining it. The opera house cost about 140,000*l.*, and a large part of the building was at once leased, by the two purchasers, to themselves as the Erie Corporation, to serve as offices. This suite of apartments was then furnished by themselves as representing the Corporation, at an expense of some 60,000*l.*, and in a style which, though called vulgar, is certainly not more vulgar than that of the President's official residence, and which would be magnificent in almost any palace in Europe. The adjoining houses were connected with the main building; and in one of these Mr. Fisk had his private apartments, with a private passage to his opera box. He also assumed direction of the theatre, of which he became manager-in-chief. To these royal arrangements he brought tastes which have been commonly charged as the worst results of royal licence. The atmosphere of the Erie offices was not supposed to be disturbed with moral prejudices; and as the opera itself supplied Mr. Fisk's mind with amusement, so the opera *troupe* supplied him with a permanent harem. Whatever Mr. Fisk did was done on an extraordinary scale.

These arrangements, however, regarded only the pleasures of the American Aladdin. In the conduct of their interests the new Directors showed a capacity for large conceptions, and a vigour in the execution of their schemes, such as alarmed the entire community. At the annual election in 1868, when Gould, Fisk, and Lane, having borrowed or bought proxies for the greater part of the stock, caused themselves to be elected for the ensuing year, the respectable portion of the public throughout the country was astonished and shocked to learn that the new Board of Directors contained two names peculiarly notorious and obnoxious to honest men;—the names of William M. Tweed and Peter B. Sweeney. To English ears these commonplace, not to say vulgar, titles, do not seem singularly alarming; but to every honest American they conveyed a peculiar sense of terror and disgust. The State of New York in its politics is much influenced if not controlled by the city of New York. The city

politics are so entirely in the hands of the democratic party as to preclude even the existence of a strong minority. The party organization centres in a political club, held together by its patronage and the money it controls through a system of jobbery unequalled elsewhere in the world. And the Tammany Club, thus swaying the power of a small nation of several million souls, is itself ruled by William M. Tweed and Peter B. Sweeney, absolute masters of this terrible system of theft and fraud, and to American eyes the incarnation of political immorality.

The effect of this alliance was felt in the ensuing winter in the passage of a Bill through the State legislature and its signature by the Governor, abolishing the former system of annual elections of the entire Board of Erie Directors, and authorizing the Board to classify itself in such a manner that only a portion should be changed each year. The principle of the Bill was correct. Its practical effect, however, was to enable Gould and Fisk to make themselves Directors for five years, in spite of any attempt on the part of the stockholders to remove them. The formality of annual re-election was spared them; and so far as the stockholders were concerned, there was no great injustice in the Act. The Erie road was in the peculiar position of being without an owner. There was no *cestui que trust*, unless the English stockholders could be called such. In America the stock was almost exclusively held for speculation, not for investment; and in the morals of Wall Street, speculation means, or had almost come to mean, disregard of intrinsic value. In this case society at large was the injured party, and society knew its risk.

This step, however, was only a beginning. The Tammany ring, as it is called, exercised a power far beyond politics. Under the existing constitution of the State, the judges of the State Courts are elected by the people. There are thirty-three such judges in New York, and each of the thirty-three is clothed with equity powers running through the whole State. Of these judges Tammany Hall elected several, and the Erie railway controlled others in country districts. Each of these judges might forbid proceedings before any and all the other judges, or stay proceedings in suits already commenced. Thus the lives and the property of the public were in the power of the new combination; and two of the city judges, Barnard and Cardozo, had already acquired a peculiarly infamous reputation as so-called "slaves to the ring," which left no question as to the depths to which their prostitution of justice would descend.

The alliance between Tammany and Erie was thus equivalent to investing Mr. Gould and Mr. Fisk with the highest attributes of sovereignty; but in order to avail themselves to the utmost of

their judicial powers, they also required the ablest legal assistance. The degradation of the bench had been rapidly followed by the degradation of the bar. Prominent and learned lawyers were already accustomed to avail themselves of social or business relations with judges to forward private purposes. One whose partner might be elevated to the bench was certain to be generally retained in cases brought before this special judge; and litigants were taught by experience that a retainer in such cases was profitably bestowed. Others found a similar advantage resulting from known social relations with the Court. This debasement of tone was not confined to the lower ranks of advocates; and it was probably this steady demoralization of the bar which made it possible for the Erie ring to obtain the services of Mr. David Dudley Field as its legal adviser. Mr. Field, a gentleman of European reputation, in regard to which he is understood to be peculiarly solicitous, was an eminent law reformer, author of the New York Code, delegate of the American Social Science Association to the European International Congress; and asserted, by his partner Mr. Shearman, in evidence before a Committee of the New York legislature, to be a man of Quixotic sense of honour. Mr. Shearman himself, a gentleman of English parentage, had earned public gratitude by arraigning and deploring, with unsurpassed courage and point, the condition of the New York judiciary, in an admirable essay which will be found in the *North American Review* for July, 1867. The value of Mr. Field's services to Messrs. Fisk and Gould was not to be measured even by the enormous fees their generosity paid him. His power over certain judges became so absolute as to impress the popular imagination; and the gossip of Wall Street insists that he has a silken halter round the neck of Judge Barnard, and a hempen one round that of Cardozo. It is certain that he who had a year before threatened Barnard on his own bench with impeachment, now appeared in the character of Barnard's master, and issued as a matter of course the edicts of his court.

One other combination was made by the Erie managers to extend their power, and this time it was credit that was threatened. They bought a joint stock bank in New York city, with a capital of 200,000*l.* The assistance thus gained was purchased at a very moderate price, since it was by no means represented by the capital. The great cliques and so-called "operators" of Wall Street and Broad Street carry on their transactions by a system of credits and clearing houses with a very limited use of money. The banks certify their checks, and the certified checks settle all balances. Nominally and by law the banks only certify to the extent of *bonâ fide* deposits, but in

reality the custom of disregarding the strict letter of the law is not unknown, and in regard to the bank in question, the Comptroller of the Currency, an officer of the National Treasury, testifies that on an examination of its affairs in April, 1869, out of fifteen checks deposited in its hands as security for certifications made by it, selected at hazard for inquiry, and representing a nominal value of 300,000*l.*, three only were good. The rest represented accommodation extended to brokers and speculators without security. As an actual fact it is in evidence that this same bank on Thursday, September 24th, 1869, certified checks to the amount of nearly 1,500,000*l.* for Mr. Gould alone. What sound security Mr. Gould deposited against this mass of credit may be left to the imagination. His operations, however, were not confined to this bank alone, although this was the only one owned by the ring.

Thus Mr. Gould and Mr. Fisk created a combination more powerful than any that has been controlled by mere private citizens in America or in Europe since society for self-protection established the supreme authority of the judicial name. They exercised the legislative and the judicial powers of the State; they possessed almost unlimited credit, and society was at their mercy. One authority alone stood above them, beyond their control; and this was the distant but threatening figure of the National Government.

Nevertheless, powerful as they were, the Erie managers were seldom in funds. The huge marble palace in which they lived, the theatre which they supported, the reckless bribery and profusion of management by which they could alone maintain their defiance of public opinion, the enormous schemes for extending their operations into which they rushed with utter recklessness, all required greater resources than could be furnished even by the wholesale plunder of the Erie road. They were obliged from time to time to issue from their castle and harry the industrious public or their brother-freebooters. The process was different from that known to the dark ages, but the objects and the results were equally robbery. At one time Mr. Fisk is said to have ordered heavy speculative sales of stock in an Express Company which held a contract with the Erie railway. The sales being effected, the contract was declared annulled. The stock naturally fell, and Mr. Fisk realized the difference. He then ordered heavy purchases, and having renewed the contract the stock rose again, and Mr. Fisk a second time swept the street. In the summer and autumn of 1869 the two managers issued and sold 235,000 new shares of Erie stock, or nearly as much as its entire capital when they assumed power in July, 1868. With the aid of the money thus obtained, they succeeded in withdrawing

about 2,500,000*l.* in currency from circulation at the very moment of the year when currency was most in demand in order to harvest the crops. For weeks the whole nation writhed and quivered under the torture of this modern rack, until the National Government itself was obliged to interfere and threaten a sudden opening of the Treasury. But whether the Erie speculators operated for a rise or operated for a fall, whether they bought or sold, and whether they were engaged in manipulating stocks, or locking up currency, or cornering gold, they were always a public nuisance and scandal.

In order to explain the operation of a so-called corner in gold to ordinary readers with the least possible use of slang or technical phrases, two preliminary statements are necessary. In the first place it must be understood that the supply of gold immediately available for transfers is limited within distinct bounds in America. New York and the country behind it contain an amount usually estimated at about 4,000,000*l.* The National Government commonly holds from 15,000,000*l.* to 20,000,000*l.*, which may be thrown bodily on the market if the President orders it. To obtain gold from Europe or other sources requires time.

In the second place, gold in America is a commodity bought and sold like stocks in a special market or gold-room which is situated next the Stock Exchange in Broad Street and is practically a part of it. In gold as in stocks, the transactions are both real and speculative. The real transactions are mostly purchases or loans made by importers who require coin to pay customs on their imports. This legitimate business is supposed to require from 1,000,000*l.* to 1,500,000*l.* per day. The speculative transactions are mere wagers on the rise or fall of price, and neither require any actual transfer of gold nor even imply its existence, although in times of excitement hundreds of millions nominally are bought, sold, and loaned.

Under the late administration Mr. McCulloch, then Secretary of the Treasury, had thought it his duty at least to guarantee a stable currency, although Congress forbade him to restore the gold standard. During four years gold had fluctuated little, and principally from natural causes, and the danger of attempting to create an artificial scarcity in it had prevented the operators from trying an experiment which would have been sure to irritate the government. The financial policy of the new administration was not so definitely fixed, and the success of a speculation would depend on the action of Mr. Boutwell, the new secretary, whose direction was understood to have begun by a marked censure on the course pursued by his predecessor.

Of all financial operations, cornering gold is the most brilliant

and the most dangerous, and possibly the very hazard and splendour of the attempt were the reasons of its fascination to Mr. Jay Gould's fancy. He dwelt upon it for months, and played with it like a pet toy. His fertile mind even went so far as to discover that it would prove a blessing to the community, and on this ingenious theory, half honest and half fraudulent, he stretched the widely extended fabric of the web in which all mankind was to be caught. This theory was in itself partially sound. Starting from the principle that the price of grain in New York is regulated by the price in London and is not affected by currency fluctuations, Mr. Gould argued that if it were possible to raise the premium on gold from thirty to forty cents at harvest time, the farmers' grain would be worth $1.40 instead of $1.30, and as a consequence the farmer would hasten to send all his crop to New York for export, over the Erie railway, which was sorely in need of freights. With the valuable assistance of another ingenious gentleman not unknown to the English public, Mr. James McHenry, Mr. Gould calculated the exact premium at which the western farmer would consent to dispose of his grain, and thus distance the three hundred sail which were hastening from the Danube to supply the English market. Gold, which was then heavy at 34, must be raised to 45.

This clever idea, like all the other ideas of these gentlemen of Erie, seems to have had the single fault of requiring that some one somewhere should be swindled. The scheme was probably feasible; but sooner or later the reaction from such an artificial stimulant must have come, and whenever it came some one must suffer. Nevertheless, Mr. Gould probably argued that so long as the farmer got his money, the Erie railway its freights, and he himself his small profits on the gold he bought, it was of little consequence who else might be injured; and, indeed, by the time the reaction came, and gold was ready to fall as he expected, Mr. Gould would probably have been ready to assist the process by speculative sales in order to enable the western farmer to buy his spring goods cheap as he had sold his autumn crops dear. He himself was equally ready to buy gold cheap and sell it dear on his private account; and as he proposed to bleed New York merchants for the benefit of the western farmer, so he was willing to bleed Broad Street for his own. The patriotic object was, however, the one which for obvious reasons Mr. Gould preferred to put forward most prominently, and on the strength of which he hoped to rest his ambitious structure of intrigue.

In the operation of raising the price of gold from 133 to 145, there was no great difficulty to men who controlled the resources of the Erie railway. Credit alone was needed, and of credit Mr. Gould had an unlimited supply. The only serious danger lay in

the possible action of the National Government, which had not taken the same philanthropic view of the public good as was peculiar to the managers of Erie. Secretary Boutwell, who should have assisted Mr. Gould in "bulling" gold, was gravely suspected of being a bear, and wishing to depress the premiums to nothing. If he were determined to stand in Mr. Gould's path, it was useless even for the combined forces of Erie and Tammany to jostle against him; and it was therefore essential that Mr Gould should control the government itself, whether by fair means or foul, by persuasion or by purchase. He undertook the task; and now that his proceedings in both directions have been thoroughly drawn into light, it is well worth while for the public to see how dramatic and how artistically admirable a conspiracy in real life may be, when slowly elaborated from the subtle mind of a clever intriguer, and carried into execution by a band of unshrinking scoundrels.

The first requisite for Mr. Gould's purpose was some channel of direct communication with the President; and here he was peculiarly favoured by chance. Mr. Abel Rathbone Corbin, formerly lawyer, editor, speculator, lobby-agent, familiar as he claims with everything, had succeeded during his varied career in accumulating from one or another of his hazardous pursuits a comfortable fortune, and he had crowned his success, at the age of sixty-seven or thereabouts, by contracting a marriage with General Grant's sister-in-law, precisely at the moment when General Grant was on the point of reaching the highest eminence possible to an American citizen. To say that Mr. Corbin's moral dignity had passed absolutely pure through the somewhat tainted atmosphere in which his life had been spent, would be flattering him too highly; but at least he was now no longer engaged in any active occupation, and he lived quietly in New York, watching the course of public affairs, and remarkable for an eminent respectability which became the President's brother-in-law. Mr. Gould enjoyed a slight acquaintance with Mr. Corbin, and he proceeded to improve it. He assumed, and he even asserts that he really felt a respect for Mr. Corbin's shrewdness and sagacity. It is amusing to observe that Mr. Corbin claims to have first impressed the famous crop theory on Mr. Gould's mind; while Mr. Gould testifies that he himself indoctrinated Mr. Corbin with this idea, which became a sort of monomania with the President's brother-in-law, who soon began to preach it to the President himself. On the 15th of June, 1869, the President came to New York, and was there the guest of Mr. Corbin, who urged Mr. Gould to call and pay his respects to the Chief Magistrate. Mr. Gould had probably aimed at precisely this result. He called; and the President of the United States not only listened

to the president of Erie, but accepted an invitation to Mr. Fisk's theatre, sat in Mr. Fisk's private box, and the next evening became the guest of these two gentlemen on their magnificent Newport steamer, while Mr. Fisk, arrayed, as the newspapers reported, "in a blue uniform, with a broad gilt cap-band, three silver stars on his coat-sleeve, lavender gloves, and a diamond breast-pin as large as a cherry, stood at the gangway surrounded by his aids bestarred and bestriped like himself," and welcomed his distinguished friend.

It had been already arranged that the President should on this occasion be sounded in regard to his financial policy; and when the selected guests—among whom were Mr. Gould, Mr. Fisk, and Mr. Cyrus Field, whose brother was legal adviser of the Erie railway, and others—sat down at nine o'clock to supper, the conversation was directed to the subject of finance. "Some one," says Mr. Gould, "asked the President what his view was." The "some one" in question was of course Mr. Fisk, who alone had the impudence to put such an inquiry. The President bluntly replied, that there was a certain amount of fictitiousness about the prosperity of the country, and that the bubble might as well be tapped in one way as another. The remark was fatal to Mr. Gould's plans, and he felt it, in his own words, as a wet blanket.

Meanwhile the post of assistant-treasurer at New York had become vacant, and it was a matter of interest to Mr. Gould that some person friendly to himself should occupy this position, which, in its relations to the public, is second in importance only to the secretaryship of the Treasury itself. Mr. Gould consulted Mr. Corbin, and Mr. Corbin suggested the name of General Butterfield—a former officer in the volunteer army, not altogether favourably known in the service, and charged, as chief of staff to General Hooker, with having used official information in order to speculate in stocks. The appointment was not a wise one; nor does it appear in evidence by what means Mr. Corbin succeeded in bringing it about. There is a suggestion that he used Mr. A. T. Stewart, the wealthy importer, as his instrument for the purpose; but whatever the influence may have been, Mr. Corbin appears to have set it in action, and General Butterfield entered upon his duties towards the 1st of July.

The elaborate preparations thus made, show that some large scheme was never absent from Mr. Gould's mind, although between the months of May and August he made no attempt to act upon the markets. But between the 20th of August and the 1st September, in company with Messrs. Woodward and Kimber, two large speculators, he made what is known as a pool, or combination, to raise the premium on gold, and some ten or fifteen millions were

bought, but with very little effect on the price. The tendency of the market was downwards, and it was not easily counteracted. Perhaps under ordinary circumstances he might have now abandoned his project; but an incident suddenly occurred which seems to have drawn him headlong into the boldest operations.

Whether the appointment of General Butterfield had any share in strengthening Mr. Gould's faith in Mr. Corbin's secret powers does not appear in evidence, though it may readily be assumed as probable. At all events, an event now took place which would have seemed to justify an unlimited faith in Mr. Corbin, as well as the implicit belief of an Erie treasurer in the innate depravity of human nature. The unsuspicious President again passed through New York, and came to breakfast at Mr. Corbin's house on the 2nd of September. He saw no one but Mr. Corbin while there; and the same evening at ten o'clock departed for Saratoga. Mr. Gould declares, however, that he was told by Mr. Corbin that the President, in discussing the financial situation, had shown himself a convert to the Erie theory about marketing the crops, and had "stopped in the middle of a conversation in which he had expressed his views, and written a letter" to Secretary Boutwell. This letter is not produced; but Secretary Boutwell testifies as follows in regard to it:—

> "I think on the evening of the 4th of September I received a letter from the President dated at New York, as I recollect it; I am not sure where it is dated. I have not seen the letter since the night I received it. I think it is now in my residence in Groton. In that letter he expressed an opinion that it was undesirable to force down the price of gold. He spoke of the importance to the west of being able to move their crops. His idea was that if gold should fall, the west would suffer, and the movement of the crops would be retarded. The impression made on my mind by the letter was that he had rather a strong opinion to that effect. . . . Upon the receipt of the President's letter on the evening of the 4th of September, I telegraphed to Judge Richardson [Assistant Secretary at Washington] this despatch: 'Send no order to Butterfield as to sales of gold until you hear from me.'"

Mr. Gould had therefore succeeded in reversing the policy of the National Government; but this was not all. He knew what the Government would do before any officer of the Government knew it. Mr. Gould was at Corbin's house on the 2nd of September; and although the evidence of both these gentlemen is very confused on this point, the inference is inevitable that Gould saw Corbin privately, unknown to the President, within an hour or two after this letter to Mr. Boutwell was written; perhaps he read the letter itself. Then followed a transaction worthy of the French stage. Mr. Corbin's evidence tells his own account of it:

"On the 2nd of September (referring to memoranda) Mr. Gould offered to let me have some of the gold he then possessed. . . He spoke to me as he had repeatedly done before, about taking a certain amount of gold owned by him. I finally told Mr. Gould that for the sake of a lady, my wife, I would accept of $500,000 of gold for her benefit, as I shared his confidence that gold would rise. . . . He afterwards insisted that I should take a million more, and I did so on the same conditions for my wife. He then sent me this paper."

The paper in question is as follows:—

"Smith, Gould, Martin & Co., Bankers,
11, Broad Street, New York, September 2, 1869.

"Mr.——

"Dear Sir: we have brought for your account and risk—
500,000, gold, 132, R.
1,000,000, gold, 133⅝, R.
which we will carry on demand with the right to use.
"SMITH, GOULD, MARTIN & CO."

This memorandum meant that for every rise of one per cent. in the price of gold Mr. Corbin was to receive 3000*l.*, and his name nowhere to appear. Gould must have seen Corbin in the morning while the President was in the house; he must have learned from Corbin what the President had written; he must have made this bargain, and then going directly to the city, he must have in one breath ordered this memorandum to be made out and large quantities of gold to be purchased, before the President had allowed the letter to leave Mr. Corbin's house.

No time was lost. On this same afternoon, Mr. Gould's brokers bought large amounts in gold. One testifies to buying $1,315,000 at 134⅛. On the 3rd, the premium was forced up to 36; on the 4th, when Mr. Boutwell received his letter, it had risen to 37. Here, however, Mr. Gould seems to have met a check, and he describes his own position in nervous Americanisms as follows:—

"I did not want to buy so much gold. In the spring I put gold up from 32 to 38 and 40, with only about seven millions. But all these fellows went in and sold short, so that in order to keep it up I had to buy, or else to back down and show the white feather. They would sell it to you all the time. I never intended to buy more than four or five millions of gold, but these fellows kept purchasing it on, and I made up my mind that I would put it up to 40 at one time. . . . We went into it as a commercial transaction, and did not intend to buy such an amount of gold. I was forced into it by the bears selling out. They were bound to put it down. I got into the contest. All these other fellows deserted me like rats from a ship. Kimber sold out and got short. . . . He sold out at 37. He got short of it, and went up; [or in English, he failed.]"

It was unfortunate that the bears would not consent to lie still and be flayed, but this was unquestionably the fact. They had the great operators for once at a disadvantage, and they were bent on revenge. Mr. Gould's position was very hazardous. When Mr. Kimber sold out at 37, which was probably on the 7th of September, the market broke; and on the 8th the price fell back to 35. Nor was this all. At the same moment, when the "pool" was ended by Mr. Kimber's desertion, Mr. Corbin, with his eminent shrewdness and respectability, told Mr. Gould "that gold had gone up to 37," and that he "should like to have this matter realized," which was equivalent to saying that he wished to be paid something on account. This was on the 6th; and Gould was obliged this same day to bring him a check for 5000*l.* drawn to the order of Jay Gould, and endorsed in blank by him with a touching regard for Mr. Corbin's modest desire not to have his name appear. There are few financiers in the world who will not agree that this transaction does great credit to Mr. Corbin's sagacity. It indicates at least that he was acquainted with the men he dealt with. Undoubtedly it placed Mr. Gould in a difficult position; but as Mr. Gould already held some fifteen millions of gold and needed Mr. Corbin's support, he preferred to pay 5,000*l.* outright rather than allow Corbin to throw his gold on the market. Yet the fabric of Gould's web had now been so seriously injured that, for a whole week, from the 8th to the 15th of September, he was at a loss what to do, unable to advance and equally unable to retreat without very severe losses. He sat at his desk in the opera house, silent as usual, and tearing little slips of paper which he threw on the floor in his abstraction, while he revolved new combinations in his mind.

Down to this moment Mr. James Fisk, jun., has not appeared in the affair. Gould had not taken him into his confidence; and it was not until after the 10th of September that Gould appears to have decided that there was nothing else to be done. Fisk was not a safe ally in so delicate an affair, but apparently there was no choice. Gould approached him; and, as usual, his touch was like magic. Mr. Fisk's evidence begins here, and may be believed when very strongly corroborated:—

"Gold having settled down to 35 and I not having cared to touch it, he was a little sensitive on the subject, feeling as if he would rather take his losses without saying anything about it. . . . One day he said to me: 'Don't you think gold has got to the bottom?' I replied that I did not see the profit in buying gold unless you have got into a position where you can command the market. He then said he had bought quite a large amount of gold, and I judged from his conversation that he wanted me to go into the movement and help strengthen the market. Upon that I went into the market and bought. I

should say that was about the 15th or 16th of September. I bought at that time about seven or eight millions, I think."

The market responded slowly to these enormous purchases; and on the 16th, the clique was still struggling to recover its lost ground.

Meanwhile Mr. Gould had placed another million-and a-half of gold to the account of General Butterfield, and notified him of the purchase. So Mr. Gould swears; and in spite of General Butterfield's denial, Wall Street is inclined to believe Mr. Gould. The date of this purchase is not fixed. Through Mr. Corbin a notice was also sent by Gould about the middle of September to the President's private Secretary, General Porter, informing him that half a million was placed to his credit. General Porter instantly wrote to repudiate the purchase, but it does not appear that Butterfield took any notice of Gould's transaction on his account. On the 10th of September the President had again come to New York, where he remained his brother-in-law's guest till the 13th; and during this visit Mr. Gould appears again to have seen him, although Mr. Corbin avers that on this occasion the President intimated his wish to the servant that this should be the last time Mr. Gould obtained admission. "Gould was always trying to get something out of him," he said; and if he had known how much Mr. Gould had succeeded in getting out of him, he would have admired the man's genius, even while shutting the door in his face. On the morning of the 13th the President set out on a journey to the little town of Washington, situated among the mountains of Western Pennsylvania, where he was to remain a few days. Mr. Gould, who now consulted Mr. Corbin regularly every morning and evening, was still extremely nervous in regard to the President's policy; and as the crisis approached, this nervousness led him into the fatal blunder of doing too much. The bribe offered to Porter was a grave mistake, but a greater mistake yet was made by pressing Mr. Corbin's influence too far. He induced Mr. Corbin to write an official article for the New York press on the financial policy of the Government, an article afterwards inserted in the *New York Times* through the kind offices of Mr. James McHenry, and he also persuaded or encouraged Mr. Corbin to write a letter directly to the President himself. This letter, written on the 17th under the influence of Gould's anxiety, was instantly sent away by a special messenger of Fisk's to reach the President before he returned to the capital. The messenger carried also a letter of introduction to General Porter, the private secretary, in order to secure the personal delivery of this important despatch.

We have now come to the week which was to witness the

explosion of all this elaborately constructed mine. On Monday the 20th, gold again rose. Throughout Tuesday and Wednesday Fisk continued to purchase without limit, and forced the price up to 40. At this time Gould's firm of Smith, Gould, and Martin, through which the operation was conducted, had purchased some $50,000,000; and yet the bears went on selling, although they could only continue the contest by borrowing Gould's own gold. Gould, on the other hand, could no longer sell and clear himself, for the very reason that the sale of $50,000,000 would have broken the market to nothing. The struggle had become intense. The whole country was looking on with astonishment at the battle between the bulls and the bears. All business was deranged, and all values unsettled. There were indications of a panic in the stock-market; and the bears in their emergency were vehemently pressing the Government to intervene. Gould now wrote to Mr. Boutwell a letter so inconceivably impudent that it indicates desperation and entire loss of his ordinary coolness. He began,—

"Sir: There is a panic in Wall Street, engineered by a bear combination. They have withdrawn currency to such an extent that it is impossible to do ordinary business. The Erie Company requires eight hundred thousand dollars to disburse. . . . Much of it in Ohio where an exciting political contest is going on, and where we have about ten thousand employed, and the trouble is charged on the administration. . . . Cannot you, consistently, increase your line of currency?"

From a friend such a letter would have been an outrage; but from a member of the Tammany ring, the principal object of detestation to the Government, such a threat or bribe—whichever it may be called—was incredible. Mr. Gould was, in fact, at his wits' end. He dreaded a panic, and he felt that it could no longer be avoided.

The scene now shifts for a moment to the distant town of Washington, among the hills of western Pennsylvania. On the morning of the 19th of September, President Grant and his private secretary, General Porter, were playing croquet on the grass, when Fisk's messenger, after twenty-four hours of travel by rail and carriage, arrived at the house, and sent in to ask for General Porter. When the President's game was ended, General Porter came, received his own letter from Corbin, and called the President, who entered the room and took his brother-in-law's despatch. He then left the room, and after some ten or fifteen minutes' absence returned. The messenger, tired of waiting, then asked, "Is it all right?" "All right," replied the President; and the messenger hastened to the nearest telegraph station, and sent word to Fisk, "Delivered; all right."

The messenger was, however, altogether mistaken. Not only was all not right, but all was going hopelessly wrong. The President, it appears, had at the outset supposed the man to be an ordinary post-office agent, and the letter an ordinary letter which had arrived through the post-office. Nor was it until Porter asked some curious question as to the man, that the President learned of his having been sent by Corbin merely to carry this apparently unimportant letter of advice. The President's suspicions were at once excited; and the same evening, at his request, Mrs. Grant wrote a hurried note to Mrs. Corbin, her sister, telling her how greatly the President was distressed at the rumour that Mr. Corbin was speculating in Wall Street, and how much he hoped that Mr. Corbin would "instantly disconnect himself with anything of that sort."

This letter, subsequently destroyed or said to have been destroyed by Mrs. Corbin, arrived in New York on the morning of Wednesday the 22nd, the same day on which Gould and his enemies the bears were making their simultaneous appeals to Secretary Boutwell. Mrs. Corbin was greatly excited and distressed by her sister's language. She at once carried the letter to her husband, and insisted that he should instantly abandon his interest in the gold speculation. Mr. Corbin, although he considered the scruples of his wife and her family to be highly absurd, assented to her wish; and when Mr. Gould came that evening as usual, with $50,000,000 of gold on his hands, and extreme anxiety on his mind, Corbin read to him two letters; the first, written by Mrs. Grant to Mrs. Corbin; the second, written by Mr. Corbin to President Grant, assuring him that he had not a dollar of interest in gold. The assurance of this second letter was, at any sacrifice, to be made good.

Mr. Corbin proposed that Mr. Gould should give him a check for 20,000*l.*, and take his $1,500,000 off his hands. A proposition more calmly impudent than this can scarcely be imagined. Gould had already paid Corbin 5000*l.*, and Corbin asked for 20,000*l.* more, at the very moment when it was clear that the 5,000*l.* he had received had been given him under a misunderstanding of his services. He even had the impudence to represent himself as doing Gould a favour by letting him have a million and a half more gold at the highest market price, at a time when Gould had fifty millions which it was clear he must sell or be ruined. What Gould might, under ordinary circumstances, have replied, may be imagined; but at this moment he could say nothing. Corbin had but to show this note to a single broker in Wall Street, and the whole fabric of Gould's speculation would have fallen to pieces. Gould asked for time and went away. He consulted no one. He gave Fisk no hint of

what had happened. The next morning he returned to Corbin, and made him the following offer :—

"'Mr Corbin, I cannot give you anything if you will go out. If you will remain in, and take the chances of the market, I will give you my check [for £20,000].' 'And then,' says Mr. Corbin, 'I did what I think it would have troubled almost any other business man to consent to do—refuse one hundred thousand dollars on a rising market. If I had not been an old man married to a middle-aged woman, I should have done it (of course with her consent) just as sure as the offer was made. I said, 'Mr. Gould, my wife says 'No! Ulysses thinks it wrong, and that it ought to end.' So I gave it up. . . . He looked at me with an air of severe distrust, as if he was afraid of treachery in the camp. He remarked, 'Mr. Corbin, I am undone if that letter gets out.' . . . He stood there for a little while looking very thoughtful, exceedingly thoughtful. He then left and went into Wall Street . . . and my impression is that he it was, and not the Government, that broke that market.'"

It was the morning of Thursday the 3rd, Gould and Fisk went to Broad Street together, but as usual Gould was silent and secret, while Fisk was noisy and communicative. There was now a complete separation in their movements. Gould acted entirely through his own firm of Smith, Gould, and Martin, while Fisk operated principally through his old partner, Belden. One of Smith's principal brokers testifies—

"'Fisk never could do business with Smith, Gould, & Martin very comfortably. They would not do business for him. It was a very uncertain thing of course where Fisk might be. He is an erratic sort of genius. I don't think anybody would want to follow him very long. I am satisfied that Smith, Gould, & Martin controlled their own gold and were ready to do as they pleased with it without consulting Fisk. I do not think there was any general agreement. . . None of us who knew him, cared to do business with him. I would not have taken an order from him nor had anything to do with him.' Belden was considered a very low fellow. 'I never had anything to do with him or his party,' said one broker employed by Gould. 'They were men I had a perfect detestation of; they were no company for me. I should not have spoken to them at all under any ordinary circumstances.' Another says, 'Belden is a man in whom I never had any confidence in any way. For months before that, I would not have taken him for a gold transaction.'"

And yet Belden bought millions upon millions of gold. He himself says he had bought twenty millions by this Thursday evening, and this without capital or credit except that of his brokers. Meanwhile Gould, on reaching the city, had at once given secret orders to sell. From the moment he left Corbin, he had but one idea, which was to get rid of his gold as quietly as possible. "I purchased merely enough to make believe I was a

bull," says Gould. This double process continued all that afternoon. Fisk's wild purchases carried the price up to 144, and the panic in the street became more and more serious as the bears realized the extremity of their danger. No one can tell how much gold which did not exist—they had contracted to deliver or pay the difference in price. One of the clique brokers swears that on this Thursday evening the street had sold the clique one hundred and eighteen millions of gold, and every rise of one per cent. on this sum implied a loss of more than 200,000*l.* to the bears. Naturally the terror was extreme, for half Broad Street and thousands of speculators would have been ruined if compelled to settle gold at 150 which they had sold at 140. It need scarcely be said that by this time nothing more was heard in regard to philanthropic theories of benefit to the Western farmer.

Mr. Gould's feelings can easily be imagined. He knew that Fisk's reckless management would bring the Government upon his shoulders, and he knew that unless he could sell his gold before the order came from Washington, he would be a ruined man. He knew, too, that Fisk's contracts must inevitably be repudiated. This Thursday evening he sat at his desk in the Erie offices at the Opera House, while Fisk and Fisk's brokers chattered about him.

"I was transacting my railway business. I had my own views about the market, and my own fish to fry. I was all alone, so to speak, in what I did, and I did not let any of those people know exactly how I stood. I got no ideas from anything that was said there. I had been selling gold from 35 up all the time, and I did not know till the next morning that there would probably come an order, about twelve o'clock, to sell gold."

He had not told Fisk a word in regard to Corbin's retreat, nor his own orders to sell.

When the next day came, Gould and Fisk went together to Broad Street, and took possession of the private back office of a principal broker, "without asking the privilege of doing so," as the broker observes in his evidence. The first news brought to Gould was a disaster. The Government had sent three men from Washington to examine the bank which Gould owned, and the bank sent word to Mr. Gould that it feared to certify for him as usual, and was itself in danger of a panic, caused by the presence of officers, which created distrust of the bank. It barely managed to save itself. Gould took the information silently, and his firm redoubled sales of gold. His partner, Smith, gave the orders to one broker after another—"Sell ten millions!" "The order was given as quick as a flash, and away he went," says one of these men. "I sold only eight millions." "Sell, sell, sell! do nothing but sell!—only don't sell to Fisk's brokers," were the orders

which Smith himself acknowledges. In the gold room Fisk's brokers were shouting their rising bids, and the packed crowd grew frantic with terror and rage as each successive rise showed their increasing losses. The wide streets outside were thronged with excited people; the telegraph offices were overwhelmed with messages ordering sales or purchases of gold or stocks; and the whole nation was watching eagerly to see what the result of this convulsion was to be. All trade was stopped, and even the President felt that it was time to raise his hand. No one who has not seen the New York gold-room can understand the spectacle it presented; now a perfect pandemonium; now silent as the grave. Fisk, in his dark back office across the street, with his coat off, swaggered up and down, "a big cane in his hand," and called himself the Napoleon of Wall Street. He really believed that he directed the movement, and while the street outside imagined that he and Gould were one family, and that his purchases were made for the clique, Gould was silently flinging away his gold at any price he could get for it.

Whether Fisk really expected to carry out his contract and force the bears to settle, or not, is doubtful; but the evidence seems to show that he was in earnest, and felt sure of success. His orders were unlimited. "Put it up to 150," was one which he sent to the gold-room. Gold rose to 150. At length the bid was made—"160 for any part of five millions," and no one any longer dared take it. "161 for five millions"—"162 for five millions." No answer was made, and the offer was repeated—"162 for any part of five millions." A voice replied, "Sold one million at 62." The bubble suddenly burst, and within fifteen minutes, amid an excitement without parallel even in the wildest excitements of the war, the clique brokers were literally swept away, and left struggling by themselves, bidding still 160 for gold in millions which no one would any longer take their word for; while the premium sank rapidly to 135. A moment later the telegraph brought from Washington the Government order to sell, and the result was no longer possible to dispute. Mr. Fisk had gone too far, while Mr. Gould had secretly weakened the ground under his feet.

Gould, however, was saved. His fifty millions were sold; and although no one yet knows what his gains or losses may have been, his firm was now able to meet its contracts and protect its brokers. Fisk was in a very different situation. So soon as it became evident that his brokers would be unable to carry out their contracts, every one who had sold gold to them turned in wrath to Fisk's office. Fortunately for him it was protected by armed men whom he had brought with him from his castle of Erie; but nevertheless the excitement was so great that both

Mr. Fisk and Mr. Gould thought it best to retire as rapidly as possible by a back entrance leading into another street, and to seek the protection of the Opera House. There nothing but an army could disturb them; no civil mandate could be served without their permission within these walls, and few men would care to face Fisk's ruffians in order to force an entrance.

The subsequent winding-up of this famous conspiracy may be stated in few words. But no account could possibly be complete which failed to reproduce in full the story of Mr. Fisk's last interview with Mr. Corbin, as told by Fisk himself.

"I went down to the neighbourhood of Wall Street, Friday morning, and the history of that morning you know. When I got back to our office, you can imagine I was in no enviable state of mind, and the moment I got up street that afternoon I started right round to old Corbin's, to rake him out. I went into the room, and sent word that Mr. Fisk wanted to see him in the dining-room. I was too mad to say anything civil, and when he came into the room, said I, 'You damned old scoundrel, do you know what you have done here, you and your people?' He began to wring his hands, and, 'Oh!' he says, 'this is a horrible position. Are you ruined?' I said I didn't know whether I was or not; and I asked him again if he knew what had happened? He had been crying, and said he had just heard; that he had been sure everything was all right; but that something had occurred entirely different from what he had anticipated. Said I, 'that don't amount to anything; we know that gold ought not to be at 31, and that it would not be but for such performances as you have had this last week; you know, damned well, it would not if you had not failed.' I knew that somebody had run a saw right into us, and said I, 'this whole damned thing has turned out just as I told you it would.' I considered the whole party a pack of cowards, and I expected that when we came to clear our hands they would sock it right into us. I said to him, 'I don't know whether you have lied or not, and I don't know what ought to be done with you.' He was on the other side of the table, weeping and wailing, and I was gnashing my teeth. 'Now,' he says, 'you must quiet yourself.' I told him I didn't want to be quiet. I had no desire to ever be quiet again, and probably never should be quiet again. He says, 'But, my dear sir, you will lose your reason.' Says I, 'Speyers [a broker employed by him] has already lost his reason; reason has gone out of everybody but me.' I continued, 'Now what are you going to do? You have got us into this thing, and what are you going to do to get out of it?' He says, 'I don't know. I will go and get my wife.' I said, 'Get her down here!' The soft talk was all over. He went upstairs and they returned, tottling into the room, looking older than Stephen Hopkins. His wife and he both looked like death. He was tottling just like that. [Illustrated by a trembling movement of his body.] I have never seen him from that day to this."

This is sworn evidence before a committee of Congress; and

its humour is perhaps the more conspicuous, because there is every reason to believe that there is not a word of truth in the story from beginning to end. No such interview ever occurred, except in the unconfined apartments of Mr. Fisk's imagination. His own previous statements make it certain that he was not at Corbin's house at all that day, and that Corbin did come to the Erie offices that evening, and again the next morning. Corbin himself denies the truth of the account without limitation; and adds, that when he entered the Erie offices the next morning, Fisk was there. "I asked him how Mr. Gould felt after the great calamity of the day before?" He remarked, "Oh, he has no courage at all. He has sunk right down. There is nothing left of him but a heap of clothes and a pair of eyes." The internal evidence of truth in this anecdote would support Mr. Corbin against the world.

In regard to Mr. Gould, Fisk's graphic description was probably again inaccurate. Undoubtedly the noise and scandal of the moment were extremely unpleasant to this silent and impenetrable intriguer. The city was in a ferment, and the whole country pointing at him with wrath. The machinery of the gold exchange had broken down, and he alone could extricate the business community from the pressing danger of a general panic. He had saved himself, it is true; but in a manner which could not have been to his taste. Yet his course from this point must have been at most self-evident to his mind, and there is no reason to suppose that he hesitated.

His own contracts were all fulfilled. Fisk's contracts, all except one, in respect to which the broker was able to compel a settlement, were repudiated. Gould probably suggested to Fisk that it was better to let Belden fail, and to settle a handsome fortune on him, than to sacrifice something more than 1,000,000*l.* in sustaining him. Fisk therefore threw Belden over, and swore that he had acted only under Belden's order; in support of which statement he produced a paper to the following effect:—

"September 24.

"DEAR SIR,—I hereby authorize you to order the purchase and sale of gold on my account during this day to the extent you may deem advisable, and to report the same to me as early as possible. It is to be understood that the profits of such order are to belong entirely to me, and I will, of course, bear any losses resulting.

"Yours, "WILLIAM BELDEN.

"James Fisk, Jun."

This document was not produced in the original, and certainly never existed. Mr. Fisk, as usual, lied. Belden himself could not be induced to acknowledge the order; and no one would have believed him if he had done so. Meanwhile the matter is

before the national courts, and Fisk may probably be held to his contracts; but it will be far more difficult to execute judgment upon him, or to discover his assets.

One of the first acts of the Erie gentlemen after the crisis, was to summons their lawyers, and set in action their judicial powers. The object was to prevent the panic-stricken brokers from using legal process to force settlements, and so render the entanglement inextricable. Messrs. Field and Shearman came, and instantly prepared a considerable number of injunctions, which were sent to their judges, signed at once, and immediately served. Gould then was able to dictate the terms of settlement; and after a week of complete paralysis, Broad Street began at last to show signs of returning life. As a legal curiosity, one of these documents, issued some time after the crisis, may be reproduced, in order to show the powers wielded by the Erie managers:—

"Supreme Court.

H. N. Smith, Jay Gould, H. H. Martin, and J. B. Bach, Plaintiffs, *against* John Bonner and Arthur L. Lewell, Defendants. } Injunction by order.

"It appearing satisfactorily to me by the complaint duly verified by the plaintiffs that sufficient grounds for an order of injunction exist, I do hereby order and enjoin . . . . That the defendants, John Bonner and Arthur L. Lewell, their agents, attorneys, and servants, refrain from pressing their pretended claims against the plaintiffs, or either of them, before the Arbitration Committee of the New York Stock Exchange, or from taking any proceedings thereon, or in relation thereto, except in this action.

"George G. Barnard, J.L.C.

"New York, December 29, 1869."

Mr. Bonner had practically been robbed with violence by Mr. Gould, and instead of his being able to bring the robber into court as the criminal, the robber brought him into court as criminal, and the judge forbade him to appear in any other character. Of all Mr. Field's distinguished legal reforms and philanthropic projects, this injunction is beyond a doubt the most brilliant and the most successful.

The fate of the conspirators was not severe. Mr. Corbin went to Washington, where he was snubbed by the President, and at once disappeared from public view, only coming to light again before the Congressional Committee. General Butterfield, whose share in the transaction is least understood, was permitted to resign his office without an investigation. Speculation for the next six months was at an end. Every person involved in the affair seemed to have lost money, and dozens of brokers were

swept from the street. But Mr. Jay Gould and Mr. James Fisk, jun., continued to reign over Erie, and no one can say that their power or their credit was sensibly diminished by a shock which for the time prostrated all the interests of the country.

Nevertheless it is safe to predict that sooner or later the last traces of the disturbing influence of war and paper money will disappear in America, as they have sooner or later disappeared in every other country which has passed through the same evils. The result of this convulsion itself has been in the main good. It indicates the approaching end of a troubled time. Messrs. Gould and Fisk will at last be obliged to yield to the force of moral and economical laws. The Erie Railway will be rescued, and its history will perhaps rival that of the great speculative manias of the last century. The United States will restore a sound basis to its currency, and will learn to deal with the political reforms it requires. Yet though the regular process of development may be depended upon, in its ordinary and established course, to purge American society of the worst agents of an exceptionally corrupt time, there is in the history of this Erie Corporation one matter in regard to which modern society everywhere is directly interested. For the first time since the creation of these enormous corporate bodies, one of them has shown its power for mischief, and has proved itself able to override and trample on law, custom, decency, and every restraint known to society, without scruple, and as yet without check. The belief is common in America that the day is at hand when corporations far greater than the Erie—swaying power such as has never in the world's history been trusted in the hands of mere private citizens, controlled by single men like Vanderbilt, or by combinations of men like Fisk, Gould, and Lane, after having created a system of quiet but irresistible corruption—will ultimately succeed in directing government itself. Under the American form of society, there is now no authority capable of effective resistance. The national government, in order to deal with the corporations, must assume powers refused to it by its fundamental law, and even then is always exposed to the chance of forming an absolute central government which sooner or later is likely to fall into the very hands it is struggling to escape, and thus destroy the limits of its power only in order to make corruption omnipotent. Nor is this danger confined to America alone. The corporation is in its nature a threat against the popular institutions which are spreading so rapidly over the whole world. Wherever there is a popular and limited government this difficulty will be found in its path, and unless some satisfactory solution of the problem can be reached, popular institutions may yet find their very existence endangered.

INDEPENDENT SECTION.

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

ART. X.—THE BALLOT.

AFTER the passing of the first Reform Bill, the ballot was an article in the faith of every progressive Liberal. It distinguished the men then generally known as Radicals from the Whigs. The latter looked upon the Reform Bill as a final measure, the crowning of the edifice of the English Constitution; while the former desired to carry its principles still further. A measure that would protect the poorer and more dependent voters, both from the bribery of the wealthy, and the intimidation of the powerful, seemed to them especially needful.

But the people of England at that time had had enough of Reform; and dreaded lest any change, however slight, might unsettle everything, and reopen the floodgates of revolution. In vain Mr. Grote urged upon the House of Commons that the ballot was no innovation on the Constitution, no advance towards democracy; that it would not in the slightest diminish the legitimate influence of property and rank; and that, even if it were admitted that the Reform Act was final, as to the distribution of the franchise, it could not be pretended that it was final as to topics, such as the best mode of taking votes, and the duration of Parliaments, which were entirely put aside in the consideration of that measure. Every proposal coming from the Radical benches was looked upon with suspicion and aversion; and none more so than that for the establishment of secret voting. So violent was the reaction against the Reformers, that within nine years of the passing of the Reform Act, the Tory leaders who had taken the most active part in opposing it—Sir Robert Peel, the Duke of Wellington, and Lord Lyndhurst—

were installed in office, supported by a majority of nearly 100 in the Reformed House of Commons. Mr. Grote was no longer in Parliament. The Liberals, so far from hoping for fresh victories, almost feared they might lose some of the ground gained in recent years. From this apprehension they were soon freed by the enlightened policy of Sir Robert Peel's administration, which culminated in the repeal of the Corn Laws. This triumph of Liberal principles was immediately followed by the return of the Liberal party to power; and the general election gave them a large majority in the Lower House. Propositions for Reform, long unheard within the walls of St. Stephen, were again brought forward, and amongst them the ballot. The violent revolution of 1848, followed by a still more violent reaction, once more checked all desire for constitutional changes in this country. The supporters of the ballot were for a season almost confined to the members of the largest boroughs. With these constituencies it continued to be a sort of shibboleth, necessary to be uttered by all who sought their suffrages; but like most imposed shibboleths, one in which the professors had little faith. The conduct of the measure in Parliament was at this time entrusted to the hands of the late Mr. H. Berkeley. This choice of a leader was not fortunate. His annual motion soon came to be looked upon as an annual nuisance, yet one which could be easily abated by a little playful badinage from that prince of political jesters—Lord Palmerston.

During this period also, the cause of the ballot received a blow from the hand of a former friend more damaging than the apathy of the public, or the injudicious advocacy of supporters. Mr. Mill, in his work on Representative Government, announced that he had seen reason to modify his previous opinion upon the ballot. In this he was followed by a large number of the younger members of that advanced school of politicians, who owe so much to the most original and profound of modern thinkers. The reasons assigned by Mr. Mill for this change demand, as indeed all that comes from his pen demands, the most serious attention of every sincere Liberal. Before we conclude, we shall consider his objections with all fairness and candour, and examine what weight ought to be attached to them. Here we have only to notice the injury inflicted upon the cause by the defection of so distinguished a supporter.

The death of Lord Palmerston brought to a close that system of masterly inactivity which had so long presided over our domestic affairs. The resolute earnestness of a great statesman hastened a political crisis. The second Reform Bill was passed in a manner that reflected little credit on the country. The Liberals were robbed of the honour of passing a measure that

was fairly their own, while the Tories incurred the disgrace of carrying, for the sake of remaining a few months in office, the measure of their opponents, which in their hearts they detested. Then came the general election of the autumn of 1868. The clever but unscrupulous policy of Mr. Disraeli had placed the Conservative party in office, and enabled him to pass a Reform Bill. By claiming credit for having bestowed household suffrage upon the country, he hoped for support from the new electors. The leaders of the Tory party, however, did not consider it prudent to rely too much on these men's gratitude. They were aware that the new electoral body was, as a class, more susceptible to influence than the old. The landed proprietors of that party—and nearly all do belong to that party—were stirred up to exert to the uttermost all the influence they possessed in the counties and small boroughs. They found everywhere zealous and active allies in the clergymen of the Established Church, who saw, in the disestablishment of the sister Church in Ireland, a presage of their own fate. "The parson of the parish and the squire," as Mr. Justice Blackburn said of East Norfolk, "acted in each particular parish as a sort of committee" for the Conservative candidates. These committees, though weak in the number of their members, did not prove destitute either of zeal or of energy in their proceedings. Everywhere landlords through their agents *requested* the votes of their tenants. These were requests not more capable of being resisted than the prayer for a few pieces of silver which the highwayman preferred to Gil Blas,—"Tenant en main une escopette, avec laquelle il me couchait en joue." Customers brought their influence to bear most unfairly on their tradesmen. Employers of labour often, in the cruellest manner, put the screw, as it was termed, on their workmen. Lavish expenditure prevailed universally. Bribery and treating, scenes of drunken debauchery and of tumultuous rioting committed by hired mobs, were only too common. We do not say that these practices were confined to one party, far from it; but we do believe that the great bulk of the voters thus unduly influenced would have voted for the Liberal candidates, if they had been left free to exercise their electoral rights in accordance with their convictions.

The combined influence of the aristocracy and the clergy were, however, powerless before the stern resolve of the country that justice should be done to Ireland—at least in respect to the Church Establishment. The general election resulted in a Liberal majority of 120, and Mr. Disraeli resigned without waiting for the meeting of Parliament. Yet no sooner were the members of the majority met together than it was found that, next to the disestablishment of the Irish Church, there was no

measure so earnestly and so universally demanded by their supporters throughout the country as the ballot. The constituencies had learnt in the bitter school of experience how right those were who had inculcated upon them the necessity of some measure for securing to the voter freedom of voting. It was impossible for their representatives to remain deaf to their desires. Old Whigs of the school of Palmerston, and young Radicals of the school of Mill, hastened to declare themselves converts to its necessity. Some Conservatives even had engaged to support it; and it was understood that the party generally was not disposed to offer it a very strenuous opposition.

When the new Ministry were installed in office, and Parliament reassembled for the despatch of business in February, 1869, the House of Commons were invited in the Speech from the Throne to consider whether it might be possible to provide any further guarantees for the tranquillity, purity, and freedom both of municipal and parliamentary elections. In pursuance of this recommendation a select committee of the House of Commons, consisting of twenty-three members, was appointed, on the motion of Mr. Bruce, the Home Secretary, to inquire into the subject. The Marquis of Hartington (who was appointed chairman), Messrs. Bright, Villiers, Fawcett, and Sir G. Grey, from the Liberal side, and Messrs. G. Hardy and Hunt, from the Conservative, served upon it. The committee having sat on twenty-seven days, and examined nearly eighty witnesses, agreed to report the evidence taken before them to the House, and recommended that the committee should be reappointed in the ensuing session, for the purpose only of considering their report with a view to early legislation. A draft report prepared by the chairman is annexed, which either in its present or in a slightly amended shape is almost certain to be adopted; and in this report the substitution of secret for open voting, that is to say, the ballot, is distinctly recommended.

The evidence given before the committee naturally divides itself under two heads: first, that which relates to the evils of the system of open voting, as practised in the United Kingdom, the only country in the world, we believe, in which that system prevails; and secondly, that which explains the various modes of secret voting in use in foreign countries, and in many of our own colonies.

There is, unhappily, no necessity for producing evidence to prove that bribery and treating prevail to a very large extent at our parliamentary elections; the fact is notorious, and admitted by all. It is a blot upon the fair fame of England, the mother of Parliaments; a reproach that ought not to be endured by a people whose boast it has been since the days of Milton, "to

teach the people how to live." No general election takes place without many members being unseated for bribery; though probably the worst cases usually escape (those in which both sides are equally guilty) through fear of disclosures that might lead to the disfranchisement of the borough. Wherever commissions of inquiry have been held in the locality, extensive and systematic bribery has been discovered. After such inquiries, St. Albans and Sudbury were disfranchised some years ago; subsequently Totness, Reigate, Lancaster, and Yarmouth shared the same fate. Beverley and Bridgewater, and a portion at least of the constituency of Norwich, have been proved before the recent commissions to have been as corrupt as any of the early delinquents.

The evidence as to bribery taken before the Hartington Committee refers chiefly to municipal elections, probably because it was deemed that enough was already known as to corruption existing at parliamentary elections; still the two are often closely connected. If a large number of voters are accustomed to receive payment to induce them to vote for a municipal councillor, it is only natural that they should require to be paid before they vote for a Member of Parliament; and if both elections turn upon politics, it is inevitable that payment for the one should influence the other.

Mr. Barber, the Mayor of Nottingham, declared that one-third of the electors of that town required money—that corruption was increasing—that even the wives of voters would visit their husbands with their displeasure if they returned without having got something for their votes. Mr. Bradshaw, a town councillor of the same town, thought the proportion of corrupt voters was much larger than that stated by the mayor. Mr. Darvill, the town clerk of Windsor, affirmed that it was notorious that a considerable portion of the poorer voters would not vote unless they were paid their day's wages, and that the payment often turned their vote; that a candidate with a view to parliamentary elections had been in the habit of distributing groceries, to the amount of twenty or thirty shillings a year, to as many as two hundred persons in that borough. Mr. Addyman, an alderman of Leeds, stated that in the municipal elections of that borough the existence of bribery and treating was notorious; they were practised openly, and existed to so great an extent as to have become a public scandal. It was, however, stated by another witness, Mr. Grant, that this only applied to the municipal elections, and was confined to three or four wards chiefly inhabited by the lower class of Irish and English voters; while some of the largest wards, inhabited exclusively by the working classes, were entirely free from anything like corrup-

tion. Witnesses from Liverpool also proved that the municipal elections in many of the wards of that borough were totally corrupt; and as those contests always turned upon politics, they greatly influenced the parliamentary elections. One of the witnesses, Mr. W. Johnson, declared that in his ward the voters, as they came to the polling-booth, were directed to an adjacent house, and were there shown into a room where the son of the candidate was seated at a table, with a bag of money before him; that he saw the voters coming out by hundreds with money in their hands; and that this was done in so open and shameless a manner, "that the arrangements were carried out by one of the assessors of the ward, who sat in the polling-booth along with the presiding alderman during the day." (1961.)* This would appear almost incredible; but it is confirmed by the evidence of Mr. F. Johnson, a former councillor of Blackburn, who declared that ninety at least out of every one hundred voters at the municipal elections in that town "had very substantial reason for voting." He added—"The bribery is done quite openly by both parties. I have myself seen men paid for their votes in the booth in the presence of the presiding alderman." (3065.) The want of a special tribunal, invested with power to unseat members elected by means of bribery, is the main cause of the absolute impunity that attends corrupt practices in our municipal elections. But when we consider that the electoral body at both elections has always been nearly, and is now altogether identical—that the honour of a seat in Parliament is prized far more highly than a seat in the Town Council, and is consequently sought after by a much more wealthy class of candidates—there is ground for the apprehension that corruption prevails, even to a greater degree than is commonly supposed, at the parliamentary elections, though veiled through dread of election petitions and commissions with a view to disfranchisement.

Intimidation at the present time is perhaps a greater evil than bribery. At any rate, it is more incumbent upon the Legislature, if possible, to put a stop to it; and it is certainly far easier to protect a man from the intimidation of others than to preserve him from the influence of corrupt motives, that is to say, to protect him from himself.

The coercion of landlords over tenants, of customers over tradesmen, and of masters over workmen, unquestionably prevails to a very great extent, but not usually in a very gross or

* The numbers quoted in parentheses in this article refer to the Evidence taken by the Select Committee of the House of Commons, mentioned above, at page 440.

palpable form; it is, however, as efficacious in its results as if it did; the severity of its action is not mitigated by reason of its covert operation. We find traces of it in every direction. In Windsor, for instance, we are told by one witness, that a capitalist would purchase a large number of cottages, and then, without giving a single thought to the convictions of the tenants, reckon upon each cottage as a vote at his disposal. The same witness states that in that town workmen are frequently intimidated, and compelled by their masters to vote one way when they would wish to vote another way (494). In Liverpool also we are told, "if the screw can be brought to bear upon a working man through his employer, it is done." Some instances of extreme intimidation in that town are given in the evidence (1665, 2010, 2017). A witness from Staleybridge says, "As the elections are at present conducted there is a great deal of intimidation, and a great deal of coercion used; the overlookers and managers go round to the men under them and tell them how they must vote. If they vote contrary to the wishes of their masters they are discharged, and their families as well." This, the witness declares, is very universally practised on the one side (the Liberal), but not so much on the other. Similar complaints were made by Conservative witnesses from Ashton, against the millowners of that town. It was further added that the tradespeople there are supported, both by Conservatives and Liberals, exclusively according to their politics. On the other hand, the mayors of Ashton and Staleybridge were called before the Committee, and denied the existence of anything like general intimidation on the part of the employers of labour in those boroughs. On the contrary, they asserted that nearly all the public-houses in those towns were engaged by the Conservatives; that treating prevailed extensively on that side, and that a perfect reign of terror, directed against the Liberals by an Orange mob, lasted from August to the end of November. So contradicting on such subjects is the evidence of partisans. In fact no sooner were charges brought before the Committee against either party than witnesses came forward from the opposite side, asserting their own purity and charging similar malpractices upon their accusers; probably we shall not be far wrong in concluding that those mutual accuasations confirm each other as to the existence of corrupt practices, while their mutual denials of participation in them cancel each other.

We shall only refer to two more cases of intimidation in boroughs, those of Blackburn and Carlisle. The two Members for Blackburn were unseated by Mr. Justice Willes on the ground of intimidation exercised by millowners—in this instance Conservatives—upon their workmen. The facts of the case were

these. A very influential meeting of the Conservative party was held on the 12th of October, 1868; at this meeting a circular, afterwards known as the Screw Circular, was agreed upon and issued. By this was resolved, "That all millowners and their managers and overlookers, and all master tradesmen and others possessing influence, should be strongly urged to exert that influence, so as to secure in the municipal as well as in the parliamentary elections the success of the candidates who adhere to the Constitution in Church and State." Several of those who signed this circular were on the Committee of Messrs. Hornby and Fulden, the Conservative candidates, and were on this account held to be agents. The screw was not suffered to remain idle in the hands of managers and overlookers, anxious to stand well themselves with their employers. Previous to the municipal elections the fear of losing their situations was held out before the men, and on the day after those elections a very large number of the men were discharged on account of their votes on that occasion; workmen were in some instances expelled with personal violence from some of the mills by their fellow-workmen, "under circumstances," said Mr. Justice Willes, "in which it is highly improbable that they should have ventured upon such misconduct of their own heads, and in which the just inference is, that they were led astray by overlookers or others in a higher position." Employment was then very scarce; the men remaining at the mills where these discharges and expulsions had taken place were made to feel that they must either vote along with their masters or be prepared to lose their means of livelihood, at a time when it was almost impossible to get employment elsewhere. On these grounds Mr. Justice Willes declared the election void. It is, however, much more probable that this decision will render the employers of labour cautious as to the manner in which they discharge workmen, and the reasons they assign for so doing, than that it will put a check upon undue influence. We may judge how strong this influence is when a witness from Blackburn, who denies that there was intimidation on the side of the Liberal millowners (he is confirmed in this by Mr. Justice Willes) says, "The feeling there is general with respect to both parties that a man should vote pretty much as his employer votes."

This is curiously confirmed by what occurred at Carlisle. The Committee went very fully into the matter; there was not much evidence of actual intimidation, and this was as usual met by conflicting testimony. From the evidence, however, this fact stands out broadly—that of 154 voters employed by the North Western Railway Company, 136 gave plumpers for Mr. Hodgson, a director of the company, only 16 voted for Potter and Lawson,

the Liberal candidates, yet it was generally believed, from the papers taken in by the men at their mechanics' institute, and from other circumstances, that the great majority of them were Liberals in politics. Of the men employed by the North Eastern Railway at Carlisle, where a notice had been published that the men might vote as they liked, 27 voted for Potter and Lawson, and only 8 plumped for Hodgson. Upon the Maryport Railway, of which Sir W. Lawson is a director, though it was not alleged that he had even canvassed the men, 14 voted for him and only 4 for Hodgson. Of persons under the control of the corporation, who were charged with using influence on behalf of the Liberals, 48 voted for them, only 13 for Hodgson; while in the case of persons in the employ of Mr. Fergusson, the chairman of the Liberal part., above 100 are stated to have voted for the Liberals, and only 2 or 3 for the Conservative candidate. Nor is there any cause for wonder that the votes of workmen are thus generally at the disposal of their employers (in the absence at least of effective trades unions, in which case the men may come under influence of a different description). How easy a thing is it to discharge a workman because business is slack, because he is inefficient, because he has been guilty of some petty act of neglect. How easy is it to let it be generally understood that those who do not vote along with their employer get into his black books; and that those who do get into his black books, not only are apt to have an uncomfortable time of it so long as they do remain in his employ, but are pretty certain to find themselves in the discharged list on the first occasion that offers.

Similar to this, in its nature and effects, was the intimidation and undue influence exercised by landlords over their tenants in counties. We may gather what was the real amount of freedom possessed by the farmers generally from one circumstance,—that it was considered an act of unwonted liberality when a landlord intimated to his tenants that he did not desire to influence their votes. A candidate would hardly presume to canvass the farmers on a large estate without the permission of the proprietor; armed with a letter of recommendation from him almost as powerful as a congé d'élire from her Majesty addressed to the Dean and Chapter of a cathedral city, and accompanied by the agent, he might reckon confidently on the votes of every one of them. Mr. Latham, a magistrate of Cheshire, expressed his opinion that, "It was the evil of property that a man considers that he not only owns the property itself, but that he owns the souls of the tenants also." He further says that nine-tenths of the farmers in Cheshire are dissenters. It is well known how the sympathies of the dissenters went at the last

election; yet, the bulk of them in Cheshire were forced to vote for the Conservatives, though they had almost to a man signed a requisition to Mr. Warren, the Liberal candidate. Mr. Latham found that 400 men who were pledged to vote on the Liberal side voted on the Conservative side; and every one of these men was a tenant-farmer on a large estate. It is not too much to say that the farmers of England, liable as they are to be ejected at six months' notice from the farms in which they may have sunk their whole capital, possess less real freedom of voting than the mechanics and operatives in towns; who, if trade is brisk, are as necessary to their employer as he is to them. It may possibly be said that the farmers in most English counties are at one with their landlords in politics, and cordially go along with them; but this is not always the case, and deep must be the humiliation of a man of spirit to be obliged to change his vote, if a new landlord should happen to be on the different side of politics to the old one. The farmers, from the commencement of the free trade agitation, no doubt, have generally considered their interests identical with those of the landlords; this feeling, however, may not always continue; already there is evidence of it, and considerable diversity of views between landlord and tenant on the question of the game laws.

In Scotland, where the almost universal existence of leases gives comparative freedom to the farmers, we see that this divergence has already manifested itself both in respect to the game laws and the law of hypothec. In most of the Scotch counties, the farmers decided the last elections, against the landlord influence, in favour of the Liberal candidates. Yet in that country, too, complaints of undue influence were heard. Even where a lease exists the landlord and the agent, by making or refusing advances for buildings and improvements, by granting or refusing various favours and indulgences, can put strong pressure upon the tenant, and still stronger is the pressure if the lease is drawing to a close and the tenant desires a renewal. Some evidence of undue influence of this kind was given from Roxburghshire, relating to the Marquis of Lothian. Mr. Scott, a tenant of the Marquis, just before the election was in treaty for a renewal of his lease with every prospect of getting it; he voted against the brother of the Marquis, and shortly after, without any reason being assigned, it was intimated to him that the lease would not be renewed. People can draw their own conclusions from these facts, and the conclusion a canny Scotch farmer is likely to draw from them is this:—if you want your lease renewed don't vote against the brother of the Marquis of Lothian if you happen to be a tenant of the Marquis. With regard to Dumfriesshire, the exercise of a very large amount of

undue influence seems to be proved, sufficient in fact to have turned the election on the second occasion.

But nowhere in Great Britain was landlord intimidation more shamefully exercised than in Wales. In that principality 80 per cent. of the population are dissenters of a very pronounced character; while the landlords are generally members of the Church of England. This placed the two classes in violent antagonism to each other at the last general election, which turned so much on the expediency of Church Establishments. The farms in Wales are generally small, and held as yearly tenancies; tenant right there is none, though, as one witness said, "it is much wanted." From these circumstances an amount of oppression on the part of the landlords towards the tenants took place in Wales, unparalleled in any other part of Great Britain.

The evidence of Mr. Harris, a gentleman of independent means in Cardiganshire, is very conclusive on this point. He informed the Committee that in that county threats, both by word of mouth and by letter, were made use of; these were too often successful; for we are told that the most influential members of some dissenting congregations were themselves in some instances forced to vote against their own wishes. Though four-fifths of the farmers of the county of Cardigan are dissenters, strongly objecting to any connexion between Church and State, the majority of them were compelled to vote for the Conservative candidate. The election was nevertheless won by the Liberals, through the votes of the freeholders and leaseholders of cottages. The landlords, enraged at their defeat, proceeded to wreak their vengeance upon those of their tenants who had presumed to vote in accordance with their convictions. Mr. Harris believed that as many as two hundred notices to quit had been served in Cardiganshire alone at Lady Day after the election. He was himself aware of from thirty to thirty-five served upon tenant-farmers, in some cases where the families had been two hundred and four hundred years upon the estates; in others where considerable sums had been laid out by the farmers in improving their farms, which, as the law now stands in England, they have no means of recovering. What took place in Cardiganshire is merely a sample of what occurred in other counties in Wales. This oppressive conduct aroused a strong feeling of indignation throughout the Principality; public meetings were held to denounce the coercion, and subscriptions were raised to compensate the victims for their losses; the attention of the House of Commons also was called to the subject. These, however, are abuses of the rights of property which no direct legislation can prevent; but no one who has a regard for justice or a righteous hatred of

oppression should, on slight grounds, object to a system of voting that would render impossible so flagrant an abuse of legal rights.

If we would witness all the evils of open voting carried to the highest pitch, we must turn to Ireland. All the causes that render landlords and tenants hostile to each other in Wales, operate with tenfold force in that country. A spirit of animosity between the Saxon territorial aristocracy and the Celtic population, springing from national antipathy, inflamed by religious bigotry, has been kept alive by mutual wrongs through three disastrous centuries. The cruel oppression of the ruling class, not the less terrible because inflicted under the sanction of law, has been met by the cruel vengeance of the subject race; and as yet their mutual hatred has been little mitigated by the lapse of time. The opposition also in interests, which always exists between the proprietors and the cultivators of the soil, whenever they form two distinct classes, is more entire and absolute in Ireland than in any other country on the face of the earth. Still so complete was the subjection of the Celtic race, up to the end of last century, that the Protestant Parliament sitting in Dublin made no difficulty in bestowing the suffrage upon the Roman Catholics in 1792; though no member of that faith could himself be elected. It seemed to the Protestant landlords that they could as securely count upon the votes of their tenants as on those of their domestic servants. They had forgotten the mighty power of religious enthusiasm lying dormant in the rude hearts of their poor dependents. They did not foresee that a time might come when the despised parish priest would possess a spiritual influence over the cultivators of their estates, against which all their own material power would count for nothing. The landlords even strove by all means possible to multiply the votes of their tenants, under the belief that they were only increasing their personal weight in county elections. Suddenly the demand for emancipation arose, and speedily became irresistible. The majority of the electors in most counties in Ireland were Catholics; if they only proved true to their religion they could return Catholic representatives to Parliament. In the summer of 1828 the tenant farmers of Clare elected O'Connell, though legally ineligible; from that day Catholic emancipation was gained, and it was demonstrated that the popular voice, in unison with the priesthood, was more than a match for the landlords. Except at periods of great political or religious excitement, the power of the landlord resumes its sway; even at these periods his lieutenant, the agent, armed with notices to quit, and backed by the police, is sufficiently formidable. Threats of eviction, distresses, and demands for immediate payment of rent, large arrears of which

are usually due, assail him on one side; on the other, the priest exhorts him to be true to his faith and church, perhaps even warns him that if he votes contrary to his conscience for the sake of worldly advantage, he is guilty of mortal sin; which warning may be easily paraphrased in a manner more remarkable for strength than politeness of expression. The position of the voter between these opposing influences is really pitiable. All his convictions and sympathies urge him in one direction; every motive of self-interest impels him in another; except perhaps the fear of injury to his person or his property at the hands of his fellow-countrymen, if he should vote for the enemy. In his difficulty he sometimes adopts the truly Irish mode of inviting his friends to pay his house a burglarious visit by night, and swear him not to vote, so that he may have an excuse to give to his landlord for breaking his promise, that he dare not commit perjury. Sometimes he makes promises to both sides, and trusts to the chapter of accidents for some mode of escape.

It has long been the practice in Ireland for the landlords to collect together their tenants who are voters, to place them upon cars, and send them in a body under the agent to record their votes at the polling booth. These parties of voters are frequently escorted by detachments of the police and military, on the alleged ground that there is fear of their being prevented by violence from going to the polling-place. It is observable that these escorts are always asked for by the landlords or their agents, never by the voters themselves. At Sligo they were asked for ten or twelve days before the election. The voters are often collected together and marched to some place of security several days before the poll; here they are carefully preserved from all communication with the outer world; probably they have no want of either food or whisky to complain of. It is doubtful what is, in some cases, the feeling of the voters themselves; but it is clear that when they are thus escorted and guarded, they are looked upon by the mass of the people as prisoners, or at least —and this is probably the truth—as men who are being taken to record their votes contrary to their real wishes. Whenever it is possible, therefore, large parties of the peasantry waylay and attack these escorts. The voters themselves take no share in repelling these attacks. For the possession of the person of these voters there are often battles royal that remind one of the fight over the body of Patroclus. The agent and the police on the one side endeavour to carry their bodies to the poll; while a mob of the popular party on the other side endeavour, as they say, to rescue them from imprisonment; not, as is generally believed, without the secret approbation of the voters themselves. Just as in times past, some Irish damsels are supposed to have

submitted, not unwillingly, to the gentle violence of their too ardent lovers, who carried them off out of the clutches of their inexorable parent.

The evidence of General M'Murdo who commanded a brigade in Ireland during the last general election, upon the subject of military escorts to voters, is most remarkable. He says, "It is very well understood by the officers of the army in Ireland that the majority of these voters go under the escort very much against their own inclination, in order to vote according to the wishes of their landlord." He mentions a case that happened at Longford some years ago, where a large number of voters were collected and shut up for some four or five days, and ultimately taken by dragoons to the polling-place. In reply to the question, "In what light do military officers regard those voters that are committed to their charge? do they regard them as free men whom they are bound to protect, or do they regard them in the light of prisoners?" He answered, "Practically, as prisoners." He even went so far as to give the following answers to questions put by Mr. G. Hardy:—

Q. (7655). "But I presume that if any one of those persons were to tell the escort or the commander of the escort that he wished to be left he would be left?" "No, certainly not; no such discretion is given to officers." "Q. If one of them said, 'I do not wish to go;' do you mean to say that the escort would compel him to go?" "Certainly, he is committed to their charge. If such a principle was understood they might all go."

It is true that Lord Strathnairn contradicted General M'Murdo on this point. He says, "I never dreamt of such an idea as coercing them." (11,731.) Yet even he admits that possibly they do go involuntarily. He is asked by the Chairman, "But still may it not be the fact, as stated by General M'Murdo, that the majority of these voters may go under escort very much against their own inclination, in order to vote according to the wishes of their landlords?" And he replies, "It is perfectly possible, and it very often happens I have no doubt."

When we find such statements as these, made by men in the position of General M'Murdo and Lord Strathnairn, we may readily conceive what are the sentiments of the ignorant voters as to their right and power to resist the agent, who often goes from house to house, accompanied by the police, to collect them days before the polling. What more natural than that the voters should in most instances believe that if they are, what they generally call, "taken by the police," they are obliged to go with them whether they please or not. One fact alone is sufficient to prove how terrible in many cases was the pressure brought to bear at the last election upon these unhappy tenants.

They would beg that armed parties should be sent to attack their houses by night, to commit assaults upon themselves and families, in order that they might have an excuse for refusing to vote as their landlords desired. Mr. M'Dermot, a Catholic priest of Sligo, gave evidence that one voter requested that such an act of violence should be perpetrated upon himself. He asked that he should be carried out and well shaken, but that care should be taken not to hurt him.* From the evidence of Captain Percy, the stipendiary magistrate, we find that in some cases where serious damage was done to property, and even where serious violence was inflicted upon the person, it was strongly suspected that the injury was connived at by the sufferers as a less evil than the wrath of the landlord. The dreadful riots, accompanied by murderous violence on the part of a savage mob, at Drogheda, caused that election to be declared void. But the infliction of this penalty does not appear to have had much effect in maintaining order and tranquillity at the recent elections in Tipperary and Waterford. At the first Tipperary election, a Fenian convict was elected by the votes of scarcely more than 1000 electors out of a constituency of nearly 10,000; the majority being deterred by fear or prevented by force from going to the poll. At the second election, a Fenian ex-convict was only defeated by four votes. The majority on this occasion also did not dare to exercise their constitutional right.

Thus, to sum up our hasty review of the general character of our elections, as presented by the evidence laid before the Hartington Committee, we find that our boroughs, except the Scotch, are largely tainted with corruption. We find that both in counties and boroughs severe pressure is brought to bear by landlords upon tenants, by employers upon workmen, and by customers upon tradesmen. In numerous cases freedom of election cannot be said to exist; and it is a fact that many men in a humble position in life would hail as a boon any measure that would deprive them of the franchise. While in Ireland, where intimidation and coercion on the one side are opposed by priestly influence and mob violence on the other, an election more resembles a campaign in a civil war than a free selection of magistrates by a civilized community.

The question then arises, is there no remedy for this state of things? Must we continue quietly to endure these evils? Every one seems to be agreed that it is impossible to check

* There is a touch of Irish humour here. We can fancy Pat saying to Mr. M'Dermot,—"I hope, your riverence, the boys will carry me out aisy, and mind I'm not killed outright."

them by increased penalties. Public opinion will hardly permit the infliction of the present penalties. Nothing is more unpopular than a prosecution for bribery; and in no case, except a prosecution for an agrarian murder in Ireland, are the chances of a conviction smaller. There *is* one measure which its advocates assert would prove an effectual remedy for most of these evils, and would reduce the remainder to a minimum. They do not assert this merely upon theory; they affirm that it has never failed when it has been put in practice. They declare that it exists with the universal approbation of the community in every country of Europe where popular elections are held; in the United States of America, and in many of our own colonies. They allege that even those who have opposed the measure previous to its adoption have invariably been brought to approve of it when they have once seen it in operation. This plan is the very simple one of providing that the voting should be secret; that no one but the voter himself should know for whom he gave his vote.

It is obvious that, provided only the secrecy of the vote be preserved, intimidation will be torn up by the roots; and bribery, at least in the shape in which it usually appears among us, will be rendered almost impossible. Whatever intimidation may have been attempted upon a voter before he comes to the poll, can by no possibility have any effect in compelling him to vote contrary to his convictions, if the way in which he votes remains known only to God and his own conscience. It is equally clear that a man is much less likely to pay a sum of money for the bare promise of a vote (when there is no certainty that the promise *will* be fulfilled, nor any means of ever knowing that it *has* been fulfilled), than that a man should pay a sum of money for a vote that has actually been given.

The only answer ever attempted to be given to these arguments is, that this system would induce persons liable to be intimidated, to lead a whole life of lying and dissimulation; and that bribery might be carried on by promising to give money to a voter, in the event of a particular candidate being elected. To take the last objection first, we reply, the gain from such a transaction would be infinitesimal compared with the risk,—nay, the certainty of detection. To be of any avail it would require to be practised on a very large scale. The transaction could not be carried out by a stranger to the borough and the voters; no "man in the moon" sitting in an obscure publichouse would suffice. The voters would not *trust* the promise of the usual bribery agents; they would require, as a guarantee, the word of some one known as representing the member or his party—a

class of persons who now usually keep themselves in the background. The risk of detection would be doubled, as in every case there would need to be a previous promise, and a subsequent fulfilment of the promise. A successful candidate who had recourse to bribery might be unseated for a single act proved against him or his agents, even though by that bribery he had not gained a single vote (since all the bribed voters, for aught that is known, may have voted against him), while at the same time the result of the poll may disclose the fact that there had never been any occasion for him to have had recourse to practices which most men hold in their consciences to be disgraceful, and all men feel in their pockets to be disagreeable. Even in cases of *defeat*, the agent might be forced to make the payment, promised only in the event of success; as the bribed voters might threaten otherwise to inform against him, a promise to pay being in law as much bribery as the actual payment; so that both agent and candidate, if privy to it, would be exposed to all the penalties for bribery. Wherever the parties at an election were at all equal, wherever there was uncertainty as to the result, the candidates, always over sanguine of success, would be *really* anxious not to endanger their anticipated victory by a means of such doubtful advantage. Wherever a candidate perceived that he was in a hopeless minority, he would be aware also that any attempt to purchase a majority would require corruption on so gigantic a scale as to render detection inevitable.

The other objection, that the system of secret voting would entail upon the dependent voter a life of dissimulation, and would cause him at every election to be guilty of acting a lie, is more plausible; but we fully believe that, if carefully examined, it will be found to have no greater weight. The experience of every country bears witness to these two facts: that whenever the power of concealing his vote has been given to the voter, all attempts at coercion cease; where the voting is really secret, bribery is unknown. Those who are in a position to exercise undue influence over a voter, at once feel that they may possibly force the man into acting a lie; they cannot by any possibility force him into voting in the way they desire. They consequently leave him alone, or merely endeavour to affect him by the legitimate means of persuasion. They instinctively feel that since he is absolutely free to vote in whatever way he pleases, they cannot adopt any mode more likely to induce him to resent their solicitations as an impertinence than by making use of even the semblance of pressure. Personal or house-to-house canvassing is almost invariably given up where the ballot exists, as entirely useless. Under

these circumstances the voter makes no attempt to conceal his vote, or at least his opinions; he has no *motive* to conceal his vote, precisely because he has *power* to conceal it. No one possesses the power of controlling his vote; no one therefore attempts to control it. Let us look at it in a practical manner. Let us consider how it would in all probability work in this country. Suppose the landlord's candidate is defeated (as he always would be, under the ballot, whenever an attempt was made unduly to influence those whose votes were absolutely at their own disposal), and the landlord suspects his tenants have voted against him, what can he do? To be certain of reaching the offender, if there be an offender, he must evict *all* his tenants, although it is possible that every one of them may have voted for him. The reason also for which they were evicted would be manifest to the whole world. Now, on the contrary, he can strike terror among them all, by evicting one or two, whom he knows to be the most guilty, as he terms it; usually assigning some pretext, other than that of having voted against him, as the cause of eviction. What, then, would he gain by this wholesale eviction? In the first place, a large amount of odium for the party he supported. In the next, a new body of tenants; every one of whom, despite their promises, might at the next election vote against him. Sooner or later the conviction would be brought home to every one that the most effectual means of inducing tenants or workmen to support the opposite side was the attempt to coerce them; and it would soon become manifest to all, that that landlord, or that employer, was the most likely to have his tenants or workmen voting along with him, who made it most clear that he really desired to leave them as free as himself, to vote in accordance with their conscientious convictions. Even Welsh and Irish landlords would come to recognise that it was the act of a simpleton, no less than that of a despot, to threaten a dissenting or Catholic tenant with eviction for refusing to vote against his convictions. This, we repeat, is not based upon mere theoretical conception; it has been found to be realized in practice wherever the ballot has been adopted, as we shall now proceed to show.

Ever since it became generally known in this country that the ballot had been adopted in several of our Australian colonies, it has been felt that the success or failure of the experiment would have a most material effect on its adoption at home. Not that it was an exemplification of the adage, "fiat experimentum in corpore vili." Those colonists, "the sires of empires yet to be," in spite of the difficulties they have had to encounter, from the introduction of the convict element among them, have, no less than their predecessors in the Western world, been enabled, beneath the Southern Cross, "to plant the tree of life, to plant fair

freedom's tree," with every prospect of a glorious future before them. It is a sign of the progress they have made that the mother country should not disdain to take a lesson from them in the art of government. The most interesting evidence taken by Lord Hartington's Committee relates to the introduction of the ballot into our Australian colonies, and its operation after it had been introduced. Colonel Torrens, M.P. for Cambridge, was the first witness examined on this part of the subject. He had been a member of the Legislature and Treasurer in South Australia; he had used all his power to oppose the introduction of the ballot. Previous to its introduction, he states that bribery and rioting prevailed extensively; exactly the same state of things went on there as now in England, though perhaps more aggravated. Colonel Torrens then proceeds to say that the effect of the introduction of the ballot into South Australia was that rioting entirely disappeared; everything at the elections became orderly and quiet. "Then, as regards bribery, I think that has almost disappeared. There was a case of bribery brought forward a short time ago, but it was at once detected. A Mr. Dunn paid the travelling expenses of some voters, which was contrary to the law, and was treated as bribery, and he lost his seat in consequence; but I think that that is the only case I can call to mind in which there was even a suspicion or a rumour of anything of the kind taking place." This is fully confirmed by Mr. Dutton, who had been for years a member of the South Australian legislature, and of several administrations. He declares also, most emphatically, that the operation of the ballot in South Australia is absolutely secret, and that it is utterly impossible that it can be known how a person has voted in any other way than by the voter himself telling it. There is no difficulty in reconciling this statement with one of Colonel Torrens which we shall immediately quote, if we only bear in mind that the former affirms there is absolute secrecy for all who desire it; while the latter declares that just because every one possesses the power of keeping his vote secret, no one finds it necessary to do so. "Since the ballot has been in operation for some time it is generally known how most persons vote. The fact is, that when that system is in operation for any length of time in a community, it appears that the idea of coercing, or bribing, or influencing, passes out of people's minds altogether. Such a thing has dropt out of mind, as a thing impossible and not to be thought of, and, practically, the people avow their political opinions, and they are always supposed to vote in accordance with them. No person there conceals his political opinions at all; every one assumes that, and nobody scarcely is ever asked the question how did you vote, or how did you not vote. Canvassing goes on to

some extent, and people express their desire, and even a promise to support such and such a candidate, but there is no means whatever of proving whether they have ever fulfilled these promises or not." (8754.)

The mode of taking the votes in South Australia appears both simple and efficacious. The voter comes to the polling place; as soon as his right to vote is established, he receives a voting card, on which are printed the names of the candidates, and nothing else. He takes this card into a recess of the polling-place, and puts a cross against the name of the candidate for whom he votes; he himself is still visible while he puts the mark, but it cannot be seen against what name he puts it. He then gives the card to the officer, who drops it into the ballot-box. At the close of the poll the boxes are opened by the returning officer in the presence of scrutineers appointed to represent the candidates, and the result of the election is publicly declared.

The mode of election at Victoria is similar, except that the voter is required to strike out the names of those candidates for whom he does *not* intend to vote; and also (which is far more material) a number is put upon the voting paper corresponding to the number attached to the voter's name on the electoral roll or register. This of course renders it possible, upon a scrutiny, to know for whom each voter recorded his vote; but the greatest care is observed to preserve the secrecy of the ballot, except in the rare cases in which a scrutiny is instituted by a committee of the Legislative Assembly, upon sufficient cause being shown. All the witnesses agreed that secrecy was practically preserved under this system, at least whenever it was desired by the voter himself. These voting papers are then sealed up by the returning officer, and are sent to the Chief Secretary or the Speaker, and after a specified time they are destroyed.

Mr. Muir, who had acted as returning officer in Melbourne, the capital of Victoria, asserts that there was a great deal of bribery, treating, and mob intimidation in that colony before the introduction of the ballot, but that it wholly ceased afterwards.* Mr. Verdin, who had been treasurer of Victoria, and a member of the Legislature, did not believe that it ever prevailed to any great extent in Victoria; but he declares his belief that the ballot had been most beneficial, and that it had tended to keep the elections pure, and to make them orderly and decent proceedings, instead of the reverse. Mr. Fitzgerald, who had been Colonial

* Mr. Muir is confirmed in this statement by a speech of Mr. Childers in the House of Commons, in which he said—"Bribery and treating, in the vulgar forms in which we know them, were rife in the town constituencies" (9818).

secretary and treasurer in Victoria, also agreed with him in thinking that there had never been bribery there, "because a seat in Parliament was no object to any man;" yet he admitted that there had been considerable mob intimidation, and once or twice very serious rioting, which had been entirely checked by the ballot, so that the elections had become very quiet indeed. He thought it put a check upon individual bribery, but that it would be difficult to detect wholesale bribery; yet he only knew of one petition having been presented for bribery, and he did not allege that the wholesale system (where the voters are "bought up in hundreds by means of arrangements with leaders of clubs") had sprung up. His apprehensions on this ground appear to us altogether chimerical: the necessity that such arrangements should be made directly by the member or his immediate agents —the prospects of success, which always appear great when the result is unknown—the certainty of a large outlay, without the certainty of a single vote being gained by it, would all combine to prevent a candidate from having recourse to such a hazardous experiment. The extent of the operation would render detection almost inevitable, since any one bribed would be able to give evidence that would not only prove his own guilt, but lay open the whole transaction. Before a purely hypothetical apprehension of this kind is allowed to have any weight, we do not think we ask too much in requiring the opponents of the ballot to produce a single instance from the countries where *secret voting* is in operation, in which this wholesale bribery has been practised. The ballot has been also adopted in New South Wales and Tasmania with entire satisfaction to the inhabitants of those colonies. No direct evidence was received by the committee as to these colonies, except that of Sir C. Dilke, who was only personally acquainted with the former. In the *Times* newspaper of February, 1870, there is a letter from their correspondent in Sydney, giving a most satisfactory account of the working of the ballot at the elections which had just terminated, and highly praising the purity and order of the proceedings, and the good selection of members made by the voters.

Sir C. Dilke gave the committee some very interesting information as to the working of the ballot in France and America. The mode adopted in those countries is nearly identical. In France, the voter having established his right to vote, delivers to the president of the section, a voting paper, folded up, termed in French "bulletin," within which the name of the candidate for whom he votes is written or printed; the president of the section himself deposits it in the ballot box. These voting papers or bulletins are supplied to the voters by the supporters of the candidate, often at the polling-place, and it may be seen, if he chooses, for

whom the voter casts his vote; but it is quite within his power to conceal it.

In answer to the question, Is the ballot really secret in France in the majority of cases? Sir C. Dilke replies, "In point of fact, it is; in Paris it is; in the rural districts, where the Imperial pressure is very great, I heard, as a matter of common rumour, that the voters like it to be seen how they are voting when they are voting on the Imperial side." In fact, under the Empire secret voting, i.e., the ballot in the only true acceptation of the word, was not permitted to exist, at least, in the rural districts; though the law throughout assumes that the vote is secret. "Bulletins sur lesquels les votants se sont fait connaître," are held bad, and are not counted. In the towns the law was better observed. The protection of the ballot enabled the citizens of Paris, almost under martial law within a few years of the *coup d'état*, to return opposition members to the Corps Legislatif. It enabled the national voice to make itself heard at the recent general election, though the country was bowed down in the chains of a despotism irresistible by reason of its all-pervading centralization, and the overwhelming strength of its military force. The ballot cannot in itself give liberty; it ensures freedom to individuals, but for its successful working it requires freedom of the person, of speech, and of the press; these are the requisites of liberty, without which there can be no freedom of election, whatever be the form employed. Sir C. Dilke says also (10169), "The French and Americans from having had, with very rare exceptions, complete exemption from bribery, at all events in the Northern States (I am not speaking of the Southern States), are not aware of the evils against which we wish to guard; and therefore in explaining their system, the French particularly will commonly tell you that it is secret; as they think it is secret for all practical purposes." And he adds further (confirming in a remarkable manner the accounts given by Colonel Torrens and Mr. Probyn, as to the entire absence of interference under the ballot), "I doubt whether any voters ever make their votes known in Paris purposely." Probably it is the same in the other cities, and wherever the law is honestly put in force. There is a general feeling in Paris that the vote is a thing which should not be asked about, and that if it comes out which way a voter's sympathy is, it should come out as it were by chance, and not in answer to a direct question." Under such circumstances, the very idea of any one seeking to molest a voter for a vote he had given is perfectly absurd.

In the United States, according to Sir C. Dilke, bribery is almost confined to the large cities of New York and Boston; its existence in these cities is owing to the large number of Irish,

"who are," as Sir C. Dilke says, "a very ignorant class of persons, most of them unable to read or write, untrained to free government, probably never having had a vote before in their lives." But the American system, like the French, is not necessarily secret; while the Australian is and necessarily must be secret. Sir C. Dilke (10219) confidently affirms that the Australian system would prevent this bribery. He assures us that in both countries elections are conducted in a very quiet and peaceable way; which last circumstance is truly marvellous, when we consider how large a proportion of the population in the cities of the United States are Irish, and see what sort of quiet and peaceable elections take place before our eyes in Ireland.

Mr. Probyn, who had spent many months in Italy for the express purpose of following the political events which were taking place in that country, and who had carefully studied the working of its political institutions, was called to speak to the operation of the ballot. If his description of the elections was not borne out by the accounts of independent witnesses speaking of other countries, we should find it difficult to suppose that it was not overdrawn, so unlike are they to anything with which we are familiar at home. Certainly the following account of an Italian election is as thoroughly un-English as can well be conceived. Will any one say that if this system should be introduced among us, and should be followed by similar results, it would not be in every way an inestimable gain to us? The ballot with them is kept strictly secret, there is no canvassing, and the elections are remarkably quiet. "Bribery scarcely exists; indeed, I may say it does not exist." No pressure whatever is put on shopkeepers and others to vote for particular candidates. Mr. Probyn used to ask them about political matters, and their reply always was, "We vote as we like." I said. "Well, but do not gentlemen or even ladies go round, and ask you for your votes?" And they said, "Oh dear, no; no one ever comes. *What would be the use?* they do not know how we vote." The elections cost little or nothing to the candidates; there is never any disturbance at the time of taking the votes; and the civil or military authority is never resorted to on those occasions (12299).

The mode of taking the votes is carried out in a very simple fashion. One of those large halls or rooms so common in Italian cities, is made use of for the polling-place; here the returning officer takes his seat at a table, with the ballot box before him; the voter goes up to him; his right to vote is verified by the production of his voting card (certificato d'iscrozione), and a reference to the electoral list. The returning officer then gives to the voter a blue voting paper (il bolletino). He turns aside to a little table, and writes the name of the candidate for whom he

votes on the inside of the paper. He can be seen while writing; but care is taken that no one should see what he writes. He returns the voting paper, filled up, into the hands of the president, who drops it into the ballot box. The great difference between the French ballot and this is, that in the Italian ballot you cannot vote with any paper except the paper which the returning officer hands to you; if you take any other paper, and bring it in, and if it is found in the ballot box, it is torn up.

In concluding our brief survey of the working of the ballot we are reminded of its origin. We obey the injunction of the oracle, "Antiquam exquirite matrem." We turn to Athens, the birthplace of all our political and intellectual freedom; the fountain source as well of our institutions and laws as of our philosophy, science, and art. Here was the ballot first introduced, or, at least, here first assumed a definite form and character. We cannot in this place enter upon an inquiry into the nature of the Athenian ψῆφος, or the leges tabellariæ of the Romans. We can only consider the details given by Mr. A. Arnold of the electoral system of modern Greece. Yet our attention is involuntarily directed to the past, when we find that either by accident or design the process now employed at Athens more nearly resembles that in use in the days of Pericles than any of the modes employed by other countries. The Greeks use small balls now as they did 2300 years ago. We believe balls are not used in the political elections of any other state. In the polling-places there is a ballot box for each candidate, with his name above it. One half of these boxes is coloured white, bearing "Yes," the other half black, bearing "No" upon it; each of them is furnished with a funnel, long enough to conceal the arm of the voter up to the elbow; in front of each ballot box the voter receives a bullet from a clerk, who attends him round; he puts his arm into the funnel and gives his vote by dropping the bullet to the right or to the left, as he wishes to vote yes or no for the candidate. This is repeated at each box, so that every voter votes for or against every candidate; consequently the votes given for and against, in each ballot box, must balance, and there should be the same number of balls in each ballot box. To make his voting effectual it is essential that the voter should not only vote for those candidates whom he wishes to succeed, but also *against* those whom he wishes to fail. Under this system it is absolutely impossible that any one should know how another voted. Mr. Arnold pronounces it the simplest and best form possible.

The order in the city during the election was surprising; there was not the slightest commotion. He heard of no malpractices, except such as arose from the disordered and lawless state of the

country districts; such as, for instance, where voters were forcibly kept from the ballot by a band of brigands, or where a mayor in Eubœa took the liberty of filling with earth the side of the ballot box which was against his candidate. But these are abuses, as Mr. Arnold remarks, which would be impossible in any state where the authority of law was maintained; and he considers with justice the political state of Greece a testimony to the excellence of a system of voting which worked so well even when surrounded with such elements of disorder. To the question—does any corruption prevail? he replies, "I am not aware of any. As it is absolutely impossible to know how a man has voted, I should presume there is very little opening for corruption." And this seems to us a complete answer to those who fear that a system of wholesale bribery might be established under the ballot. The advantages of secret over open voting are so great, that whenever any one, accustomed to the tumult, the coercion, and the corruption that attend the latter, witnesses for the first time the peacefulness and quiet, the absence of all attempts at intimidation or corruption which invariably characterize the former, he comes to the conclusion that the particular one he has witnessed must be the best. It seems to us that the South Australian (or Italian, with the single alteration suggested by Mr. Probyn that the names of the candidates should be printed on the voting papers supplied to the voter) is the best. This was the form so successfully adopted at the test ballot at Manchester and Stafford to decide between the contending Liberal candidates, except that in the former the voting paper was placed into an envelope, which seems to us an unnecessary change. Sir C. Dilke thinks it might conduce to fraud by giving the voter an opportunity of substituting another paper for the one he received from the presiding officer.*

It is a curious illustration of the aversion of the English people to change, that notwithstanding all these manifold advantages, which had been long universally recognised wherever the ballot was tried, the supporters of that system made little progress in this country until a very recent period. It was declared to be un-English, and this with many was a sufficient condemnation. The great and wealthy were unwilling to part with the means of exercising the influence which their station and wealth conferred. The corrupt class—both the corruptors and the corrupted, a numerous body in our electoral system, did not desire any measure that promised to diminish their unlawful gains. So long as the electoral franchise was possessed by a small

* This has been called the Tasmanian dodge. It was attempted, as far as appears, only once, and was immediately detected.

minority of the people it was not, even in the eyes of many Radicals, altogether desirable to free them from public control. This objection has been removed by the adoption of household suffrage, while the unwise attempt of the Conservative party to carry with a high hand the last general election wrought a change in the public mind, and brought on a movement that has now rendered certain the early adoption of the ballot.

Such a survey as we have, however imperfectly, made of the ballot viewed in operation under the most varied conditions, affords the best and, as we deem, a *conclusive* answer to the objections of those who hold, along with Mr. Mill, that secret voting will compel the dependent class of voters to pass their lives in dissimulation and lying. This would certainly be a grievous evil. There is too much already of deception latent in every rank and class of life. We should be the last to support any measure we believed had a tendency to increase it. We are confident, however, that this evil exists only in the imagination of the opponents of the system, who have never seen it in operation. They conjure up from their own apprehensions a spectre as unsubstantial as the spirit of the Brocken. It has no existence in reality. Where the ballot is in operation concealment does not prevail, because as soon as it is adopted the necessity for concealment ceases.

Under the ballot indeed, a timid or quiet man, or any one who for special reasons did not desire to take an active part in politics, would say little about his vote; he would resent as an impertinence any inquiry from a stranger or superior concerning the way in which he intended to vote. This class probably would not be a numerous one. The great majority of electors would not hesitate openly to declare their sentiments and to state for whom they had voted. Having no motive for falsehood, their statements would generally be true. For under the system of secret voting, provided it is rendered absolutely impossible that it should be known how he votes, it makes no difference to a voter whether he afterwards keeps his vote secret or proclaims it from the house-tops; no one dreams of questioning his conduct, nor of molesting him for what he has done or intends to do with his vote. The utmost that coercion can possibly do under this system against any person is to drive him from the large class, who proclaim their votes, to the small class who keep them secret. There is no power to force him to change his vote, or to vote against his wishes; it is impossible to compel him, and men do not commonly attempt impossibilities. The voter is therefore left alone to his freedom and his conscience.

All the witnesses examined before the committee, who had seen the ballot in operation, agreed in this, that as soon as it

comes into operation in any country, the very idea of coercion goes out of people's minds. The explanation of this fact is to be found in the answer of the citizens of Florence to Mr. Probyn: "What is the use, when they don't know how we vote?" What would be the use, indeed! Every attempt at coercion would act in a direction *opposite* to that intended, with a force proportioned to the pressure applied. A little deception might be made use of at first; for a time some persons schooled in the old ways might endeavour to make use of the old engine of intimidation; but ere long they would find how futile, and worse than futile, under the new system, all their attempts had become. If the ballot were adopted in this country, the victims of coercion, who now labour under a pressure too severe for ordinary men in the humble station in life to contend against, would be released from their servitude, and thereby freed from the necessity of practising that falsehood which in reality so largely prevails under our present system of open voting, but which, happily, is altogether unknown in those countries where secret voting exists.

The greatest evil of secret voting, however, according to Mr. Mill, is that it releases the voter from responsibility to the public, leaving him exposed to the uncontrolled promptings of *self-interest*, and that it tends to foster the notion that the vote is the right, that is to say, the property, of the voter. He acknowledges that in some countries and at some times the freedom from responsibility that proceeds from secret voting is a smaller evil than the coercion of powerful individuals. He admits that it proved beneficial both in Athens and Rome, where it was necessary, according to him, to protect the many from the few.* He says, "The ballot was in these cases a valuable instrument of order, and conduced to the eunomia by which Athens was distinguished among the ancient commonwealths." But he thinks that at the present day, in this country, the voters generally are able to defend themselves without its aid. One would almost imagine from this that Mr. Mill was not aware of what is going on at the present day in every part of the United Kingdom. In many places voters come with tears in their eyes, and beg to be released from the promises they have given. Tenants, four hundred in one division of an English county, after having signed a requisition to the Liberal candidate, are compelled to vote for the Conservative candidate. Voters in Ireland are in the habit of waiting till late in the afternoon, that they may be enabled to vote for their landlord's nominee, if the candidate they prefer

* In future times it may be equally necessary to protect the few from the many.

does not absolutely require their votes; in which case they vote for the Tory. Thus the cause they have at heart is not injured, though their own consciences are violated. It was proved before Lord Hartington's Committee that even in England many persons take steps to have their names struck off the register that they may escape the persecution they are now exposed to, if they presume to exercise the first right of a citizen, that of voting in accordance with their convictions. Notwithstanding all this, Mr. Mill holds that now, in this country, there is more reason to apprehend that base and mischievous votes should be given from private interest, or some mean feeling in the voter's own mind, than from fear of consequences at the hands of others. We cannot see that the giving of these base and mischievous votes, or the operation of these mean and selfish feelings, are checked by publicity, more than by secrecy of voting. These feelings operate and these votes are given at present; what reason is there to suppose that they would be more prevalent under the opposite system?

Mr. Mill does not here, we imagine, allude to those who sacrifice their political convictions in return for some private reward bestowed upon themselves; this is the case of ordinary bribery. If he does mean to include this too numerous class within the scope of his observations, we shall only state our confident belief that under the system of secret voting this bribery would altogether cease; not because the morality of the class of voters who receive bribes would be elevated, at least in the first instance, but because the corrupter would not choose to make a payment to the venal rogue for his vote, when he had no guarantee, save the word of the rogue, that the promised vote had been given. Mr. Mill, if we correctly understand him, here refers to that large class of persons who, from mean and selfish motives, give base and mischievous votes; such as slaveholders, regardless of the interests of the slaves, voting against abolition to preserve their estates from being ruined, or abolitionists, regardless of the interests of others, voting against slavery for the sake of their party, of popularity and office; or landowners, indifferent to the condition of the half-starved labourers, voting for protection to keep up their rents; or manufacturers, careless of the general prosperity of their workpeople, voting against measures for shortening the hours of labour. Of the same class are landowners and farmers, voting against compulsory education, for fear of an increase of wages being caused by young children being withdrawn from agricultural employment; and Radical shopkeepers, who would vote for Lord Fitznoodle,* on the ground

* Provided he possess the one thing needful, money.

that he will "do good" to the town, in preference to Mr. Mill himself. If this is the class of men, and these are the motives to which Mr. Mill alludes, we cannot see how they would be affected one way or the other by any system of voting; good fruit could not come from the corrupt tree; these men would still act under any system as they do at present, in conformity with the low tone and narrow sentiments of their own class, and of the little world in which they move. These men do not say, with regard to public affairs, what an individual sometimes says with respect to his private conduct, deliberately quitting the steep and thorny path for the purpose of treading the primrose path of—

> "Video meliora proboque
> Deteriora sequor"—

The faculties of these men are for the most part uncultivated; their minds are unstored with information; their consciences are unenlightened; their moral tone is low; they do not even know that they are ignorant and base. They imagine, as far as they consider the matter at all, that their own interests are identical with those of the state. The slaveholder sees only that the land will be uncultivated if slavery is abolished. The partisan Abolitionist believes that it is not party spirit, but the wrongs of the slave, that actuate him. The farmer probably considers that book learning makes a man a worse labourer; the squire possibly thinks it has a tendency to make him a poacher; the Radical shopkeeper thinks, in a blind sort of way, that he is doing his duty in "doing good" to his native town, the prosperity of which may enable him to add something to the comfort of an ailing wife, or to the advancement of his children. Until the intelligence and conscience of the ordinary class of voters be enlarged and enlightened, and their sympathies expanded, we cannot expect that enlightened or unselfish actions will be found in their conduct as citizens. The progress of civilization, the improvement of education, the increased and widened interest taken in political affairs, may do much to elevate the present low tone of political morality, and to inculcate the lesson that the interest of a man's town or class, of his family or of his property, must be subordinated to the welfare of the state. In the meantime, we think it of vital importance that every voter should give his vote in accordance with his convictions—that is, a conscientious vote; and we hold this is most likely to be the case when he is left entirely free and uncontrolled by the action of others, except by the advice and persuasion of his friends and fellow-citizens, which no one would wish to take away, and which never can be taken away. This freedom from the control of others, whether in the shape of

seduction or of intimidation, can be attained by no other means than that of the ballot; and when we consider the tumultuous disorder, the debauchery, the venality, and the shameful coercion, that disgrace our electoral proceedings, and compare them with the peacefulness and the quiet, the purity and the personal independence of the electors, that characterize the elections of all countries where really secret voting is in use, we are astonished that its adoption has been so long delayed in this country.

It is not, therefore, as the least of two evils, that we advocate the ballot; but because we regard it as absolutely the best mode of voting, and because we believe that secrecy of voting conduces not less to the personal morality of the citizen than to the general welfare of the state.

Contemporary Literature.

The Foreign Books noticed in the following sections are chiefly supplied by Messrs. Williams & Norgate, *Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, and* Mr. Nutt, 270, *Strand.*

THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY.

A VERY good general view of recent controversies touching the Church of England in its legal and political relations is given in the collected Essays on "Questions of Church and State," by the Dean of Westminster.[1] It may be said of Dr. Stanley, *quorum pars magna fuit*, and the volume will be read with pleasure by those who, on the more liberal side, have at all interested themselves in these ecclesiastical battles. On the whole, the author thinks there has been a gain to the cause of clerical liberty during the period of the last twenty years. There has been, perhaps, rather a successful resistance to attempts made on different sides to narrow the Established Church than any effectual enlargement of its boundaries. And the fear is reasonable on the part of those who wish well to it as an institution, that no movement which can be hoped for within it, or changes in its legal relations, will enable the Christianity taught in it to assimilate itself sufficiently to the theology and religion which are being developed outside and independently of it.

The first Essay in the book consists of a reprint of an article in the *Edinburgh Review* for July, 1850, on the Gorham Controversy. Nothing could well be more repulsive than the original matter in dispute between the High Church Bishop and his pugnacious antagonist. Mr. Gorham's doctrine was not generally intelligible, nor was it in terms, or in detail, by any means accepted by the Evangelical party as such, though they were as much opposed as himself to the High Church theory of baptismal regeneration. The contest, however, had a real and very great value indirectly, in eliciting a clear statement from the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of the principles by which that tribunal must be guided in the decision of ecclesiastical causes. They asserted that it does not sit to make or modify the law of the Church of England, only to declare it—to say what it is, not what it ought to be—a point as to which some friends and some foes of the more free modern theology have been equally mistaken: 2, they laid down, that doctrine or opinion was open where the formularies had not spoken; and where they had spoken ambiguously, that it was free to that extent. Under this last rule Mr. Gorham obtained his success. Mr. Heath, on the other hand, was condemned for applying to a technical word a meaning inconsistent with its definition in the Thirty-nine Articles.

[1] "Essays, chiefly on Questions of Church and State, from 1850 to 1870." By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D., Dean of Westminster, Corresponding Member of the Institute of France. London: Murray. 1870.

The second and third Essays in this volume are reprints, with a little revision, of articles on the "Essays and Reviews." It is highly probable that volume grew much more directly out of the Judgment in the Gorham case than has been generally supposed—that one or more of the writers had pondered the possibility of applying the principles laid down in that Judgment to some more important subject matter than was put in issue in the Gorham controversy itself. It is at least evident that those who ventured the furthest in that volume, notwithstanding a few incautious expressions, knew their ecclesiastical ground too well to impugn doctrines however astounding which were distinctly laid down in the written law of the Church. Hence the rage and gnashing, occasioned as much by the nearness with which they approached in safety close to the fatal rocks, as by the triumphant air with which they sailed into the newly vindicated open channels. To a certain extent, perhaps, Dean Stanley countenances the supposition that the lay tribunal widened the law of the Church; in other places he shows distinctly that this was not the case. In fact, the Essayists who were put upon their trial extorted the acknowledgement of their rights from most reluctant tribunals. Throughout the whole of the judgment in the Court of Arches there ran a strong feeling of personal disapproval; and even in that of the Privy Council there was a tone of apology hardly consistent with the dignity of the judgment-seat. Among other instances which might be alleged, their lordships were obliged by the requirements of the law to pronounce, that the doctrine of the imputed righteousness of Christ is not expressed in the Thirty-nine Articles. Dr. Williams had described this Lutheranism very happily as a "fiction of merit by transfer;" the judges must needs go out of their way to call this an unseemly expression on such a subject; but if Dr. Williams might deny the truth of that dogma *in toto,* he might surely couple his denial with any rhetorical forms and stigmatize it as atrocious, fictitious, or immoral, without transgressing the fair bounds of controversy. Such literary forms are beyond legal cognizance.

The fourth Essay in the volume is concerned with a subject which belongs to the Dean of Westminster by hereditary right; and we do not wonder that he has shown himself over-sanguine as to the effect of the small relaxations in the matter of clerical subscription which have hitherto been accomplished. His contrast, however, of the reception in the House of Lords of proposals for the relaxation of the form of subscription in 1840 and in 1865 is exceedingly good—what at the "former date was trampled down without mercy was at the latter so obvious as to be approved, not only without opposition but almost without comment" (p. 218). Dr. Williams would probably have said, concerning the latter exhibition, the prelates "sat balancing terror against mutual shame."

In the next (fifth) Essay are some sensible remarks directed to clear up people's notions as to what kind of unity or re-union of Christendom might be possible; to which is added a glorification of Dr. Pusey's "Eirenicon," so far as it reasserts the principles of the famous Tract No. XC. Dr. Stanley appears to confound the principles therein advocated with those implied in the position taken up by the Essayists.

He allows indeed, that "the particular ground on which Tract XC. rests its process of dissolving the Articles is historically untenable," (p. 240): in other words, a large part of the Articles were, as matter of history, directed against the specific doctrines for which it was the object of the Tract to open the door; whereas the Essayists took possession of vacant ground—ground for the most part purposely left vacant: for where other Confessions of the Reformation period go further in definition on various points, the Anglican Confession stops short; as in the Article on the Scriptures, in the Article on Justification, and above all, in the withdrawal of the article which stood in the Forty-two Articles of Edward VI., with the heading, *All men shall not be saved at the length.* It is true, the re-publication by Dr. Pusey of the Tract XC. has not occasioned any such outcry as that which burst forth on its original appearance—which is attributable, we rather think, to the great extent in which the clergy have now adopted the very views for which the Tract was designed to open the way, and to which their predecessors were vehemently opposed; but certainly not, as the Dean would represent, to any growth of the principles of liberality, latitude, or toleration, at least among the clergy of the High Church type. It is remarkable throughout this volume—the component parts of which are spread, as it were, over so large a portion of his life—how the Dean, who has the reputation of being a friend to the liberal theology, has been consistent with himself in not venturing beyond the limits of mere latitude. His sympathies, moreover, however liberal in some senses, and always cordially enlisted on the side of the harshly treated or oppressed, are strongly ecclesiastical: in his apologies for the Essayists, and even in his noble championship of Bishop Colenso in the seventh Essay, he grounds himself principally upon ecclesiastical argument—"this is not forbidden by the Creeds"—"that has not been condemned by the first four Councils." To a certain extent this may be accounted for, as having been the most effective *argumentum ad homines* for those whom he was addressing. But we miss altogether any appeal to what may be called the Protestant principle itself—we do not mean to any particular Protestant doctrine, as of Original Sin, or Justification by Faith—but to the principle of Reason, as opposed to the principle of Authority—to this principle, namely, that the best informed Reason of to-day is to be preferred as a guide, where they differ, to that which may have been the best informed Reason of past ages. In other words, the Dean may lie open to the charge of making latitude its own end rather than a means for the approximative discovery of truth.

The eighth Essay advocates the continuance of the union between Church and State, but only on the grounds of the Church being made as broad as possible. The author thinks that even now the only real doctrinal test is the so-called Apostles' Creed. Whether this be so or not, there are some clauses in it which require a good deal of dissolving; and in any case the repetition of such dogmatical forms is unsuitable in devotional services. The next advance towards equality between Churchmen and Nonconformists, the Dean fairly anticipates, will be the interchange of pulpits between the ministers of

Established and Voluntary Churches. Many clergymen would initiate this interchange, but the law at present debars them either from inviting a non-Episcopalian to occupy their pulpits, or from preaching themselves in a non-Episcopalian chapel.

In the paper on the Reconstruction of the Irish Church, the sufferers are wisely recommended to make the best of what has come upon them—it is not so bad as it might have been—it is not very easy to disestablish and disendow, and if any Church has to undergo the process thoroughly at all, let it pray that the operation be performed by hand tender as Mr. Gladstone's. Three biographical notices conclude the volume—of Archdeacon Hare, Dean Milman, and John Keble, of which the first-named appears to us very interesting and instructive.

Mysticism is a religious affection, not a theological method, and may exist towards an imaginary object, as well as towards a real one; or towards a real object in respect of imaginary attributes. Theology gives the doctrine, which mystical sentiment assumes: the theology may be erroneous, but the mystical sentiment implies no critical faculty which can detect the error; it cannot supply its own basis. Mysticism, in various degrees, has at different times appeared to have somewhat in common with Protestantism in the larger sense of the word, as Tauler preceded Luther; but then Luther was very mystical himself. Nevertheless as in a free theology the appeal in each individual's case must be to his own reason—so in mystical religion the conclusive witness is the personal consciousness; that is to say, the individual is the ultimate judge of truth in both cases. Beyond this similarity, apparent rather than real, there is little in common between the Protestant theologian properly so called and the mystic. Among ourselves the mystical or semi-mystical school has contributed nothing of any importance to theology, although it has operated in some directions to soften the asperity of controversy. Latterly it has been rather reactionary in respect of theology; by reason, as we have said, of its incapacity to supply its own basis, which it has sought for after all in the old dogma, with a surrender only of a few harshnesses, as of the penal satisfaction of Jesus Christ and of the never-ending torment of hell. In the present volume on "Prominent Questions in Theology,"[2] edited by Bishop Ewing, we cannot say that the original papers exhibit much force. The most direct and effective for its purpose is a tract with which the volume is opened, by the once celebrated William Law (1686-1761) on "The Atonement." Law has been best known as the author of the "Serious Call," long a favourite work among the Evangelicals. He was also renowned for his defence of Episcopal Succession and of Church authority in his controversy with Bishop Hoadly—but we cannot agree with Bishop Ewing who sets those letters on a par for closeness of argument, terseness, and wit, with the "*Lettres Provinciales*" of Pascal. There are, however, many admirable things in this tract here reprinted, wherein the author vigorously opposes the notion of a wrath in God requiring to be appeased, or of

---

[2] "Present-Day Papers on Prominent Questions in Theology." Edited by the Right Rev. Alexander Ewing, D.C.L., Bishop of Argyll and the Isles. London: Strahan and Co. 1870.

a debt, which he could not forgive till he had received an equivalent for it. "What becomes of the philosophy of debtor and creditor, of a satisfaction made by Christ to a wrath in God; is it not the grossest of all fictions, and in full contrariety to the plain written Word of God?" (p. 52.) Our readers will remember the rebuke, before referred to, administered to Dr. Williams by the highest legal and Episcopal authorities for the use of the word "fiction" in reference to the transferring of the merits of Christ, which the "pious" William Law applies to a closely cognate subject, and to the doctrine of compensation itself.

Mr. Cheyne's "Book of Isaiah"[3] exhibits a piece of scholarly work bold enough, as many will say, but very carefully and considerately done. In assigning the chapters xl.—lxvi. together with xxiv.—xxvii.; xxi. 1—10; xiii. 2—xiv. 23, to the period of the Babylonian exile the author has laid little or no stress upon any inference from peculiarities of language. The Hebrew literature which has descended to us is so scanty in bulk, and moreover has been subjected in its various portions to so much revising and re-editing at different times that this test is very fallacious and very capable of being retorted. On the other hand the arguments from the historical circumstances implied in these chapters and from the ideas and thoughts embodied in them become continually more cogent as their consistency with the later period is the more carefully observed. Mr. Cheyne says:—

"The sarcastic descriptions of idolatry, the appeals to the victories of Cyrus in proof of the sole divinity of Jehovah, are unintelligible as proceeding from Isaiah, but are full of beauty and propriety when read in the light of the Babylonian exile. So too these chapters contain the germs of dogmas, which Isaiah was scarcely prepared to understand, such, for instance, as the influence of the angelic powers (xxiv. 21), the resurrection of the body (xxvi. 19), and the everlasting punishment of the wicked (lxvi. 24). And in chap. liii. the idea of vicarious atonement is expressed in such vivid language, as to produce all the effect of a new revelation. Indeed, the passages which relate to the 'Servant of Jehovah' are so unlike Isaiah, that we can hardly avoid ascribing them to some later prophet. Not that we deny the existence of a certain amount of material common to both writers. The final establishment of the Divine Kingdom on earth is the Gospel of the exiled prophet, as it was that of the prophets of Jerusalem; but the organ through which this is to be effected is no longer the anointed king, but one who bears the lowly name of 'Servant.' Surely this points to a time when the hope of elevating the nation through its king had vanished for ever, and when the ideal of the prophets had grown so spiritual as to find its best expression in a personification of missionary zeal."—pp. xxii. xxiii.

In detail Mr. Cheyne has scarcely developed his observations and inferences sufficiently. We do not think for instance that on Is. vii. 14 he has pushed his criticism sufficiently home. He indicates very well that "the sign given to Ahaz consisted not in the manner of the child's birth, but in his name and fortunes." The passage is not to be understood as a prediction of a miracle to be given as a voucher for

[3] "The Book of Isaiah Chronologically Arranged." An Amended Version, with Historical and Critical Introductions, and Explanatory Notes. By T. K. Cheyne, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. London: Macmillan and Co. 1870.

the truth of another prediction: also, *hinneh*, which is used to invite attention to the present and past as well as the future, here ties together the whole of the facts, the pregnancy, the parturition, and the name; the damsel is with child, bears a son, *yoledeth* (participle) and thou callest his name Immanuel. There is nothing (as in Gen. xvi. 11) to place the prediction between the pregnancy and the parturition, so that there should be any pretence of the prophet having supernaturally foretold the birth of a son and not of a daughter. In the very nearly parallel passage Is. viii. 3, 4, the name Maher-Shalal-hashbaz is given to the son of the prophetess after his birth. In the later portion of the book, Mr. Cheyne understands, as above quoted, "the Servant" and "the Sufferer," as of ideal Israel personified. There is probably some kind of individual portraiture in lii. liii. However this may be, the author seems to exalt too highly the spiritual insight and attainment of the Prophet: for if Israel is to become the missionary for conveying glad tidings to the heathen, the message has a dark and altogether unspiritual side: it is in fact a Gospel of damnation to all unconverted heathen. The prophets after the captivity unite in depicting the joining of the converted Gentiles in the temple service and in describing the punishment, by overthrow in battle, or torment, of the opposers of Israel. In this respect, as Mr. Cheyne points out, the author of Is. lxvi. surpasses the rest in horrible imagery, which is only to be matched in the Apocryphal Book of Enoch; it should be added, in the Gospels and in the Epistles of Jude and Peter, which have adopted it.

The volume of "Miscellanies" from various writings of Dr. Newman gives a fair representation of some of the chief characteristics of his works.[1] They abound in considerable literary beauties; but his illustrations serve not to give clearness of conception, but to occasion indistinctness. It is a fixed, and no doubt pious, maxim with him, that the attempt to be precise even in historical matters connected with religion and the Church, may be very dangerous; while to leave the divine operations and interventions in a halo of uncertainty, is becoming and devout. The extent, however, to which the superstition of the supernatural can be carried may be seen in the following extract from a historical study on the life of St. Anthony:—

"Whether from their mode of interpreting Scripture, or from the opinions and practices which came down to them, they [the primitive Christians] conceived the devil to have that power over certain brute animals which Scripture sometimes assigns to him. He is known on one memorable occasion to have taken the form of a serpent; at another time a legion of devils possessed a herd of swine. These instances may, for what we know, be revealed *specimens* of a whole side of the Divine dispensation—viz., the interference of spiritual agencies, good or bad, with the course of the world, under which, perhaps, the speaking of Balaam's ass falls; and the early Christians, whether so understanding Scripture, or from their traditionary system acted as if they were so. They considered that brute nature was widely subject to the power of spirits; as, on the other hand, there had been a time when the Creator Spirit had condescended to manifest himself in the bodily form of a dove. Their notions

[1] "Miscellanies from the Oxford Sermons, and other Writings of John Henry Newman, D.D." London: Strahan and Co. 1870.

concerning local demoniacal influences in oracles and idols, in which they were sanctioned by Scripture, confirmed this belief. . . . When then we read of Anthony's sensible contests with the powers of evil, the abstract possibility of these is to be decided by the existence, in his day, of such parallel *facts* as demoniacal possessions, which certainly *are* witnessed unanimously by his contemporaries; and the really superhuman character of what seemed like natural occurrences is to be estimated, not by the mere circumstance that they may be brought under natural laws, as demoniacal possessions also may be by the physician, but by the known actual presence of unseen agents to which they may be referred. Anthony's conflict in the tombs may be solved into a dream, or an attack from jackals; yet this only removes the real agent a step further back. Satan may still have been the real agent at bottom, and have been discerned by Anthony through the shadow of things sensible."—pp. 83, 84.

Nothing can be more pitiable than the perversion of a great influence to the promotion of such miserable superstitions.

Mr. Girdlestone is known as the author of a "Biblical Commentary," specially adapted to practical and devotional purposes; his present work is also directed to the promotion of the religious life.[5] The leading idea of it is found in the distinction he draws between Christianity and Christendom. The former is the religion, the latter the geographical stage on which its part is played. Moreover, Christianity may be understood in two senses—the Christianity of doctrine, and the Christianity of life. It is with the latter that the minister of religion, properly so called, is concerned; and he may do good service by pointing out the distinction between genuine or primary Christianity and secondary Christianity, as it has shown itself in history. The former holds forth the ideal, the principles and precepts of Christ and his Apostles; the latter shows the defective realization exhibited in the so called Christian populations:—

"Christendom, if correctly characterized in these pages, is a society of men who, for the most part, walk by sight, but who have in the midst of them another society, consisting of those who walk by faith in the unseen. These latter have been expressly told, that they are to be 'the salt of the earth,' 'as a city set on a hill,' and as 'a light lifted up on high to give light to all around them.' In our review of history, we have met with no organized society of Christians at all answering to these figurative descriptions, no brotherhood of believers testifying to Christ, and adorning his Gospel, in the midst of an evil world, at once distinctly, decidedly, and permanently. In all the centuries of Christendom, and in all its sections, ecclesiastical and civil, they that walk by faith and they that walk by sight appear so intermingled, that it is hard to discern one from the other individually; and still more hard to point out any community, civil or religious, in which the worldly have not borne a considerable proportion, as far as man can observe, to the genuine members of Christ's kingdom upon earth."—p. 195.

Mr. Picton's position relative to the "Old Faith," can best be understood by an extract bearing upon what used to be called the doc-

[5] "Christendom, Sketched from History in the light of Holy Scripture." By Charles Girdlestone, M.A., Rector of Kingswinford, Staffordshire; and Author of "A Commentary on the Old and New Testaments." London: Low, Son, and Marston. 1870.

trine of the Incarnation.[6] It will be seen that although he rubs off some of the harsher extremities of the dogma, he retains a great deal of its substance. Mr. Picton's convictions rest for him on a double support of an inner conviction and of outward evidence, for he considers that in the Gospel histories—without asserting all that is contained in them to be absolutely true—we find ourselves upon historical ground:—

"I have always maintained, and I maintain now, that a hearty belief in the essential and conscious divinity of Christ does not at all involve the supposition of his omniscience when on earth. If it did, no real belief in the incarnation would be possible; and we should have to fall back on the phantastic notions of the Docetæ, who regarded the Lord's body as a mere spectral illusion, the arbitrary and empty sign of the presence of a heavenly Spirit. For what the Incarnation really means, is that God was manifested, not in an abstraction of humanity, but in an individual man who 'was made of the seed of David according to the flesh,' and therefore was subject in all things innocent to the mental associations of Jewish life. I say in all things innocent, &c."—p. 153.

And he considers that the God-consciousness in Jesus implied a knowledge of all that was needed to establish in the world a universal religion, but without involving omniscience. But it is at least not without difficulty that Mr. Picton maintains himself upon this narrow bordering ledge of the finite sinlessness of Jesus.

Hennell's "Inquiry concerning the Origin of Christianity,"[7] was originally published in 1838, but before the author had read Strauss's "Leben Jesu." To some extent the two works go over the same ground; that of Mr. Hennell, however, covers the larger area, and in great measure is directed to a constructive or restorative end. It is his special object to show that the religion of Christ will remain, as to all which is essential to a religion, when the scaffolding of supernaturalism on which it was first built up has been removed. In his analysis of the Gospel Memorials he is somewhat more conservative than Dr. Strauss was: his examination of his material is conducted independently of theory, and could not be better adapted to the English reader. The republication of the work at the present time is very opportune, when the clouds of a kind of mystical reaction are gathering over the ground won from superstition. The present edition is obtainable at a very moderate price indeed. Mr. Hennell, as is well known, blinks no difficulties and evades no consequences of his argument. Although familiar to many of our readers, we cannot forbear extracting his summing up of the result on the supposition that the miracle of the Resurrection, so generally considered as the key-stone of Christianity, is found incapable of proof.

"It is impossible to disguise the momentous consequence of the rejection of the divine origin of Christianity—that a future state is thereby rendered a

[6] "New Theories and the Old Faith." A Course of Lectures on Religious Topics of the Day, Delivered in St. Thomas's Square Chapel, Hackney, by the Rev. J. Allanson Picton, M.A. London: Williams and Norgate. 1870.

[7] "An Inquiry Concerning the Origin of Christianity, by Charles C. Hennell, to which is added Christian Theism, by the same Author." Third (People's) Edition of both Works. London: Trübner and Co. 1870.

matter of speculation, instead of certainty. If Jesus was not seen after he was risen, we no longer see immortality brought to light; the veil which nature has left before this mysterious subject, still remains undrawn; and like the Jews and all heathen nations, we are compelled to rest satisfied with the conjectures to which reason alone can attain. With respect to one of the subjects most interesting to man, we return into the position in which the whole race stood for four thousand years, and in which a great part has remained ever since. The withdrawal of a proof on which we had relied is not, however, equivalent to a disproof. The arguments of natural reason, on behalf of a future state, still remain; and when it is recognised that these are all which the order of things allows of, the mind which feels the want of this doctrine may learn to dwell upon them with increased interest, and to be content with that degree of evidence on this point which has been compatible with the happy existence of many generations of men, and with the tranquillity of many virtuous and reflecting minds in all ages."—p. 373.

A pleasing account of the earlier English versions of the Bible, or of parts of it is given by Mr. Blunt,[8] who looks with considerable suspicion upon the movement for a further revision, which he rather thinks originated in a dissatisfaction with some of the doctrines which belong to the Bible itself, and has been encouraged unwarily and without any evil intent by some scholars, who are more anxious for a perfect version than thoughtful of the interests of the dogma.

The author of "Complete Triumph of Moral Good over Evil,"[9] considers that Rationalism, as met with in England, derives its chief strength from the incongruities of the theological systems which are usually put forth as founded upon the Scriptures. The design of the book is to show that the grosser forms of the doctrine of propitiation, and above all the doctrine of endless punishment in hell, are not really substantiated by Scriptural authority. Thus he relieves the Bible from a great weight which has been thrown upon it; and, as he thinks, preserves its authority within due limits still unimpaired. He retains, however, the bulk of doctrine as being the substance of a supernatural revelation vouched by miraculous attestations, not observing that in taking away the superstition of an everlasting hell, he has removed the key-stone of the whole doctrinal arch. The style of the book is somewhat diffuse.

Both clergy and laity of the disestablished Irish Church appear to have conducted themselves with dignity and good temper under the blow which has fallen upon them.[10] They are now reconstituted upon a legal foundation, and as a corporation having perpetual succession are enabled to hold real and other property for the benefit of the communion. They have certainly lost prospectively a considerable portion of their property, which is the most doubtful part of the legisla-

[8] "A Plain Account of the English Bible, from the Earliest Times of its Translation to the Present Day." By John Henry Blunt, M.A., F.S.A., Vicar of Kennington, Oxford; Author of "The History of the Reformation of the Church of England," &c. London: Rivingtons. 1870.

[9] "Complete Triumph of Moral Good over Evil." London: Longmans. 1870.

[10] "Journal of the General Convention of the Church of Ireland, First Session, 1870; with the Statutes passed, and an Appendix containing the Division Lists, &c." Edited by the Rev. Alfred T. Lee, LL D., D.C.L., Rector of Ahogill, and Rural Dean of Antrim. Dublin: Hodges, Foster and Co. 1870.

tive operation; unequal honours and privileges, such as seats in the House of Lords, and coercive legal jurisdiction, might be taken away, and even property be confiscated to the State, if required by public policy, without arousing much sense of injury; but a transfer of property from one possessor to another, however adroitly managed, is an offence against distributive justice which even the supreme prerogative cannot efface. The revived Church is reconstituted with the same doctrine and discipline as before; the English Thirty-nine Articles and Liturgy having already, long before the Union, been received synodically in Ireland, namely, in 1634. There was passed, however, on the late occasion, a preamble in which a slight amount of new matter has been introduced:—

"1. The Church of Ireland doth, as heretofore, accept and unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, *as given by inspiration of God*, and containing all things necessary to salvation; and doth continue to profess the faith of Christ *as professed by the Primitive Church*."—p. 185.

The introduction of such an ambiguous term as inspiration, and the reference as a standard of faith to the profession of the primitive Church, itself a subject of so great controversy, seems to us to have been unnecessary and hardly wise. The second paragraph runs—"The Church of Ireland will continue to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded; and will maintain inviolate the Three Orders of Bishops, Priests or Presbyters, and Deacons in the Sacred Ministry." Considering that the Irish Church receives the 36th Article of Religion and the Ordination Services of the English Prayer Book, this declaration could not be required unless it were intended as a demonstration against Presbyterianism, and as a repudiating all prospect of union between the two Protestant Churches of Ireland; this appears gratuitous and invidious. The third paragraph is as follows: "The Church of Ireland, as a Reformed and Protestant Church, doth hereby reaffirm its constant witness against all those innovations in doctrine and worship whereby the Primitive faith hath been, from time to time, defaced or overlaid, and which at the Reformation this Church did disown and reject." There is the same objection as before to making a vague "Primitive faith" into a standard, and the corruptions, as they are usually called, of the Church of Rome, are sufficiently struck at in the Thirty-nine Articles, so that this additional protest was superfluous.

Probably the temporal power of the Pope,[11] as it has existed for many

[11] "The Growth of the Temporal Power of the Papacy: a Historical Review, with Observations upon the 'Council of the Vatican.'" By Alfred Owen Legge. London: Macmillan and Co. 1870.

"Letters from Rome on the Council." By Quirinus. Reprinted from the "Allgemeine Zeitung." Authorized Translation Vol. i., First Series. Preliminary History of the Council. Second Series. London: Rivingtons. 1870.

"The Church of God and the Bishops: an Essay Suggested by the Convocation of the Vatican Council." By Henry St. A. Von Liano. Authorized Translation. London: Rivington's. 1870.

ages, is approaching its end. It is usual to contrast it with the spiritual supremacy of the Pontiff; the two are intimately connected, and unless the superstition concerning the supernatural authority in spirituals be cut up, the priestly domination in temporals will survive in some shape or other. Nor as long as men are found to surrender themselves willingly to the belief in a miraculously transmitted authority over the conscience, will it matter where the supposed depository of the authority may dwell. Wherever he be, from that centre will issue disturbance and corruption of civil society. And in degree, wherever, in whatever church or society are found the same principles which have borne their extreme fruit in the Papacy, there also in degree will follow the same mischiefs to humanity. Simply, that which has so largely turned Christianity from a blessing to a curse upon the peoples, has been the persuasion that it has its root in miracle and is essentially continued by miracle.

Dr. Schenkel observes very well that the claim of Papal Infallibility is only the extreme form wherein a like supernatural claim is made by every Council, Bishop, and Priest.[12] Luther was to a great extent driven back from the position which he took up originally. He was fearful that his Reformation should be identified with the excesses of the Anabaptists. So he fell back upon the principle of authority, which it was essential to the consistent progress of the Reformation to have repudiated altogether. Lutheranism, with an ordained Clergy, Creeds and Confessions, and an elaborate Sacramental system, became an abortion :—*amphora cœpit Institui, currente rotâ cur urceus exit?* It is the purpose of Dr. Schenkel and his friends to work out the Reformation if possible according to Luther's original plan.

A great deal of curious material has been collected by Dr. Gustav Oppert,[13] for the purpose of ascertaining as far as possible the history of the semi-fabulous person known as Prester John. He was perhaps something of a Christian, converted, it is said, by the Nestorians—at all events he made a pretence of being so. The site of his kingdom appears to have been in Tartary, bordering on China: he sent high-flown and ridiculous accounts of himself to Christian potentates; he or his son, it is not quite certain which, was put to death by Gengis Khan in the commencement of the thirteenth century. This volume is dedicated to the Duke of Argyll.

Ancient versifications of portions of the Biblical story in the various Teutonic dialects of the middle ages served to familiarize the people with the principal events narrated, and to a certain extent prepared them to require full prose versions of the sacred Books. Our own Cœdmon, the Anglo-Saxon Milton as he is called, is well-known. "The Wood of the Holy Cross" is a Netherlandish poem, in rhyme, of 800

---

12 "Luther in Worms und in Wittenberg und die Erneuerung der Kirche in der Gegenwart." Von Dr. D. Schenkel. Elberfeld. 1870.

13 "Der Presbyter Johannes in Sage und Geschichte. Ein Beitrag zur Völker- und Kirchenhistorie und zur Hildendichtung des Mittelalters. Von Dr. Gustav Oppert. Zweite verbesserte Auflage." London: David Nutt. 1870.

lines, of the fourteenth century, founded partly on the Bible history and partly on Oriental legends. There was a tradition that a branch had been taken from the Tree in the fruit of which Adam committed the first transgression, and planted at Jerusalem, where it grew to a great size, and the Cross of the Lord was afterwards made from it, so that the saving of man was accomplished in the same tree in which he fell: this legend was mixed up with another concerning the Tree of Life in the midst of the garden, a Tree of Anointing for the healing of mankind, as the Cross was, from which flowed the saving blood, &c. Dr. Schröder has edited this medieval poem very carefully with illustrative introduction and glossary.[14]

An able but somewhat severe critique upon the recent arrangements at Cambridge for encouraging to some extent the study o philosophy and for testing the proficiency of the students.[15] In 1851 the Moral Sciences Tripos was established at Cambridge; in 1856 it was made to embrace Moral Philosophy, Mental Philosophy, Logic and Political Economy, thus necessarily involving a confusion of subjects and a confusion of study. During the twenty years or nearly of its existence 159 students have obtained its honours, of whom were 82 in the first class. Philosophy has made some way, but not much. Many do not believe in metaphysics; and the academical prizes—especially fellowships in the colleges—which determine almost universally the course of study, are given exclusively to attainments in classics or mathematics. The principal defect, as pointed out by Mr. Ingleby, in the examinations themselves, consists in the questions put being too much concerned with the literature of the subject and not founded with sufficient definiteness upon some particular philosophy, say, for instance, the Kantian.[16]

Dr. Willis justly observes that save two or three summary notices we have nothing in English to convey a true idea of the life and writings of the man who is the "father of the speculation of our age," and the "father of our Biblical criticism." He has endeavoured to supply this deficiency, illustrating the somewhat sparse accounts extant of Spinoza's life from the extremely valuable remains of his correspondence, and above all by a translation of the "Ethics."[17]

"The fundamental axiom or postulate in Spinozism," says Dr. Willis, "is a self-existing First Cause, in which is comprised, on which depends, from which follows the universe of things;—the universe is not to be conceived as

---

[14] "Van deme Holte des Hilligen Cruzes. Mittelnieder-deutsches Gedicht. Mit Einleitung, Anmerkungen, und Wörterbuch. Herausgegeben von Dr. Carl Schröder." London: David Nutt. 1869.

[15] "Reflections, Historical and Critical, on the Revival of Philosophy at Cambridge." By C. M. Ingleby, M.A., LL.D., Foreign Secretary to the Royal Society of Literature. Cambridge: Hall and Son. 1870.

[16] At p. 52, Mr. Ingleby alludes to a fabulous belief about the beaver, "Imitatus castora qui se," &c., and which did *not* concern the animal's tail. We should have taken what Mr. Ingleby says for an Euphemism, but he will have it to be the tail. "That appendage is said to possess a medicinal power, as well as to serve its owner as truck and trowel," &c.

[17] "Benedict de Spinoza; His Life, Correspondence and Ethics." By R. Willis, M.D. London: Trübner and Co. 1870.

arising, or beginning to be; it IS, and from eternity it WAS; and is, consequently, understood by Spinoza as both necessary and eternal."—p. xiii.

That is to say, in speaking of a *first* cause we are not to imagine an emergence out of nothing, or a priority in time. Spinoza's system is proper pantheism, which rightly understood, is "nothing more than the assertion of the Divine omnipotence, or the opposite of the popular Dualism;" it is also, "the reverse of the Atheism which denies a first cause, and refers power and action alike to the brute matter of the universe." There is indeed, according to Spinoza, only one essence or entity, and God and Substance are used by him as synonymous terms—

"Were there more substances than one, they must differ in some way from one another; one would be what the other is not; not be what the other is; each would be limited, its character of Infinity annulled, and the unconditioned Infinite cease to be what it is—which is absurd."—p. xv.

But the One Substance being constituted by an infinity of Attributes, we attain to some knowledge of WHAT God, or Substance is, when we comprehend one or more of the *infinite attributes* comprised in Essential Being. Of this infinity of infinite Attributes we particularly apprehend two only, Thought and Extension; whence Spinoza held that the human understanding can only cognize God under these two of his attributes (p. xvi.). The One and All must comprehend the universe of things in himself. Finite things are not realities in themselves, but so far only as they are forms, or modes of the changeless Substance. Nothing finite exists independently, or by virtue of any power inherent in itself, but only as determined by the Great Cause of All, and as in relation to it and to other finite forms. This Great Cause is neither transient nor extrinsic, but immanent in All; Cause of himself and of all things. Moreover, he is to be accounted "Free Cause of All." Now, that is free which is not constrained from without, and it would be contradictory to suppose anything external to that which is All. That the Substance, the All, the Great Cause is, and acts by the necessity of its own nature is not excluded, it is rather implied by this definition of Freedom. Only it is to be observed that, according to Spinoza, Will and Choice, as between several possibilities, are excluded. God could not, in virtue of his very perfection, which is the same as the necessity of his nature, have acted otherwise than he has. The great chasm, however, between the Spinozist philosophical theology and that which is generally current among ourselves, is in the assertion that, "the Infinite, Unconditioned God, is necessarily Impersonal." Personality, as we can conceive of it, being denied to belong to the Divine Being, "all that can only be connected with personality is logically detached from the idea of God." Will, therefore, and Understanding, as we are humanly conscious of them, are so detached. Spinoza, however, declares the opinion that God might have willed otherwise than he has willed to be less erroneous, than the supposition that God is determined in what he does by the idea of the good—by the design, as some would express it, of promoting his own "glory," or out of "love" to mankind. For this would be "to put

something beyond God, which does not depend on him, to which he looks as a pattern, at which he aims as a mark" (p. xxi.). And inasmuch as God acts, "not as will but as cause, the world is no work of divine volition; and if he acts not for ends, it is no stage for the display of divine purposes" (*ib.*). Of course Spinoza, in consistency with his philosophical conception of the Divine Being as All in All, denies Miracle—that is to say, if Miracle be defined as contravening the established order of the Universe. And such Miracle so far from proving the existence of the One God, would rather lead to the questioning of it, or to the supposition of more Gods than One. If, however, Miracle is supposed to be comprehended in the universal order, it proves nothing, when established in particular cases, but the incompleteness hitherto of human experience and observation. Spinoza, indeed, although he rejected the stories of the supernatural, met with both in the Old Testament and in the Gospel narratives, esteemed Jesus of Nazareth himself to have been the most eminent of all teachers of religion, so that in his two great commandments he enunciated, and in his example he set forth, a religion which cannot pass away. It follows from Spinoza's doctrine of the Divine Universe, that all moral existence is the outcoming of the One Cause as necessarily and as freely as all physical nature; and he shows by a thorough analysis of the phenomena of the moral nature of man, how they are interlaced and linked with the rest of the universe in a determinate whole, thus excluding all contingency in the details of human agency, as it is excluded from the idea of God. He guards himself at the close of this great treatise against supposed immoral consequences which are likely to be charged against his system.

"Most men appear to think themselves free only when they can give full play to their lusts, and fancy they are hindered of their rights when held to live in conformity with the prescriptions of the Divine law. They, therefore, esteem piety and religion to be loads, which they hope to lay down after death, when they hope they will receive the reward of the slavery—the piety and religion to wit—which they have endured in life. Nor are they even entirely led by such hope as this to live, in so far as the poverty and impotency of their minds permit them, in conformity with the commands of the Divine law; it is much rather the fear of frightful punishment after death that influences them. Were not such hope and fear implanted in mankind, it is said, were they to believe, on the contrary, that the mind or soul perishes with the body, and that there was no immortality in store for the wretched, toiling, sinking under a load of pious observances, they would yield to their natural bent, give the rein in all things to their lusts, and make fortune rather than themselves the guide and arbiter of their lives. But such notions seem to me not less absurd than it were to suppose that a man, because he did not believe he could nourish his body with wholesome food to all eternity, should put himself upon a regimen of poisons; or because not believing that his soul was eternal or immortal, he should therefore elect to live like one demented and without reason."—p. 646.

In an interesting pamphlet,[18] the learned Rabbi, Dr. M. Joel, of Breslau, traces many of the critical and speculative opinions of

[18] "Spinoza's Theologisch-Politischer Tractat auf seine Quellen geprüft von Dr. M. Joel, Rabbiner der Israelit. Gemeinde zu Breslau." Breslau. 1870.

Spinoza to mediæval authors of the Hebrew race—such as Maimonides, Levi ben Gerson, and Chasdai Creskas. He describes Spinoza as the philosopher in whom, above all others, the spirits of the East and of the West found themselves in unison; and thus the liberal and learned Jew sets in his due place, as one of the world's teachers and restorers, as a brother among the children of the people—the man whom his fathers made anathema.

No doubt there is considerable affinity between the philosophical systems of Spinoza and of Bishop Berkeley;[19] but Mr. Doubleday's vindication, as he calls it, of the principles of Bishop Berkeley, is of the most meagre and unsatisfactory kind possible! He assigned to man a spiritual nature solely. The existence of a material world he denied (p. 148). This is really a very crude and inadequate way of putting it. Berkeley says, Philonous being the speaker, in the Third Dialogue:—

"You talked often as if you thought I maintained the non-existence of sensible things; whereas, in truth, no one can be more thoroughly assured of their existence than I am: and it is you who doubt, I should have said, positively deny it. Every thing that is seen, felt, heard, or any way perceived by the senses, is on the principles I embrace, a real being, but not on yours. Remember, the matter you contend for is an unknown somewhat (if indeed it may be termed somewhat), which is quite stripped of all sensible qualities, and can neither be perceived by sense, nor apprehended by the mind. Remember, I say, that it is not any object which is hard or soft, hot or cold, blue or white, round or square, &c. For all these things, I affirm, do exist. Though, indeed, I deny they have an existence distinct from being perceived: or that they exist out of all minds whatsoever."—Works, vol. i. p. 221. London: 1820.

That is to say—he denies they have an existence relative to us, otherwise than as they are perceived by us; and that no existence can be predicated of them without relation to some apprehending mind. What Berkeley contended against was the assumption of an inert "matter"—

"I do not argue against the existence of any one thing that we can apprehend, either by sense or reflection. That the things I see with mine eyes and touch with mine hands do exist, really exist, I make not the least question. The only thing whose existence we deny is that which philosophers call matter or corporeal substance."—p. 39.

The weak point in the Berkelian theory is, that it supposes an unknown substance, called "spirit," as the substratum of the phenomena of consciousness and of our ideas.

The popular book of Dr. Louis Büchner,[20] of which we note an En-

[19] "Matter for Materialists: a Series of Letters in Vindication and Extension of the Principles regarding the Nature of Existence, of the Right Rev. Dr. Berkeley, Lord Bishop of Cloyne." By Thomas Doubleday, Author of "The True Lawof Population," &c., &c. London: Longmans. 1870.

[20] "Force and Matter: Empirico-Philosophical Studies, intelligently rendered, with an additional Introduction, expressly written for the English Edition, by Dr. Louis Büchner, President of the Medical Association of Hessan-Darmstadt, &c., &c." Edited from the last Edition of "Kraft und Stoff." By J. Frederick Collingwood, F.R.S.L., F.G.S. Second English, completed from the Tenth German Edition. London: Trübner and Co. 1870.

glish translation, although tending to get rid of many superstitions, is not really of much philosophical or even scientific worth. He may succeed in exploding some notions about "souls" as separate entities; but "Kraft und Stoff" supplies no better explanation of the phenomena of the Universe than the *mens agitat molem* of the ancients.

POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES AND TRAVELS.

NO work could be more seasonable than a re-publication of some valuable essays that appeared in the years 1864 and 1867 on "The Military Resources of Prussia and France, and Recent Changes in the Art of War."[1] The authors of these essays are Lieutenant-Colonel Chesney and Dr. Reeve. The work is brimful of historical information, and teems with sagacious reflections on a class of topics which call for a good many rather exceptional qualifications for their successful treatment. There are two predominant questions which are now in everybody's mouth, and which have a distinctly practical bearing. One is—What are the changes in the art of war which have been brought about by the rapid progress of civilization? The other is—What are the main qualities in the military resources of Prussia as compared with those of France, to which it is not unreasonable to attribute the recent Prussian successes? As to the changes in the art of war, it is pointed out in these essays that strategical combination and general unity of conception now assume an importance they never assumed before. Steam, telegraphs, and improvements in artillery, all imply a greater demand than ever before on the intellectual and moral capacity of the combatants. "The wondrous facilities which steam conveyance and the electric telegraph afford for transporting and collecting troops and supplies seem to promise almost as great a revolution in strategy as gunpowder is admitted to have made in tactics." "Old lines of defence must vanish, bases formerly distant be brought near, concentration of great masses be the rule rather than the exception, months of preparation and of movement be contracted into days." An important pamphlet of General Trochu's is made much use of. His opinion is that cavalry, far from losing its importance in modern warfare, will increase it; but only on condition of adapting itself to the altered conditions of the age. Cavalry is the instrument of swiftness in war, and for that purpose everything must be done to make it light and active. The opinion of General Trochu is quoted approvingly to the effect that the first condition of a good army is to raise its moral and intellectual standard.

---

[1] "The Military Resources of Prussia and France, and Recent Changes in the Art of War." By Lieutenant-Colonel Chesney and Henry Reeve, S.C.L. London: Longmans. 1870.

"The unity and mutual reliance of the forces in the hour of danger, the knowledge the men have of the officers and the officers of the men, the moral influence which leads men to overcome their natural instincts, and a general acquaintance with the true principles of war, are the essentials with which a great commander seeks to imbue every portion of the troops under his command."

In contrasting the Prussian and French resources, the first feature of difference that arrests attention is the mode of making up the number of the soldiers in the two countries respectively. In the two chapters on the "Military Growth of Prussia," and the "Military Institutions of France," the two systems are severally exhibited in great detail. The foundation of the permanent constitution of the Prussian national force was laid by the law of September 3, 1814, and was adhered to for more than forty years. It has only been altered in detail since, especially as to the relations of the standing army to the reserved forces. The whole system comprised (1) a standing army; (2) a *landwehr* of the first call; (3) a *landwehr* of the second call; (4) and the *landsturm*. The standing army was to be composed of (1) volunteers desirous to undergo the necessary examinations for promotion with a view to adopting a regular military career; (2) of men voluntarily enlisting without being prepared for such examination; and (3) of a sufficient number of the youth of the nation collected from their twenty-first to their twenty-fifth year: the first three years to be spent by the latter actually with the colours, the other two as "reserved" recruits, remaining at home but ready to join the ranks at the first sound of war. The *landwehr* of the First Call was formed (1) of all the young men between the twentieth and twenty-sixth year who did not serve in the standing army; (2) of the volunteers who had been trained in the light battalions (provided for in another part of the law); (3) and of the rest of the male population up to the end of their thirty-second year, excepting only those who had sooner completed twelve years in this reserve and the army. The *landwehr* of the Second Call consisted of all those who had left the army and the First Call, and of any other able-bodied males who had not yet entered their fortieth year. The *landsturm* was only to be called out in provinces of the kingdom actually invaded, and was to include (1) all the men up to the fiftieth year who were not regularly allotted to the army or landwehr; (2) all who have completed their landwehr service; (3) all the youth able to carry arms who had attained their seventeenth year. The defect in the constitution of the Prussian army is the aristocratic character of its officers, resulting in continual jealousies between the standing army and the *landwehr*, which latter is officered by the middle classes. An ensign's commission in the standing army is conferred by the Government, subject to the approval of a standing committee of the corps, whom the candidate must satisfy not only as to his professional qualifications, but as to his parentage and means. "The result has naturally been to make of the service the closest corporation which any profession in the world can show." Side by side with the mode of constituting the Prussian army may be placed the system of conscription as practised in France. Under this system, every year 160,000 citizens are forcibly compelled to

enter the ranks of the army, and as many leave them. The policy of the Emperor has encouraged as much as possible the re-engagements of the men at the expiration of their period of service. General Trochu combats this system. He says that an old soldier should not be an old man, but a young one who has learnt his business; that the true spirit of the French army is to be found in its trained recruits; and that the older men who have re-enlisted for money, and who remain in the army because they have no other calling in life, "become dodgers, malingerers, and very often drunkards." The theory of equality as to chances of promotion is an advantage that the French army has over the Prussian. But it is said that under the present reign this theory has not been adhered to.

"The moral tone and professional value of the French army have been impaired by the temptation to convert it into a political instrument. Many a worthless officer has had his debts paid out of the privy purse and got his promotion, because, whatever his vices or defects might be, they only rendered him a more devoted and subservient tool of the Imperial Government."

The lessons taught by these essays, and purposely illustrated by recent facts, are full of instruction to English politicians.

A residence at Frankfort as British representative to the Germanic Confederation, begun in the month of March, 1852, enables Sir Alexander Malet to give a detailed account of all the events, political and military, which resulted in the overthrow of the German Confederation by Prussia in the year 1866.[2] Sir Alexander Malet prefaces his work by a timely reminder to his readers of the exact nature of the Germanic Confederation, and of its organ, the Diet. The Confederation was founded by the Congress of Vienna in 1815, and came into existence in the November of the following year. Its seat was fixed in the then free city of Frankfort, and the Diet, which assembled there, was composed of seventeen Envoys, presided over by the representative of Austria. The leading idea with the founders of the Diet was the preservation of internal tranquillity; the next, the formation of a league, which should inspire other nations, and especially France, with respect. It turned out, however, that owing to the mutual rivalries of the component elements, and the preponderant influence of Austria and Prussia, neither of these objects was attained. In all matters upon which the two great Powers were agreed, the Diets' proceedings were marked by the most commendable activity and promptitude: if they differed, which was more frequently the case, the game of official delays and chicanery of all sorts was played to the utmost. The middle and minor States made desperate but vain struggles from time to time to emancipate themselves from the tutelage in which they were held by one or other of the rival great Powers. In general Austria was preponderant, at least with the Cabinets of the other States, popular feeling being often the other way. Sir Alexander Malet notices that Prussia represented the liberal party in the ima-

[2] "The Overthrow of the Germanic Confederation by Prussia in 1866." By Sir Alexander Malet, Bart., K.C.B. London: Longmans. 1870.

gination of the people at large, while most of the governments of the secondary States dreaded Prussia, fearing her desire to enlarge her boundaries at their expense. Prussia, however, was so often thwarted in the Diet, that it could be no matter of surprise to anyone who observed the march of events, that the destruction of a system, which ordinarily gave its support to Prussia's rival, should be resolved on at Berlin. After 1848, the Imperial Government of Austria became more and more popular and influential, exciting not only increased jealousy on the part of her rival Prussia, but causing more than ordinary uneasiness to France. But not even the disasters of Magenta and Solferino cooled German sympathies for Austria. She encroached on no Confederate Government, and meddled in the internal affairs of no people. Her Federal garrisons were highly disciplined, the soldiers singularly popular, and their officers polished gentlemen. It was the apprehension of democratic influence and the desire of "checkmating German liberalism" which led the Imperial Government to ally itself with Prussia in the matter of Denmark. From that moment, says Sir Alexander Malet, the moral position of Austria was lost. Close scrutiny exposed her astounding condition of material weakness. Ill held together, the several divisions of the Empire were each of them working for still further dislocation. Sir Alexander Malet gives some interesting notices of the prevalent state of public feeling in Germany about this time. "No greater proof," says he, "could have been given of the difficulties which unity would still have to encounter in Germany than the strong evidences of Particularism—as they have themselves called the sentiment—which were evoked by the commencement of hostilities in Germany itself." The populations, as well as the Governments of Wurtemburg and of Bavaria, were strongly excited against Prussia, as disturbing the public peace. The majority of the Baden, Hessian, and Nassau people shared that feeling, though the Government of Baden would fain have sided with Prussia. The conduct of the Hanoverian people, more signally than that of any other, showed, at the utmost risk and peril to their lives and fortunes, that they held dear above all things their loyalty to the House of Guelph, and their separate nationality. The inhabitants of Electoral Hesse were not behind the Hanoverians in either sentiment, though governed by the most unpopular prince in Germany. Saxony gave unmistakeable proof of the sentiments that animated both the nation and its Government, "and bled and suffered by the side of Austria, as her true and loyal friend and ally." As regards the northern States of Germany, they were so situated, geographically, as to be unable to show any active anti-Prussian tendencies, even had they felt disposed that way, save at risk of their political existence. In commenting on the main consequences of the overthrow of the Germanic Confederation by Prussia, Sir Alexander Malet takes a favourable view of the general situation, though he considers it an open question whether the means adopted to effect a radical cure for admitted evils were the best, or the only ones—

"At all events, the unity of military command which has been the proximate result, and the confirmation and extension of the Customs Union, open very

different prospects for the future of Germany from any which that ill-knit congeries of tribes could possibly have looked for, while fractioned and divided, as they came forth from the alembic of the Congress of Vienna. Assuredly he who has been the main instrument of this great change deserves well of his own country! It may be that close scrutiny of means detects faults in the course by which the end was attained, and many will judge that Prussian policy was often tortuous, and that less blood and less iron needed to have been expended in cementing the new fabric; but there stands the remodelled kingdom, compact, majestic, admirably organized, honestly and economically administered, seemingly unattackable."

In a closing chapter on "The Prussian Army," Sir Alexander Malet reviews the recent history and existing condition of that army, especially investigating the changes in the constitution of the army introduced in 1866, the merits of the needle-gun, the *physique* and *morale* of the Prussian soldier, the provisions made for securing supplies of horses, and the total grounds of the successes in the Austrian campaign.

A review of all the circumstances preceding the French *coup d'état*, from the hand of an able but anonymous writer in Germany, demands particular attention at the present moment. The pamphlet on "Der Staatstreich vom December, 1851,"[3] has its value increased by the inclusion of copies of a number of original documents originating in the events of the time. Earl Russell, Lord Palmerston, Lord Aberdeen, Lord Malmesbury, the Emperor Nicolas, Metternich, Nesselrode, Bunsen, are the characters that figure in this correspondence, or else the authors of the documents. The perplexity of the French nation, in the month preceding the *coup d'état*, is vigorously portrayed. The Radical idealists, the moderate Republicans, the general mass of the peasant population, who wanted peace, order, and quiet at any price, were the main political elements which either themselves engendered the events attending the Presidential election, or else formed the tribunal to whom the several competing rivals appealed. The Legitimists hoped that, out of the existing confusion, the claims of Henry V. would rise to the surface; the Orleanists, with the help of the liberal *bourgeoisie*, hoped to press the claims of the Prince de Joinville. But the clear-sighted Peanger had correctly prophesied when he said that "universal suffrage can only nominate those it knows, and when some day it has to choose the head of the nation, the best known man will be the heir of Napoleon."

An impressive picture of the activity of co-operative habits in Italy, is supplied by Professor Alberto Errera, in his account of the co-operative institutions existing in Venice, whether for the purpose of mutual credit, productive industry, or commerce.[4] The statistical tables are given in great fulness, and seem to be of considerable value, both in their precision and the principle of their selection. The Professor says that it is the first time since the fall of the great commercial Republic that such an attempt has been made. Former statistical

---

[3] "Der Staatstreich vom 2 December, 1851, und seine rückwiskung auf Europe." Leipzig. 1870.

[4] "Monographie degli Instituti di Previdenza di co-operazione et di credita della Industria e del commercio nella provincia di Venezia per cura Prof. Alberto Errera." Venezia. 1870.

statements, such as those made or commenced in 1804, 1816, and 1827, either were poor and incomplete in their very conception, or else, being prepared under the influence of the Austrian Government, were cooked and tampered with in such a way as to render them wholly untrustworthy. The arrangement in this work is extremely skilful, and enables a reader to see at a glance what co-operative institution for any particular purpose has reached the highest degree of popularity, and what companies exist for the purpose of working up any particular kind of raw material, or sending it to market when it is wrought up by others. The main divisions under which the statistical information divides itself are (1) Provident Societies, (2) Societies for purposes of Co-operative Production, (3) Loan Societies and Banks, and (4) Associations for purposes of Trade and Navigation. The societies for purposes of co-operative production are ranged under the heads of animal, vegetable, and mineral products.

An intelligent account of the resources possessed by England and Scotland for the purposes of the higher education cannot but be welcomed.[5] Such an account cannot proceed from a more competent source than that of foreign observers, with sufficient opportunities of observation and an adequate motive to stimulate their inquiries. MM. Demogeot and Montucci, in presenting their report upon the higher education in England and Scotland to the French Minister of Public Instruction, produced such an interesting and important work that they were requested to republish it in an extended and more developed form. The result is a book which may well be deeply studied by all educational reformers in this country. All the sore points in English education, whether on its intellectual, moral, or social side, are laid bare in a way few Englishmen have the heartless audacity to attempt. All the excellences of that education are done complete justice to, in a way which few Englishmen have sufficient conceit or vanity to indulge themselves in. The mode of classifying the educational resources of the two countries is particularly valuable. In England the higher education is said "to embrace two kinds of establishments;" first, those which do nothing more than impart to the young a general literary culture by the instrumentality of mere science, apart from all preoccupation with the special subject of their future employment; the establishments, in a word, the purpose of which is only to teach men how to be men, like the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Durham, and London, and the Colleges dependent upon them. Secondly, the special schools, which suppose the man already "formed," and concern themselves with no more than providing the knowledge needed for a definite profession. To this class belong the "ecclesiastical seminaries," like (it is presumed) the Theological College at Wells; schools for the study of law, medicine, artillery, engineering, military and naval science. England, as pre-eminently the land of wealth and aristocracy, permits to herself more than any other

---

[5] "De l'enseignment superieur en Angleterre et en Ecosse." Rapport adressé a son Exc. M. le Ministre de L'Instruction publique, par MM. J. Demogeot et H. Montucci. Paris. 1870.

land the "spiritual luxury" implied in the former class of institution, while as the land of practical activity, labour, and industry, she needs more than any other land schools of applied science, where a man may learn how to become at once the artificer of the public fortunes and of his own. Scotland, a land poorer and less well favoured by nature, has to economise her resources, and to make of her four Universities, centres of education at once for general and professional purposes. She unites in each *le lycée, le seminaire*, and *l'ecole spéciale.* The authors of this work have most keenly interrogated all the English Universities and institutions for special studies. The influence of the State (though not the Government), of the Church of England, and of wealth are noted as among the least commendable features of English education, though France is bound to borrow from the system of the English Universities and professional schools in the matter of their independence, self-government, and general freedom to give what instruction they like and how they like.

Mr. David Macrae's "Pen and Ink Sketches of American Men, Manners, and Institutions" is a really good work on America, which deserves to be cordially welcomed.[6] It is replete with racy and original anecdotes, abounds with realistic pictures of American life and character, and contains, in parts, vigorous political reflections and conclusions which of themselves are sufficient to impart to the work no ordinary value. For instance, Mr. Macrae is quite rapt with enthusiasm for the Educational institutions of the States.

"To form an idea of the system of common schools as carried on in the North, suppose a fisherman's net spread out upon a lawn; suppose the lawn to be the States; suppose all the little squares made by the net to be the school sections into which the States are divided, you have a bird's-eye view of the whole country as divided for educational purposes."

Mr. Macrae is favourably impressed with the practice of educating boys and girls together, and exactly in the same way. He says that the experience at Oberlin College, Ohio, is exceedingly favourable as regards the male students, though not so easily determined as regards the female. To the male student the presence of the other sex is said to be a powerful stimulus, and even dullards are quickened with activity by the fear of falling behind the girls. It has a refining influence also on their manners. Oberlin was the only College in which Mr. Macrae saw no spittoons, and nobody using tobacco. As to the girls, Mr. Macrae says, that they gain by it intellectually, and in some respects morally. He cannot pretend to say how it affects the delicate modesty and refinement which constitute so much of the charm of women; but he repeats a story told by a friend who studied at Oberlin and married an Oberlin girl:—

"The idea of kissing a girl who had studied anatomy and knew quadratic equations alarmed me at first, but after making the experiment, I found the kiss the sweetest I had ever got in my life." The

[6] "The Americans at Home: Pen and Ink Sketches of American Men, Manners and Institutions." By David Macrae. In two Vols. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas. 1870.

example of Oberlin in opening her college course to both sexes has been followed by the Iowa and Michigan Universities, and seems likely to be followed by others. In the common and high schools the practice of educating boys and girls together is widely prevalent, and in small towns and rural districts almost universal. An interesting account is given of the effects of the abolition of slavery in the Southern States. The benefits of this abolition are described as having been almost as great to the slaveholder as to the slaves themselves. The slaveholder could not confine himself, like the employer of free labour, to the maintenance of such hands only as best suited his purpose. He must take those born on his property as they came—good, bad, or indifferent. If they grew up wild and insubordinate, he had to try and tame them; if they were lazy and stupid, he had to work them up as best he could to some degree of usefulness. Many of the masters were exceedingly attached to their slaves, and never sold them when they could possibly avoid it. In innumerable instances they retained slaves that were utterly useless, simply in order to prevent them falling into cruel hands, or because the sale of them would have involved the separation of husband from wife, or parent from child. The burden again of physically maintaining the system and keeping the slaves in order was a serious incubus on the conscience of kindly and well disposed masters. "Sometimes I felt it so much," says one, "that if it would have served the purpose I would have taken the whipping myself. But it had to be done, sir—it had to be done! We could not have maintained the system, we could not have kept order for a single day with some of them, but for the lash." The necessary withholding of education was another grievous stumbling-block in the way of honest slaveholders. So also was the evil odour attaching to the system everywhere. It is said that the war has pushed the South into circumstances that must arouse her energies as they have never been aroused before. The lazy luxury that was enervating her people is no longer possible. Yankee and foreign enterprise are coming in. The most cultured and aristocratic Southerners are competing with the new comers, and the great landed estates that formed so marked a feature in the old South are being broken up, and smaller plantations and farms coming into existence.

"Everywhere and in everything slavery seems to have been slovenly—in the house, in the factory, and in the field. All this is destined to be changed. Farmers are beginning to go in and be welcomed who know how to till the land so as to make the most of it, and who will not only introduce improved machinery and improved methods themselves, but will compel their adoption by all others who would hold their ground against this new competition."

Mr. Macrae is not insensible to the weaker side of existing American habits and institutions. The short period of the tenure of public offices opens out growing opportunities for corruption and reckless place-seeking, and the mode of appointing judicial officers in many of the States is highly unfavourable to imperturbable honesty on the bench. The alleged boastfulness of the American character is admitted as a true feature in that character, and is said to be grounded in the really extensive scale upon which American life, scenery, objects,

and institutions are really based, and upon the unwillingness of many foreigners to accord Americans their due.

"If an Arkansas man cannot boast of the education of a Boston man, at any rate he can chew more tobacco and spit more, and further and straighter, than any other man. If the Mississippi steamers are not so magnificent as some on the Hudson river, they sail faster and blow up oftener, and shoot men higher than any other steamers in the country."

As far as Mr. Macrae's observation went, most of the abuse that is poured out on Britain and British institutions, and of which so much has been made in this country, comes from the Irish, and from a few renegade Scotch and English.

For obtaining some precise information as to the progress of reconstruction in the Southern States of America and the improvement of the Negro, no source of information could be at once so valuable and reliable as the reports of "Schools for Freedmen" as furnished to the Government at Washington by the superintendents of education in the several States.[7] The present report, which extends over the half year ending December the 31st, including the period of the long vacations and the interruptions of the labouring season, is highly favourable. In December it was found that there was an increase over the same month in the previous year of 566 day and night schools, 955 teachers, 24,970 pupils, and also of 282 Sunday schools. This increase, it is said, by no means measures the whole educational progress of the race. The character of the schools and quality of instruction given have decidedly improved. There is now a thoroughness of teaching, regularity of attendance, order, and classification, "especially accurate grading of schools, whereby the teacher can impart instruction to a much larger number than he could otherwise, that was not possible four years ago." These features culminate in the high and normal schools, where there are now 3834 pupils in attendance, becoming fitted for the various professions in life; and also, in the general enrolment of pupils, 5973 have reached, and are now studying, the higher branches. Attention is called to the fact that the benefits of this education do not stop with the coloured man. His white neighbours recognise its advantage and seek a similar culture for themselves. In every State the whole school system has been quickened into a new life, and though results are not yet fully apparent, a revolution, at least in sentiment, has been effected which can never go backward. With respect to the detailed educational work in the different districts, a specimen both of the successes, the difficulties, and the general recommendations made by the superintendents, may be taken from the district of North-Western Louisiana and Northern Texas. The want of teachers is described as being great, 50 places being recorded where schools are ready to commence as soon as teachers can be procured. The district is so remote, lawless, and violent that teachers from the North and from other parts of the South justly hesitate to come there. Often those who could teach will

---

[7] "Ninth Semi-Annual Report on Schools for Freedmen," January 1, 1870. By J. W. Alvord. Washington. 1870.

not do so because they can make more by their trades or some plantation labour. Two hundred schools could be started within the next six months if teachers could be procured. In school-houses, the amount allowed for the year has been made to go to as many places as possible rather than accumulated in a few. The houses have been only built in places where there was a fair assurance that they would not be burnt down. It is said that probably more of the old slavery spirit and ways exists in this district than in any other part of the South. Thousands of negroes throughout this district are practically in a state of bondage yet. They have been remote from the influence of the army and the Bureau, and, *practically*, have not yet been set free. Many of the planters will not allow coloured children on their place to go to school at all. Along the Saline River it has been several times notified that no "negro school-house will ever be tolerated there." There is a good school law on the statute books of the State, but practically it is null and void, so far as any good it does to the freedmen. It cannot be enforced. The parish officials, in many cases, are, as the superintendent calls them, "rebels," and will do nothing towards carrying out the law. The superintendent is convinced that education in this district, particularly of the late slaves, should be taken care of by the general government. The existing law was pushed through the legislature as a matter of political capital, and many who voted for its enactment seemed to care nothing about it. "Make the education of the freedman for the next ten years a *national matter*, and at the end of that time they will be able to secure their rights through the several States in which they live. But now they have but little chance." The reports for the other districts may be read to correct any too partial impression given by the above. It will be seen that the reports generally give quite a photographic picture, accurate, and made up of strong lights and shadows, of the existing condition of the South. The report concludes with an account of the Freedmen's Savings Bank. This institution has now twenty-seven branches in as many cities and large towns of fifteen different States. Five years only have elapsed since Congress granted its charter, the signature being one of the last acts of President Lincoln. It is highly flourishing, and becoming a most promising source of moral and social education for freedmen.

In treating the subject of "Capital Punishment,"[8] Herr Van Benmelen has adopted the rigid method of examining at the outset, with great particularity, the grounds upon which all legal punishment whatever must justify themselves. The several ends of punishment may be "real" or "imaginary." Among the real ends are vengeance, expiation of the crime, purification of the criminal, reformation of the criminal, prevention of crimes, "neutralization" of the criminal; among the "imaginary" ends are satisfaction to justice and the appeasing public commotion caused by the crime. The actual question as to the expediency of retaining capital punishment is handled with consummate ability. Every possible argument of the supporters

[8] "Peine et La Peine de Mort." Par P. Van Benmelen. Paris. 1870.

of capital punishment is ably and fairly stated, and (as we think) completely answered. The expediency of retaining that form of punishment is tested by what are already the three principles of penal justice, the principle of judicial vengeance, the principle of war, and the modern principle. The last principle only admits the punishment of death as a last social extremity, provided that either the superior efficaciousness of that punishment be established or at least rendered highly probable, or else no other sufficient punishment can be found (as that of solitary confinement), either owing to the general inadequacy of existing institutions, or by a temporary lack of power to provide prisons, and defend them against assaults from without.

The reforms introduced by Döderlein in the mode of managing the *gymnasia* of Bavaria afford an old and enthusiastic pupil of the great schoolmaster an opportunity of drawing attention to some of the main mistakes made in modern education.[9] The essay on the subject is full of striking materials, and the observations made upon the facts narrated are apposite and especially instructive to English people, who are still very much at sea as to the best things to teach their children, and the best way to have those things taught. The main faults in education, which Döderlein successfully set himself to correct, were the habits of cramming young people with facts, instead of stimulating their minds; of teaching so-called "real" and useful things, to the disparagement of subjects; not training the whole nature at once; favouring a servile and selfish tone of mind by excessive prize-giving; and to abuse of competition, and teaching the wrong languages, and those the wrong way. It was the purpose of Döderlein to inspire his pupils with a feeling of duty and a real love of study, and to make them to acquire liberal habits of thought and action, very far removed from the current reformatory-like temper ever nurtured in the highest schools in this and other countries. The writer attributes the vices of the Bavarian schools to the bureaucratic system by which they are governed, and recommends a general infusion of skilled educational force in the ultimate governing bodies.

A good instance of the growing supremacy of social over political questions (if the two classes of questions can be separated) is afforded by M. Le Play's work on "The Organization of Labour."[10] M. Le Play is quite right in his complaint that most of the philanthropic attempts that have been made recently in the direction of improving the relations between employers and labourers have exhibited what he calls "a singular particularity." Those attempts have contemplated nothing more than the palliation of the disorder, or at the most removing some special classes of evils which are only superficial symptoms of a far deeper disease. Of such remedial efforts specimens are found in loan and provident societies, temperance associations, public libraries, savings banks, and new modes of recreation. The

[9] "Das bairische Gymnasialwesen einst und jeit." Eine erinnerung an Döderlein von einem ehemaligen schüler desselben. Erlangen. 1869.

[10] "L'Organisation du Travail." Par M. Le Play. Tours. 1870.

radical evils which beset the labouring community in the West lie far deeper down than any of these curative processes suppose. The evils are caused by neglect of the six commandments in the Decalogue, which prescribe reverence for God, for parents, and for women. The cure is to be sought in re-establishing habits of obedience to these commandments, and recovering the practice of such ancient customs as to the regulation of labour as best conduce to this re-establishment. The practices enforced by these customs may be grouped under six heads: 1st, permanence of reciprocal engagements between the employer and the workman; 2nd, entire understanding between the two in the matter of fixing wages; 3rd, combination of domestic industries, rural or manufacturing, with the general work of the establishment; 4th, habits of saving, favourable to maintaining the dignity of the family and providing for all its members; 5th, indissoluble union between all the parts of the family; 6th, respect and protection accorded to women. M. Le Play examines with great care the actual state of the labourer both in England and in France, and recounts the series of historical events by which that state has been produced. In England, the unhappy relations of employer and employed have been brought about by three main causes: the abuse of the principle of the division of labour; excessive production in great manufacturing centres; and the exaggeration of certain doctrines relative to the economy of labour, whereby "a systematic revolution has been effected both in the economical and the moral order." In France, the absolute monarchy of Louis XIV.; the general moral corruption that ensued; the influence of English theories, and the abuse of the doctrines of the Revolution, tended to destroy the practices which M. Le Play so warmly supports. The remedy is to be found in stirring up a sound national religious faith, in favouring the restoration of filial piety by repealing the revolutionary law for restricting testamentary power, and by making seduction a punishable offence. M. Le Play examines at length the different arguments for and against these several changes, and recommends generally a forbearance on the part of Government of all interference, and the greatest development of individual liberty.

Experiments in politics are notoriously difficult to carry out or to turn to much account. The number of causes and effects is so great, and the nature of them is often so multiform or obscure, that it is generally impossible to predicate with any confidence that any one is the necessary antecedent or consequent of the other. Nevertheless, in such simple matters as modes of agricultural labour, schemes of land tenures, systems of communism, and the like, all experiments fairly conducted bear a considerable value, and sometimes furnish most important clues to the real truth. Such an experiment was the "Co-operative Agricultural Association" established in 1831 by Mr. Vandeleur, on his estate at Rahaline, in county Clare, Ireland. Mr. Vandeleur had previously entered with much earnestness into the views of Mr. Robert Owen, but the immediate cause or occasion of the agricultural experiment was the murder of Mr. Vandeleur's steward in 1830. A minute and extremely clear and interesting account of the associa-

tion started by Mr. Vandeleur, is given by Mr. William Pave.[11] Mr. Vandeleur was assisted in his work of reconstruction by Mr. Craig, who is described as "a young man whose natural and acquired dispositions and character well qualified him to take a prominent part in the experiment." The first few months of Mr. Craig's residence on the estate was occupied in thoroughly ascertaining the condition of the people—physical, mental, moral; their wants and wishes, as far they knew or could express them; and the designs of the proprietor. When the preparations were sufficiently made, it was determined to organize the experiment under the title of "The Rahaline Agricultural and Manufacturing Co-operative Association." A draft of laws for adoption had been prepared by Mr. Vandeleur and Mr. Craig, and on the 1st of November, 1831, the whole of the labourers and artisans on the estate, consisting of 618 acres, and some living in the immediate neighbourhood, were assembled, to the number of about forty, exclusive of six orphan youths and children. It was arranged to admit each member by ballot, and, on the first occasion of its use, none were excluded. The objects of the association were described as (1) the acquisition of a common capital; (2) the mutual assurance of its members against the evils of poverty, sickness, infirmity, and old age; (3) the attainment of a greater share of the comforts of life than the working class now possess; (4) the mental and moral improvement of adult members; and (5) the education of their children. The rules recited an agreement with Mr. Vandeleur, to the effect that Mr. Vandeleur would let his estate for a year to the society, on condition that the rules of the society were strictly observed. The rent was estimated in quantities of wheat, barley, oats, butter, pork, and beef. The stock, implements of husbandry, and other property, was to belong to Mr. Vandeleur until the society accumulated sufficient to pay for them. Considerable personal powers in the way of expelling unruly members during the first twelve months, approving of new members, and choosing the officers, were reserved to Mr. Vandeleur. The mode of production was to be on the principle that every one should make use to the full of whatever talents he individually possessed; that each individual should assist in agricultural operations, particularly in harvest, and that each agricultural labouring man should receive eightpence, and every woman fivepence a day for their labour, which it was expected would be laid out at the store in provisions, or any other articles the society might produce or keep there. The fifteenth rule was, "that no member be expected to perform any service or work but such as is agreeable to his or her feelings; but if any member thinks that any other member is not usefully employing his or her time, it is his or her duty to report it to the committee, whose duty it will be to bring that member's conduct before a general meeting, who will have power, if necessary, to expel that useless member." Provisions were made in the rules for "distribution and domestic

---

[11] "Co-operative Agriculture: a Solution of the Land Question, as exemplified in the History of the Rahaline Co-operative Agricultural Association, county Clare, Ireland." By William Pave, F.S.S. London: Longmans. 1870.

economy;" for education and formation of character, under which head gaming, and the use of spirituous liquors, tobacco, and snuff were prohibited; and for the government of the society. Mr. Pave follows up in interesting detail the history of the society as denoted by such epochs as the use of "labour-notes," the introduction of machinery, and the great attention paid to the training of the youths and the general education of adults. The results were wholly satisfactory. The dwellers on the estates, from being the reckless destroyers of probity, became its conservators. In politics they were not moved as formerly by mere political excitement, but took a more practical interest in, and soberer views, of political questions. They no longer wrapped themselves up entirely in self, but could feel for, aid, and succour their neighbours in difficulty or distress. Such is the glowing account given of this little society by Mr. Pave. The experiment was unfortunately brought to a close in November, 1833, through the bankruptcy of Mr. Vandeleur, consequent on habits of gambling. Owing to the defective state of the law, the members of the society would have been ruined but for their savings.

The third volume of M. Laurent's "Principes de Droit Civil Français" treats of that part of the so-called "Law of Persons" which is concerned with marriage, divorce, and "filiation," that is, the relation of parent and child.[12] The part of the work which deals with the chief features of the French marriage law is contained in the second volume. The present volume, however, enables the reader to obtain a most distinct conception of the existing facilities for divorce provided by French law, and of the general spirit in which that law is administered by French courts of justice. M. Laurent's method is to follow the general divisions of the code, but not to bind himself by the order of the paragraphs. Thus he presents his subject as distributed according to an independent principle of his own, but for every proposition of law laid down he quotes the exact language of the code, and illustrates the correct mode of interpreting and defining that language from the discussions of the *Conseil d'Etat*, to which the code owed its origin; by *arrêts* of particular courts of justice; by deliberate decisions of the *Cour de Cassation;* and by what in France is called "jurisprudence," that is, the general spirit of interpretation that prevails among the whole legal profession, as contrasted with arbitrary written rules. Thus the method of M. Laurent, so far as it is faithfully followed, gives the highest value to his exposition of the existing French law. It is interesting, under M. Laurent's guidance, just to glance at the actual state of the French law of divorce. This is a subject which has a close connexion with some of the profoundest and most embarrassing problems of English society, and though the French solution of the difficulties is, as M. Laurent clearly points out, in many points far from satisfactory, still the questions have been approached in France more courageously and logically than in this country. Before investigating the legal grounds of divorce, M. Laurent

---

[12] "Principes de Droit Civil Français." Par F. Laurent. Tome troisième. Paris. 1870.

determines the principles upon which alone the right of divorce ought to be conceded. The question is between the expediency of recognising an entire dissolution of marriage, or of permitting a mere relaxation of one of its most prominent features, the common life of the married persons; that is, between divorce, and what is called in England "judicial separation." M. Laurent points out that marriage is in its nature eternal:—

> "Marriage is the union of two souls. Can one conceive two souls united only for time? At the very moment of union, they aspire for an eternal duration of the link which out of two beings has made one. They say to themselves, that it is God himself who has made the one for the other; they feel that apart from each other they would be incomplete; a joint life in this world would not suffice them; they would continue it beyond the limits of this brief existence; they trust love will prove stronger than death. Such is the ideal. Contracted in a spirit of perpetuity, marriage is in itself indissoluble. The author of the code admits this consequence as the rule, and up to this point the legislation of France is at one with Catholicism. The one separates from the other at the point at which the civil law recognises divorce as 'the exception.'"

The legal grounds for admitting divorce in France are either "determinate causes" or mutual consent. The determinate causes are, (1) adultery, (2) excès et sévices, (3) grave injuries. (4) condemnation "à peine infamante," and (5) what is called "Le Cas de l'Article 310." As to (1) adultery, the law in France, according to the 209th Article of the Code, is much the same as in England, the effects of simple adultery on the part of the wife entitling her husband to a divorce; whereas, in order for a wife being so entitled, a husband's adultery must be accompanied with the circumstance of his retaining another woman in his own house for the purpose of committing adultery with her. M. Laurent strongly remonstrates against this state of the law, and points out that the peculiar consequences following on a wife's adultery, may be a good ground for increasing or varying the penalty, but is a consideration wholly irrelevant to the question of divorce. Perfect fidelity is of the essence of marriage, and when this is once infringed, one party is just as much entitled to complete relief as the other, quite independently of any aggravating circumstances. The juridical history of the ground (2) "excès and sévices," implying threats to life and certain acts of cruelty, is given in interesting detail. The ground of "condemnation à peine infamante" has lost its specific meaning since the abolition, in recent legislation, of all direct significance for the term "peine infamante." M. Laurent is not in favour of supporting this class of grounds for a divorce.

> "Marriage," he says, "has for its object the perfecting of the married persons. If one of them falls, the other ought to stretch out his or her hand to recover the fallen, and be very far from avoiding him or her as an abandoned wretch. If the contrary prejudice exists in our manners, it is a fatal prejudice, because it opposes an obstacle almost invincible to the reformation of liberated convicts. It is the part of the legislature to combat prejudices, and not to feed them."

"The case of Article 310" (3) arises when, after judicial separation

has been pronounced for any other cause than the wife's adultery, and the decree has been in force for three years, if the party which originally obtained the decree does not consent to its being annulled, the other party is entitled to a divorce. The most interesting part of the subject falls under the head of "Divorce by Mutual Consent." M. Laurent reviews at length the alleged reasons in view of what this ground was originally admitted, and he shows how insufficient and fallacious these reasons were. It was supposed that the only way of obtaining evidence as to the existence of "determinate causes" would prove to be the implicit confession of husband or wife, and that in all, or most, cases a mutual consent to a divorce would imply the existence of one or other of the causes. Owing to this sophistical or mistaken supposition, the ground of "divorce by mutual consent" has been hampered by a number of conditions which have gone far to limit its usefulness, and have indeed been illogical and inconsistent in the highest degree, as M. Laurent clearly points out. Thus no divorce as by mutual consent can be obtained if the husband's age be less than twenty-five and the wife's less than twenty-one; nor before the marriage has endured as long as two years; nor after the marriage has endured for twenty years; nor if the wife's age exceeds forty-five years; nor if the mutual consent is not authorized by the father and mother, or living ascendants of both parties to the marriage.

In his work on "The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man," Sir John Lubbock has made an important contribution towards the settling of many disputed questions on points of the greatest political and social significance.[13] Mr. Maine and other writers have already pointed out how much light may be looked for in the rudimentary habits and institutions of savages for the purpose of illustrating the true nature of some of the most fixed elements of a highly civilized condition. Sir John Lubbock thinks it much to be regretted that Mr. Maine, in his valuable work, did not more extensively avail himself of the sources of information opened out by an acquaintance with the laws and customs of modern savages. The difficulty, however, of forming such an acquaintance, Sir J. Lubbock estimates very highly. "Travellers naturally find it far easier to describe the houses, boats, food, dress, weapons, and implements of savages, than to understand their thoughts and feelings. The whole mental condition of a savage is so different from ours, that it is often very difficult to follow what is passing in his mind, or to understand the motives by which he is influenced." Among the special difficulties of forming a minute acquaintance with the mental condition of savages, Sir John Lubbock enumerates the difficulty of communicating with them; the fact that savages are often reluctant to contradict what is said to them; and the further fact that the mind of the savage, like that of a child, is easily fatigued, and he will then give random answers in order to spare himself the trouble of thought. The subjects treated in this book are of great

[13] "The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man." By Sir John Lubbock, Bart., M.P., F.R.S. London: Longmans. 1870.

variety of interest and every degree of importance. A large amount of space is devoted to investigating the method of progression from what is called "communal" marriage to "individual" marriage. "The lowest races," says the author, "have no institution of marriage; true love is almost unknown among them; and marriage, in its lowest phases, is by no means a matter of affection and companionship." Thus, in India, the Hill tribes of Chittagong regard marriage as a mere animal and convenient connexion—as the means of getting their dinner cooked. Among the Mandingoes marriage is merely a form of regulated slavery. "Husband and wife never laugh or joke together." The points of transition between this loose and brutal tie to monogamous marriage are marked by increasing particularity in the marriage ceremonial; polygamy (due in some measure to the necessity of feeding the children for three or four years with the mother's milk); polyandry (much more frequent than is generally supposed); communal marriage, by which the wife becomes as much associated with certain classes of her husband's relatives as with himself; individual marriage, founded on capture; "exogamy," and the attendant habit of female infanticide. The last three steps in this chain are due to a special theory of Sir John Lubbock's, in which he is at variance with previous investigators. Sir John Lubbock holds that communal marriage and individual marriage by capture existed side by side at the same time. Owing to the special and personal privileges attaching to marriage by capture, the feeling of a connexion between force and marriage became deeply rooted, as also the idea that a wife ought not to be taken out of the same tribe or clan as her husband. This conception of marriage is called "exogamy," and it has largely prevailed among savage races, owing, no doubt, much of its popularity to experience of the value of crossing breeds. The evidence adduced on this head is very extensive and highly interesting. The frequency of infanticide in the case of female children is a consequence of the joint notion of marriage by capture and exogamy. Sir John Lubbock's remarks on the whole subject may be summed up in his final conclusion:—"Children were not in the earliest times regarded as related equally to the father and mother, but the natural progress of ideas is that—first, a child is related to his tribe generally; secondly, to his mother, and not to his father; thirdly, to his father, and not to his mother; lastly (and lastly only), that he is related to both." Sir John Lubbock's investigation as to the moral feelings of the savage (which he believes to be at a lower ebb than the intellectual, though invariably present in some degree), in his relation to law and to right respectively, on primitive ideas as to communal ownership of land, whether for hunting purposes or tillage, on laws of inheritance, on laws regulating wills, and laws for the punishment of crime, are extremely valuable, and even when they do no more than confirm the results of previous writers, supply an exuberant amount of illustration of every degree of interest and novelty.

In the course of direceting the tourist how to see Turkey in Europe, Greece, Asia Minor, Palestine, Egypt, and the Nile, in the most ex-

peditious and economical way, Mr. Albert de Burton supplies a vast amount of interesting information which it would be difficult to find given with so much point and precision elsewhere.[14] The kind of medicines needed, the best mode of dress to adopt, the useful languages to have ready for use, all tend to indicate the condition of the countries visited in the most vivid and pictorial manner. The best time for starting on a tour of the above description is said to be about the beginning of August, so as to get down to the Danubian Principalities about the end of that month or the beginning of September; at the end of which month it is advisable to be at Smyrna; then to visit the islands of the Southern Archipelago, and arrive in Palestine in the middle of October. The Suez Canal ought to be ascended at the commencement of January, as, if it is left till later, the contrary wind sets in, and the water becomes so low that one frequently gets aground, which causes great delays and lengthens the journey very considerably. Mr. Albert de Burton gives an interesting description of the canal and its formation, and discusses the question of its probable success. He himself does not share in the extreme enthusiastic views of the economy and security likely to be procured. The commerce passing through the canal being restricted to steamers only, will not, in Mr. Albert de Burton's opinion, be sufficient to leave a dividend for the shareholders, after all the enormous working expenses and obligation-holders have been paid. The immense amount of capital that has already been swallowed up, and the immense amount that will be required to complete it, will require the whole, or more, of the commerce between Europe, India, and China, to give anything like a remunerating interest for the money. The rate of insurance for navigating the Red Sea, and the difference of freight as between steam and sail, will nearly equalize the expenses of the passage round the Cape, and thus it is very improbable that all the trade will go through the canal.

A lecture to Jewish working men, by the Rev. Dr. Hermann Adler,[15] contains some highly interesting notices of the history of the Jews in England, a history which Dr. Adler complains has never been written by an English Jew. The events attending the recent plenary political emancipation of the English Jew are gratefully recounted.

In the region of maps, which is constantly becoming more important, and the importance of which is getting more and more adequately recognised, we have much pleasure in drawing attention to H. Hiepert's very beautiful "Atlas of Greece and the Grecian Colonies," in fifteen large sheets;[16] also to "Chambers's School Atlas,"[17] clear,

14 "Ten Months' Tour in the East: being a Guide to all that is most worth seeing in Turkey in Europe, Greece, Asia Minor, Palestine, Egypt, and the Nile." By Albert de Burton. London: J. Bowyer Kitto. 1870.

15 "The Jews in England." A Lecture delivered to Jewish Working Men by the Rev. Dr. Hermann Adler, of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews' School. London: Longmans. 1870.

16 "Neuer Atlas von Hellen und den Hellenischen colonien." Bearbeitet von H. Hiepert. Berlin. 1870.

17 "Chambers's School Atlas." William and Robert Chambers. London and Edinburgh.

simple, and effective; and to two more parts of "Fullerton's Hand-Atlas of the World,"[18] which, we have already had frequent occasion to notice, is one of the most valuable contributions now being made to this department of popular education.

SCIENCE.

MR. PROCTOR'S admirable Star-Atlas[1] seems to have been prepared by that gentleman with the greatest care, and will doubtless prove exceedingly useful to astronomers. It consists of twelve circular maps, each including about a tenth part of the whole of the heavens; so that the maps overlap each other on all sides; and their correlation is further provided for by index maps of the northern and southern hemispheres, in which, by an ingenious arrangement, the constellations are represented nearly as on a plane surface. By dividing the whole surface into so many parts, the author gets rid of that extreme distortion which is inevitable when a large portion of the heavens is included in a single map; and by the system adopted, the various stars are shown as nearly as possible at their true distances apart. The index maps, which are very clearly and nicely done, include all stars down to the fifth magnitude; in the others, all stars visible to the naked eye—that is to say, down to the seventh magnitude—are shown. The multiple and coloured stars are indicated by letters, and various other letters and marks furnish a good deal of valuable information as to authorities, &c. Further, the direction of precession is shown in each map by means of dotted lines with interpolated arrows. In an introduction, Mr. Proctor discusses the different modes that may be adopted in the preparation of star-maps, and shows very clearly the advantage of the one followed by him. He apologizes, rather unnecessarily, for the execution of the maps, which, he says, are not so good in some of their details of lettering, &c., as he could have wished. But any disadvantages of this kind are amply compensated by the fact that, from the process adopted, we have in these maps the actual reproduction of the author's work, each map having been carefully drawn and finished by him on a much larger scale, and then reduced and printed by the process of photo-lithography.

We need do no more than call the reader's attention to the appearance of a third edition of Professor Helmholtz's treatise on the perception of musical notes,[2] which has received considerable additions, especially in the Physiological Section.

[18] "A Descriptive Hand-Atlas of the World." Parts 11 and 12. London and Edinburgh: Fullerton.

[1] "A New Star-Atlas, for the Library, the School, and the Observatory." Drawn by Richard A. Proctor, B.A., F.R.A.S.; and Photo-lithographed by A. Brothers, F.R.A.S. Folio. London: Longmans. 1870.

[2] "Die Lehre von den Tonempfindungen, als physiologische Grundlage für die Theorie der Musik." Von H. Helmholtz. Third Edition. 8vo. Brunswick: Vieweg. 1870.

In the course of the successful career which has placed him in the very first rank of naturalists, Professor Huxley has, of course, published a great number of essays of various kinds, whose value is, to a certain extent, ephemeral. But amongst these are many which will merit being rescued from the periodical publications through whose pages they are scattered, and the distinguished author has conferred a benefit upon all thoughtful readers by reprinting a selection of these "Lay Sermons, Addresses and Reviews," in a handsome octavo volume.[3] These Essays, which relate in part to the author's speciality, Natural History, and in part to questions connected with general education, and especially the introduction of scientific teaching into our ordinary course, are all of great value, whether we consider the sound common sense which pervades them, or the brilliancy of literary treatment which most of them display. The scientific papers include, amongst others, the celebrated Edinburgh "Lay Sermon" on the Physical Basis of Life; the admirable lecture on a piece of chalk, delivered in 1868 to the working men of Norwich; and the addresses read by the author to the Geological Society in 1862 and 1869, in which he discussed questions of such high importance to our general views of geology. The concluding paper—an address on Descartes's "Discours," delivered to the Cambridge Young Men's Christian Society in March of the present year—strikes us as one of the best in the volume, and we can only hope that it may produce its due crop of charitable and liberal thought, not only in the minds of those who first heard it, but also in those of a large circle of readers.

Among the supporters of Darwinism, or, at least, of the theory of evolution, none have taken a bolder flight than Professor Häckel, of Jena. Not contented with maintaining the doctrines of Natural Selection, Professor Häckel, in common, it must be confessed, with many other German *savants*, accepted the Darwinian theory as fully established; and first, in his "General Morphology of Organisms" (1866), and afterwards in his "Natural History of Creation,"[4] a second edition of which is now before us, endeavoured not only to lay down the general laws under which the evolution of species may have taken place, but also to demonstrate the actual course which the development of organisms has followed, and in point of fact to draw up the genealogical tree of the whole vast family of organized beings. The "Natural History of Creation," which is intended as a work for general readers, contains a history of the various phases under which the hypothesis of evolution has successively presented itself, with a special indication of those laws which, in their totality, constitute the essence of the theory of Natural Selection, followed by a genealogical analysis of the groups admitted by the author in the organic world, and a discussion of certain objections which have been urged against the theory of the origin of species by descent with modification. It

---

[3] "Lay Sermons, Addresses, and Reviews." By T. H. Huxley, LL.D., F.R.S. 8vo. London: Macmillan. 1870.

[4] "Naturliche Schöpfungsgeschichte." Von Dr. Ernst Häckel. Second Edition. 8vo. Berlin: G. Reimer. 1870.

would be impossible for us, in our limited space, to enter into any detailed account of Professor Häckel's views; suffice it to say, that although we can by no means agree with them all, there is a great part of his book in which we can most heartily go with him; and, at any rate, its contents are always highly suggestive.

We have to notice a new edition of Mrs. Loudon's "First Book of Botany," produced under the care of Mr. D. Wooster.[5] It contains scarcely any account of the minute structure and physiology of plants, but briefly describes the external parts and their terminology, and then gives a sketch of the natural classification of the Vegetable Kingdom. The latter occupies more than four-fifths of the book, which will hardly do much for the diffusion of botanical knowledge. The woodcuts are tolerably numerous, and good.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

IN the preface to the first volume of the English edition of M. Lenormant's "Manual of Ancient History," an intimation was given that the History of the Indians would form a constituent part of the projected work.[1] In the present instalment of the English edition we are told that this portion of the French original is purposely omitted, not from dissatisfaction with M. Lenormant's literary competency, but from a distrust of the reality of the very foundation on which all the history of Ancient India rests. Professor Rawlinson, indeed, whom we should hardly suspect of undue scepticism on such a point, questions whether India can be properly said to have a history at all during the period comprised in the antiquity of M. Lenormant. Where the basis is considered so insecure, we contemplate with gratitude the vacancy which the omission of a precarious superstructure creates. The new volume of the English edition of the *Manual* contains the history, necessarily in an imperfect form, of four great nations of antiquity—the Medes and Persians, Phœnicians and Arabians. The volume opens with a chapter on the primitive Aryans, their civilization, social relations, and religion, with a dissertation that might very well be spared, on traditions of the creation. A belief in the divine unity, disfigured by pantheistic personification, is said to have been the original creed of mankind in general, and of our Aryan ancestors in

---

[5] "Mrs. Loudon's First Book of Botany: being a Plain and Brief Introduction to that Science, for Schools and Young Persons." New Edition. Revised and Enlarged by David Wooster. 12mo. London: Bell and Daldy. 1870.

[1] "The Student's Manual of Oriental History: a Manual of the Ancient History of the East to the Medean Wars." By Francis Lenormant, Sub-Librarian of the Imperial Institute of France; and E. Chevallier, Member of the Royal Asiatic Society, London. Vol. ii. Medes and Persians, Phœnicians and Arabians. London: Asher and Co. 1870.

particular, and the Logos or *Honover* doctrine of the Zend Avesta is pronounced to be an adumbration of the Christian doctrine of the *Word* — the philosophical doctrine adopted and embodied in the Gospel of St. John. *Linguistic palæontology* is appealed to in proof that the Aryans were acquainted with our domestic animals, with some of the metals, with some military weapons, though not with the sword; that they had a domestic hearth, inhabited villages, and constructed boats propelled with oars; that they sowed seed, but had no ploughs; that the clan was directed by a king or chief; that the father of a family presided over all religious celebrations, marriage among others, till the priesthood became a separate function. The migration of the tribes which were to form the population of Europe was a work of time. A sudden and accelerated movement took place about 3000 years before the Christian era. The reform of Zoroaster is placed in the twenty-fifth or twenty-sixth century before Christ, a thousand years before Moses. In Persia, Ormuzd the good spirit alone was adored; in Media both Ormuzd and the evil spirit Ahriman, or Afrasiab, were worshipped at the altars. With Arbaces and the Aryan republic in Media we emerge from the uncertain twilight of paleontology into the dawn of recorded history, and the growth and destruction of the Median empire, and the foundation and development of the Persian power, till the revolt of Ionia and the contemplated subjugation of Greece are related, with the details found in Herodotus, Diodorus Siculus, and other recognised sources of information, with occasional glances at the results of recent investigation, as in the case of the Behistun Inscription. The history of the Phœnicians carries us back to the possible derivation of their alphabet from the Egyptian hieratic writing of the shepherd kings of Avaris, the foundation of Citium in the island of Cyprus, in the fourteenth, or even seventeenth century before Christ, and of Thebes, for M. Lenormant is confident that he has proved the historical character of the Theban colony. A chapter on the Sidonian period is followed by one on the Tyrian epoch, by a third on the civilization of the Phœnicians, and a fourth and fifth on the origin and development of the power of Carthage, and its manners and institutions. The reader will find curious matter in some of the pages in which these topics are discussed; in particular he may notice a comprehensive table of the Ancient Semitic Alphabets, including that compiled from the recently discovered Moabite inscription of Mesha, revised by Mr. Deutsch, of the British Museum, and on religion, in which it is asserted that the Divine Being among the Phœnicians and Canaanitish populations of Palestine, was sometimes called El, and sometimes Jaoh, "the being," "the eternal," a name similar to the Jehovah of the Hebrews. If Jaoh was really the name of an old Phœnician divinity, there need be little hesitation in tracing the origin of the Hebrew Jehovah to that God. We have a suspicion, however, that the construction of primæval history is a delicate and hazardous enterprise; and without absolutely refuting the startling statements of the historians of these very dark ages, we prefer a patient indecision to an enthusiastic acceptance of striking social or religious determinations. The seventh and last *book* of the *Manual* is devoted

to the geography and ancient people of Arabia, to the Adites, the Joktanites, the Amalekites, Midianites, Edomites, and Nabathæans.

From the palpable obscurity of primæval history, we issue into the comparative day of our own orthodox Dark and Middle Ages. In illustration of the character of these times the Rev. Oswald J. Reichel has produced an interesting and valuable essay on "The See of Rome in the Middle Ages."[2] We entirely agree with the author, both in his rejection of the extreme Protestant theory—which discerns in the Papacy only an unprincipled usurpation—and in his adoption of the view that the Papacy ought rather to be regarded as a result of natural growth, produced by natural causes. Believing with him that sympathy with past institutions is compatible with the admission that they are now an anachronism, and that while we oppose their revival in the present, we may allow their necessity and salutary influence in the age which gave them birth, we welcome his attempt at a philosophical and impartial survey of the history of the Mediæval Church, and recommend it, not as a final or faultless disquisition, but as a fairly-executed outline of a magnificent subject, and one excellently suited for popular instruction. The Papal Rule and the Holy Empire are the central objects of attraction in the Middle Ages. The German nations received the Christian religion and the Roman Supremacy together; became not only Christians, but Roman Christians. Mr. Reichel points out that Christianity was, in its infancy, the religion of the poor and unlettered; then the religion of the educated classes—the villagers, or pagans, adhering to their old superstitions. This change was the consequence of the Hellenic modification of Primitive Christianity; and, just as Christianity had won the educated, when to the Greeks it became Greek—so, when cast in the mould of Roman Imperialism, it came to the West, it addressed itself to the great, the princely, the noble, and won its chief victories by the respect which the Roman name inspired. The Apostolic Church was democratic; the church of the eighth and ninth centuries was monarchical. The people followed where their princes led, blindly accepting the creed to which their chiefs were pledged. The papal monarchy—the supreme sway over the Church—had its counterpart in the Holy Empire. Both were Roman institutions; both brought with them Christian civilization, political order, and regular government. Both, as our author rightly observes, had risen to power, each by the help of the other, and having risen, had struggled for the supremacy. It was to the popes that the Empire owed its existence; for the allegiance of the West was given to the Germans *in* the person of Charles, by the favour of the popes. The preparations for the papal sovereignty by Gregory the Great, however little intended by him as such; the submission of the West under his successors; the transfer of allegiance at the coronation of Charles; the development of the Papacy by the action of the false Decretals; the

---

[2] "The See of Rome in the Middle Ages." By Rev. Oswald J. Reichel, B.C.L. and M.A., Vicar of Sparsholt; Vice-Principal of Cuddesden College, and some time Scholar of the Queen's College, Oxford. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1870.

weakness of the Papacy under the rival Italian parties of Guido, and Berengar, and Adalbert; the theocratic aspirations and ecclesiastical reform of Gregory VII.; the efforts of Innocent III. to realize universal supremacy; the exorbitant pretensions and downfall of Boniface VIII.; the age of decline during the "Captivity" at Avignon; the great schism of the West; the Councils held at Pisa, Constance, Basle; the administration of Æneas Sylvius and his successors; the moral corruption and political degradation of the Papacy; the rise of nationalities, the reaction in England; the national and anti-hierarchial movements in Bohemia; the assertion of Gallican principles in France; and the final break-up of Latin Christianity and the Empire, are the prominent topics of Mr. Reichel's historical disquisition. Special subjects, of peculiar interest, are often separately treated. The chapter in which the nature, causes, and effects of the Crusades are discussed is instructive and generally accurate; though Mr. Reichel seems scarcely aware that, in the proclamation of the Crusade, as Von Sybel has shown, Peter the Hermit played a part secondary to that of Urban. Nor are we quite satisfied with Mr. Reichel's account of the English insurrection in 1381. To say that its object was to kill the rich and to redivide all property, is a very off-hand way of describing the movement under John Ball and Wat Tyler. The chapter on investitures and jurisdiction, and on a papal form of clerical taxation—having its origin in that remarkable impost on clergy and laity alike, called the Saladin Tenth—gives a fair enough recital of the points of the struggle between popes and kings. Besides a chronological table attached to the commencement of the history, four valuable appendices, containing Magna Charta translated, the Statute of Præmunire, the Concordat concluded between Pope Martin V. and the English nation, March 21, 1418, and the Statute of Provisors, A.D. 1350—are inserted in appropriate places in the "History." In our meagre notice of Mr. Reichel's book, we have drawn attention to the constructive character of the mediæval organization, and to the beneficial results of that organization. The abuse of papal power, and the terrible Nemesis which overtook that abuse, is not overlooked by our author. The Church and Empire of the Middle Ages, because they were a natural growth, were not, therefore, an ideally perfect government. The best among available instruments of civilization during those ages, they were not only not the best conceivable instruments of civilization for all time, but their use was accompanied with tyrannical excesses which provoked, if it did not justify, the violent reaction that ensued. The debtor as well as the creditor side is not forgotten in Mr. Reichel's impartial audit.

"The History of the Councils of the Church," based on original documents, by Monsignor Héfélé, the anti-Infallibilist Bishop of Rottenburg, perhaps better known in this country as the editor of the *Patres Apostolici*, has reached its fifth volume.[3] Beginning with an account of the Synods of Verneuil in 755, it closes with a narrative of

[3] "Histoires des Conciles d'aprés les Documents originaux." Par Mgr. Charles Joseph Héfélé, évêque de Rottenburg. Traduite de l'Allemand. Par M. L'Abbé Delarc. Tome cinquième. Paris. 1870.

the ten sessions of the Œcumenical Council at Constantinople in 870. The volume contains much curious and interesting matter. The names of Ratramnus, Gotteschalk, Rabanus, Hincmar, Photius, will at once recall the contemporary controversies. The singular heresy of Adoptionism, and the more important iconoclastic movement, fall at this period. In the controversy on images the Frank Church showed its independence and superior culture. Héfélé, however, maintains, apparently with reason, that in some instances the Refutation of the decrees of the Second Nicene Council sent by Charlemagne to Pope Adrian raises a false issue, caused by the ignorance of the Latin translator. With regard to the Refutation itself, the so-called "Libri Carolini," he dissents from the view of Baronius, Bellarmin, Surius, and others, who regard it as a fabrication; but he admits that the "Libri" seen by the Pope had a different form from that which our extant Libri have; that they are, in fact, an amplification made by the Emperor's order at a period subsequent to the mission of his son-in-law Angilbert. We do not see that Héfélé mentions the critical inquiry by H. G. Floss, which, in Dr. F. C. Baur's opinion, has adduced such powerful reasons for their non-imperial authorship, even supposing that Charlemagne were assisted by Alcuin. Héfélé, however, is equally convinced that the great monarch did not himself compose the book, and inclines to the belief that the real author was Alcuin. A glance at the title below will show the reader that his acquaintance with this erudite German work may be facilitated by a French translation.

A new edition of an important work of William of Malmesbury, one of our most valuable chroniclers, will be welcome to critical readers of our early ecclesiastical history.[4] Mr. N. E. Hamilton, who complains that hitherto so little editorial labour has been bestowed on the "De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum," has undertaken the arduous task of furnishing a correct text. Luckily the task has been facilitated by the discovery of what he believes, on grounds that are at least plausible, to be Malmesbury's own autograph, now in the possession of Magdalen College, Oxford. The work before us was completed, as we are told by the author at the end of the last book, in the year 1125. The object proposed by Malmesbury was to give a history of the bishops and of the principal monasteries, from the conversion of the English by St. Augustine to his own time. The history of the prelates in general extends over the first four books, and brings us down to the year 1123. The fifth book contains the life of St. Aldhelm, whose merits the chronicler was of opinion had not been sufficiently recognised. In the supplementary biography which Malmesbury has drawn up, the saint seems to have had ample justice done him. A copious index and a glossary assist the study of the text.

In another work, included in the mediæval "Memorials of Great

---

[4] "Willelmi Malmesbiriensis Monachi De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum Libri quinque." Edited from the Autograph Manuscript. By N. E. S. A. Hamilton. Published by the authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. London: Longmans and Co.; and Trübner and Co. Cambridge: Parker and Co.; and Macmillan and Co. 1870.

Britain and Ireland," we descend a little lower down the stream of time. The third volume of the compilation by Roger of Hoveden contains the history of England and Richard from 1189 to the end of 1195.[5] It comprises some additional particulars of the Crusade, a treaty made at Winchester, the letter of Peter of Blois to Hugh of Nunant, two singular descriptions of Antichrist, the longer of which has been attributed to Augustine, to Alcuin, to Rabanus Maurus, and Albinus, or Albuinus, but which, it appears, was written originally by Adso, afterwards Abbot of Der, to Gerberga, Queen of Louis "Outremer," shortly before the year 954. The second part of Mr. Stubbs's preface is an elaborate essay on the early history of Richard's reign, in which the characters and actions of Longchamp, Gregory, and John, are more or less exhibited. One appendix contains a long curious rhyming Latin poem by Monachus Florentinus, an Eastern bishop, on the siege of Acre; and another an account of the return and capture of Richard.

The sarcastic genius of the old church historian, Malmesbury, may be compared with the bitter spirit of Hugo Donellus,[6] a distinguished jurisconsult. Donellus was born on 23rd December, 1527, at Chalons. The name of his family, to which, agreeably to the custom of his time, he gave a Latin form, was originally Doneau. A good lawyer, Donellus was an indifferent Catholic, and in the forty-sixth year of his age, was compelled to fly from his native country, during the Huguenot persecutions, to seek refuge in Geneva. From the distressing poverty in which he lived while in that city, he was rescued by the friendly appreciation of the University of Heidelberg. In 1573 he entered on the duties of the office to which he had been formerly appointed, obtained a protector in the Electoral Prince Frederick III., married a native of Brabant, and led a distinguished and happy life till the accession of Ludwig VI. Escaping from the theological embarrassments which ensued, Donellus accepted a post at Leyden. Subsequently and finally we find him at Altdorf. These and other biographical incidents, as well as a specification of his writings and law labours, form the subject matter of Dr. Stintzing's instructive memoir of this celebrated jurist. Donellus died on the 4th May, in the year 1591. It appears to have been his particular merit to systematize the separate elements of law, regarding and embodying law as a rational whole, in which the individual parts are represented as integral and necessary constituents deducible from one parent principle.

A few years before the flight of Donellus from Châlons, occurred a far more important flight, that of Mary Queen of Scots to England. It is with the fortunes of this unhappy woman that Mr. Burton com-

[5] "Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Hovedene." Edited by William Stubbs, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford, Fellow of Oriel College, &c. Vol. iii. Published by the authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, &c. London: Longmans and Co.; Trübner and Co. Cambridge: Parker and Co.; and Macmillan and Co. 1870.

[6] "Hugo Donellus in Altdorf." Von Dr. L. v. Stintzing. London: David Nutt. 1869.

mences the new instalment of his valuable History of Scotland.[7] The abdication of the Queen was signed on the 24th July, 1567. On the 22nd August Murray was inaugurated as Regent. Mr. Burton's judgment of Murray's character and government is certainly favourable to that now canonized, now vilified, half brother of the Queen of Scots. His rule was vigorous. The Border marauders, says Mr. Burton, had not felt so heavy a hand on them since the days of James IV., but it was a hand guided by a wiser head, which sought to effect real order and obedience instead of wasting strength in irritating petulance and unproductive vengeance. Mr. Burton palliates the one great blot on the Regent's government by pleading its necessity. The promoters of Darnley's murder were allowed to escape; their instruments alone paid the penalty. But to close with men like Morton, Lillington, and Balfour, would have been tantamount to civil war, and a less scrupulous man than Murray, who would have taken the crown as the trophy of his sword, or a fatalist who never paused to balance means or ends, was needed for such prompt administration of justice as this uncompromising policy implies. Concentrating in his hands all the powers, civil and military, Murray's policy was as thoroughly constitutional as that of the English statesmen who promoted the revolution of 1688 and the Hanoverian succession. The murder of the Regent "broke on the monotony of Queen Mary's prison life with a welcome and joyous excitement." In a letter to Beaton, the Archbishop of Glasgow, she expressed her satisfaction with the deed, and her gratitude to the assassin, promising not to forget Bothwellhaugh's pension in the distribution of her property. In considering Mary's possible alternatives of escape in 1568, Mr. Burton decides that, unprotected as she was on the borders, "her one chance of immediate safety to her life was to get within English ground." Mr. Burton is evidently of opinion that Mary's partisans have little or no warrant for complaint on the score of the Queen's personal treatment. Her reception was decorous. The first place of her detention was Bolton. From Bolton, omitting a few months' residence at Tutbury, she was taken to Chatsworth, a place noted for its magnificence at the present day. At Sheffield Mary remained fourteen years. In 1585 it was found necessary to remove her from Wingfield, and thence again to the fortified mansion of Tutbury; and here Mr. Burton admits "there seems to have been reasonable ground for complaint that the place was comfortless and unhealthy." Yet, if the charge of sordid penuriousness against Elizabeth's government can be sustained, Mary, "if she lacked anything, had her own dowry, valued at 30,000*l.* a year, on which she might have drawn if she had chosen," and "all our incidental knowledge on the entertainment and appointments of the captive Queen leads to the inference that they were on a liberal and costly scale." In a previous notice of Mr. Burton's *History*, we have seen what is his opinion of Mary's implication in the murder of her husband. Since the first part of his book has been given to the world our author has

[7] "The History of Scotland. From Agricola's Invasion to the Revolution of 1688." By John Hill Burton. Vols. v. vi. vii. Edinburgh and London: Wm. Blackwood and Co. 1870.

read Mr. Hosack's able and ingenious volume, to the merit of which he bears testimony, but we do not find that his opinion has undergone any change. His belief in the genuineness of the *Casket Letters* is still unshaken; and without formally re-opening the question, he brings forward some considerations which serve to reinforce that belief. Lennox, the father of the murdered Darnley, had peculiar facilities for deciding whether these documents were genuine or false, yet he busied himself in collecting collateral evidence, tending not merely to support the joint story of the Casket Letters, and of his own adherent, but otherwise to bring home guilty conclusions against his son's widow. The adherent referred to was Crawford, a great military commander, and the head of an honourable house, and his attested report of Darnley's conversation with his wife at Glasgow tallies exactly with that attributed to the Queen in the Casket Letters, and was put in evidence against her by Lennox. Again, in the deprecation of a conference expressed to Mary by her attached counsellor Leslie, the Bishop of Ross, Mr. Burton sees something ominously suggestive of the fact that her enemies knew that which would put her in their power, and in the Queen's reception of his warnings something scarcely less suggestive. Among those who avowed a belief in Mary's guilt, and who had seen the Casket Letters and acknowledged them to be genuine, was the Duke of Norfolk, whose subsequent wooing of the fugitive Queen is a mysterious passage in history, which Mr. Burton endeavours, perhaps not very successfully, to explain. The Norfolk romance was extinguished on the scaffold. Mr. Burton dwells sarcastically on Mary's "favourite pastime of besieging the male human heart," of her apparatus of fascination and glimpses into a world of love intrigue. She was ready, he tells us, to abandon Bothwell, as a necessary condition for achieving a victory over Norfolk; and he adds, that if they be correctly deciphered, her love letters to "my Norfolk" have even some faint harmony with the letters in the casket. Mr. Burton's estimate of Mary's character reminds us of Mr. Swinburne's portrait of the ill-starred Queen, and seems to challenge the criticism which has seen in it only a psychological or an ethical impossibility. Of her rival, Elizabeth, Mr. Burton has not been called to draw a full-length portrait. His opinion, so far as it is expressed, is scarcely more favourable, we think, than Mr. Froude's. Her caprice, her wilfulness, her penuriousness, her dislike of responsibility, her adherence to despotic notions, he acknowledges, or indicates. With Mr. Froude and Ranke, he regards as authentic the letter attributed to Walsingham and Davison, advising the clandestine death of the Scots Queen, after sentence had been pronounced. We should like to see this subject critically investigated by a competent person. The *Note* of Mr. Knight, in the third volume of his History of England, is the sole contribution of any importance on the opposite side of the question, with which we are acquainted. Of Mary's complicity in the Babington Plot, which had for its object the murder of Elizabeth and deliverance of Mary, if Babington is to be believed, Mr. Burton entertains no doubt. Mary's own part indeed in this conspiracy, he allows, cannot be proved to the satisfaction of devotees, and he adds, that "if we suppose a certain cipher to have been forged

by Walsingham's instrument, then the charge has not been proved." The depositions, however, of her secretaries, the confessions of Babington and other conspirators, and the inherent probabilities of her guilt, make the hypothesis of forgery incredible. Leaving the portrait of Mary Stuart as Mr. Burton has drawn it, we find some of the characteristic features of other notable persons, as Morton, Knox, Melville, James I., Montrose, and Graham of Claverhouse, delineated in these volumes. Of Montrose, Mr. Burton's opinion is less favourable than we should have expected.

Jenny Geddes, the stool-flinging revolutionist, is shown to be a mythical personage; the real Jenny Geddes was a Royalist herb-woman. The Wigtown martyrs, on the other hand, are pronounced to be historical characters. Commenting on the surrender of Charles I. by the Scots, Mr. Burton submits that the Scots had no more reason to suspect the English of any intention of putting the King to death than they had to be themselves suspected of such a design, and that it was not by the party to whom he was entrusted that he was put to death, but by the enemies of that party. In addition to the narrative interest of Mr. Burton's History, an interest from matter of a critical or reflective character is imparted to the work, as in the chapters on the Organization of the Church, Ecclesiastical Affairs, and Social Progress from the Reformation to the Restoration. The History closes with the Revolution of 1688.

The talents of Mr. Froude receive occasional recognition from the latest historian of Scotland, whose partial agreement with conclusions of the former writer we already have noticed. The justice of some of Mr. Froude's verdicts has been reasonably disputed. His misplaced reliance on statutory evidence; his too-ready faith in the heroism and integrity of men swayed by passion and self-interest, or dumb-foundered under the menace of a royal reign of terror; and his naïve acceptance of preposterous excuses for the excesses of despotic wilfulness, are generally known and allowed. Equally conspicuous are the patient research, the freshness, vigour, and eloquence of the copious narrative of the Tudor princes, to the composition of which he has dedicated twenty of the best years of his life. In the new and cheaper edition of the twelve volumes which make up his "History of England, from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada,"[8] we find little that calls for remark. In his prospectus the author tells us that the immediate occasion of the present work was the involuntary leisure forced upon him by his inability to pursue the profession which he had entered, but which he was forbidden by law to exchange for another; and the wish to vindicate the English Reformation against the attacks of High Churchmen, on the one side, and Liberal Statesmen and political philosophers, on the other. The result of a close scrutiny into the conduct of some of the distinguished persons about whom he has written, is the alteration of opinion

---

[8] "History of England, from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada." By James Anthony Froude, M.A., late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. In twelve volumes. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1870.

previously entertained, at the sacrifice of favourite prejudices. Thus, sharing at the first the prevailing views of the character of Henry VIII., he found a qualified defence of that monarch forced upon him by the facts of the case. With equal reluctance he was compelled to acknowledge that the wisdom of Elizabeth was the wisdom of her ministers; and that her chief merit lay in allowing her policy to be guided by Lord Burleigh. Many who have read Mr. Froude's volumes will consider his defence of Henry a by no means qualified defence; and all must admit the impartiality of the historian, who, in his estimate of Elizabeth, has had to do violence to all his earlier prepossessions. With the exception of the fresh evidence about Anne Boleyn, contained in the Appendix to the Second Volume, we have discovered no new matter in the present edition. This evidence is drawn from the despatches of Eustace Chapuys, who was the Ambassador of Charles V. in England between the years 1529 and 1545, which Mr. Froude has hunted out with infinite trouble. The collection was finally discovered in the Austrian Archives, accessibility to which is "one of the many happy fruits of constitutional liberty in that country." In it we have the most circumstantial of all the contemporary narratives of the trials of Anne Boleyn, Rochfort, Smeaton, Brereton, and Norris. According to Chapuys, Smeaton alone—possibly in the hope of saving his life—confessed. All the others were condemned on presumption and certain indications. Rochfort answered so well that many considered his acquittal certain. Anne, it appears, was hated by the orthodox, by the Imperialists, by the peers, and by the Duke of Norfolk, who pronounced her sentence. Some even believed that she had poisoned Queen Catherine. Chapuys himself, it should be added, regarded her with intense dislike. Mr. Froude concedes that charges of levity, folly, indecency, even if well-founded, are all compatible with substantial innocence; while, to the heated imagination of a world prepared by hatred to condemn her, they may have appeared confirmation strong as proof from Holy Writ. A wavering light is also thrown on the question of the divorce. Chapuys inclines to the belief that the ground on which Cranmer annulled the marriage of Henry and Anne was the earlier connexion of the King with her sister Mary Boleyn. Mr. Froude, however, while acknowledging the significance of the imperial ambassador's testimony, still thinks the balance of probability lies the other way. On the whole, the evidence of Chapuys is favourable to the view which asserts the innocence of Anne and her so-called accomplices; and we are indebted to Mr. Froude for this valuable addition to our documentary library.

The search for "Stuart Papers" at home and abroad may be further prosecuted, as Mr. Bannister believes, with important results. In his reprint of a discourse on the rise and power of Parliaments, laws, &c.,[9] which is ascribed, seemingly with good reason,

---

[9] "Some Revelations in Irish History; or Old Elements of Creed and Class Conciliation in Ireland." Edited by Saxe Bannister, M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, formerly Attorney-General in New South Wales. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer. 1870.

to Thomas Sheridan, of Cavan, he specifies in the appendix various repositories in which genuine materials of the story of the "Scot abroad" as well as at home may be found. Among other literary treasures he instances Thomas Sheridan's MS. history of his time, preserved in the Royal Library at Windsor. The tract of which this gentleman is presumed to be the author, is selected for publication because it affords evidence derived from notices of the history of Ireland "favourable to the advent of a peaceful and prosperous union of that island of Celts." This "ancient fact," confirmed by the recent experience of Thomas Drummond, is illustrated by the case of the Ulster settlements by citizens of London, and the prodigious moral power of Dr. Bedell, Lord Bishop of Kilmore, in 1629–1641. One result of both influences was the Anglo-Irish family of Sheridan. Thomas Sheridan, the author of the tract which forms the substance of Mr. Bannister's volume, was born in 1646. He became a student in the Middle Temple in 1670, obtained profitable employment in the Irish revenue department, travelled on the Continent, and in 1677 produced the pamphlet of which a reprint is now before us. The instruments for general conciliation on which the author relied, are toleration, education, and industrial employment of the poor. His remedial measures are a single supreme legislature for the three kingdoms; the ballot; an electoral body consisting of freeholders of every parish, and others if required, for the choice of a member; simplification of courts of justice; the establishment of a code of laws; and abolition of capital punishment. Besides the discussion of these leading topics, the interest of England in regard to France, trade, and banking regulations, are subjects of suggestive comment. A passage (p. 40) contains a singular allusion to the White King, or Rex Albus, from which last word an ingenious etymologist derives the name of the present Prince of Wales! The author tells his readers "that both for his innocence and the accidental snow that fell on his hearse, the late King Charles was that 'White King' who for some time was to be the last in England." The tract is well worth reading.

About a hundred years after the surrender by the Scots of this spotless monarch, the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, which terminated the War of Succession, restored France her colonies, gave Parma to the Bourbons of Spain, and assured Silesia to Prussia. In 1756 the Seven Years' War broke out. The history and policy of Maria Theresa in the interval between the two wars are treated with all necessary detail in a volume by Herr von Arneth, which bears her name as its title.[10] The author acknowledges his obligations to the Empress's papers which have recently been given to the world for valuable information respecting her character, opinions, resources, and the events which marked the early years of her reign. The government, the finance, the religion and ecclesiastical circumstance, the military arrangements, instruction and science, Hungary, Lombardy, the Netherlands, transactions with France, the diplomacy of Kaunitz, the relations of Austria and Prussia, of Maria Theresa and Frederick, of

[10] "Maria Theresia nach dem Erbfolgekriege, 1748 — 1756." Von Alfred Ritter von Arneth. Wien. 1870.

the Empress and her family, are the general topics of the eighteen chapters into which the history is distributed. As regards the seizure of Silesia and the treatment of Saxony, our author pronounces Frederick altogether wrong, but with regard to his conduct to Austria he considers him entirely right. The Imperial Court was preparing not only to reappropriate Silesia, but to acquire by conquest parts of Frederick's dominions, which were his undoubted hereditary possessions. Having certain knowledge of the projects of the enemy, Frederick was justified in the practical anticipation of hostilities which he offered to them. It is at this crisis, when all Europe, England excepted, was conspiring against the great king, that Von Arneth closes his history.

The Wars of Succession in Portugal and Spain furnish the subject-matter of Mr. Bollaert's informing, but most unattractive, narrative. He has one real qualification for the literary work which he has undertaken. He has himself been a part of, not of all, yet of much, which he has described. An intelligent, observing, and courageous man, he has participated in the difficulties, miseries, and dangers which he records. In 1825 he gave up his appointment of laboratory-assistant at the Royal Institution, and busied himself for a time with mining operations. On his return to England he resumed his chemical studies, but failing to obtain the assistantship which he had expected, he abandoned a scientific career, and accompanied Sir John Milly Doyle, who was then beating up for volunteers for Donna Maria.[11] Accordingly, in October, 1832, we find him serving at Oporto as volunteer rifle cadet. In the course of the next year we find him in the 1st Battalion of Artillery, performing valuable service in the Lordello lines. Of Don Pedro and Liberalism, and Don Miguel and Absolutism, of Marshal Solignac, Sartorius, Saldanha, Napier, and Terceira, much is written in this historical diary of public incident and personal adventure. The last battle was fought at Acciceira on 16th May, 1834, when the Duke of Terceira defeated the Miguelites, and Don Miguel, who was included in the general amnesty, took his leave of the Peninsula. A *resumé* of the political history of Portugal, from the marriage of the Queen, in 1835, to the Duke of Saldanha's return to office in the present year, occupies the four last chapters of the first volume. On the proclamation of the Queen in September, 1833, Mr. Bollaert left Lisbon in ill health. On his recovery, in the following year, he again sought for occupation and adventure, and as he had some knowledge of Liberals in Portugal, and wished to know something about the legitimists, his politics being of a Liberal-Conservative, or rather elastic, character, he carried despatches entrusted to him by Baron Maurice de Haber for Don Carlos and Don Miguel, both of whom were then in Portugal. An account follows of the cruel and destructive war which raged between the partisans of Isabella and those of Don Carlos; and a synopsis of the political history of Spain

---

[11] "The Wars of Succession of Portugal and Spain, from 1826 to 1840, with *resumé* of the Political History of Portugal and Spain to the Present Time." Maps and Illustrations. By William Bollaert, F.R.G.S., &c. In two volumes. London: Edward Stanford. 1870.

brings us down to June in the present year, and leaves the Liberal-Conservative agent of Don Carlos or Don Miguel advocating faith in progress, faith in democracy!

In 1789, George Washington was elected President of the United States of America by three millions of men, who, on undertaking to govern themselves, commenced that great democratic experiment in the fortunes of which the nations are so deeply interested. An excellent miniature history of this self-governed country, by Mr. Robert Mackenzie, explains the origin, growth, and political development of the United States; and narrates the incidents of the War of Independence, the war with Mexico, and the War of Secession, or Liberation.[12] The history is almost entirely a recital of events, having only the necessary minimum of explanatory comment. The author, while siding with the North, does not omit to recognise the gallantry of the South, and in particular the splendid military genius of General Lee.

The War of Secession in America was preceded by the Sepoy War in India. The second instalment of the history of this war, as related by Mr. Kaye, has, after a long delay, been given to the world.[13] The cause of this delay was the necessity for the reconstruction of the second volume, occasioned by the constant accumulation of unexpected material: an inconvenience, however, which might have been avoided by the adoption of a different method of publication. Having erred in forecasting the plan of the entire work, Mr. Kaye found himself compelled to make a selection from the chapters which he had written, in order to keep the second volume from exceeding its proper limits. This unfortunate necessity, perhaps, gives a somewhat desultory character, occasionally, to his relation of events. In the chapters thus selected, the earlier incidents of the mutiny, as at Meerut and Delhi, Benares and Allahabad, and different stations in the Punjab, are described; the writer then takes up, though for a time only, the narrative of those two great series of operations—the one expedition starting from Bengal with troops drawn from the Littoral; the other from the north-western frontier, with forces derived from the Hill stations and the Punjab—which were consummated in the capture of Delhi, and the first relief of Lucknow; tracing in one case the movements of Neill and Havelock, under the direction of Lord Canning; and in the other of Anson, Barnard, Wilson, and Nicholson, with the aid and inspiration of Sir John Lawrence. In a chapter which Mr. Kaye entitles the "Delhi History," he refers to certain admonitory symptoms of the coming mutiny. As the year 1857 advanced there was unwonted excitement among the Mahommedans of Delhi. The native newspapers hinted at changes resulting in the subversion of the power of the English. Reports about the part to be played by Persia, Russia,

[12] "The United States of America. A History." By Robert Mackenzie. London: T. Nelson and Sons. 1870.

[13] "A History of the Sepoy War in India, 1857-1858." By John William Kaye, F.R.S. Author of the "History of the War in Affghanistan." Vol. ii. London: W. H. Allen and Co. 1870.

France, and Turkey, were disseminated in the Bazaars and in the Lines, stories exciting "vague sensations of wonder and awe, which were strengthened by the circulation of the prophecy, which took different shapes, but pointed in all to the same result, that when the English had ruled in India for a hundred years, they would be driven out and a native dynasty restored." While this feeling was gathering consistency at Delhi, the native troops at Meerut, thirty miles distant, were then smouldering into rebellion, and the Sepoy war was about to commence. According to Mr. Kaye the Court of Inquiry, composed of eight native officers, elicited nothing when it assembled to examine into the composition of the suspected cartridges. All the witnesses who were questioned declared they were made just as the old cartridges were, and had nothing objectionable about them. A general impression, however, of impurity prevailed, and ominous sounds and sights were not wanting to foreshadow the aweful explosion of which they were the signs. The seizure of Delhi by the Meerut mutineers; the efforts made by Lord Canning in Calcutta to repair the first great disaster; the panic at the Hills near Umballah; and the march upon Delhi, are all described by Mr. Kaye with a facile pen and in glowing language. In the next division of his volume he takes us to Benares and Allahabad, and makes us spectators of the terrible scenes at Ghaut, and the daring deeds of two unrewarded heroes, Thomson and Delafosse. The battles of Futtehpore, Aong, and Cawnpore follow, with the horrible massacre of the women and children; and in the concluding chapter of the sixth book we have the flight of the Nana, the destruction of Bithoor Palace, the re-occupation of Cawnpore, and the first movement towards Lucknow. In the next book we have the conflicts in the Punjab, and the progress of the siege of Delhi. The volume terminates with an account of the battle of Nujafghur, leaving General Nicholson master of the field, and inspiring the hope that the coming month "would see Delhi prostrate at our feet." The tragical story, with its heroic episodes, is told with great fulness and with vivid colouring by Mr. Kaye. The ferocities of the natives are set side by side with the sanguinary doings of the Christians, as Mr. Kaye delights in calling the English. Some of the vilest acts of barbarity with which the rebels were charged, Mr. Kaye is satisfied, were never committed. On the other hand, it is humiliating to read that the "Christian" soldiers and civilians alike were holding bloody assize, or slaying natives without any assize at all, regardless of sex and age. It is on the records of our British Parliament that the aged, women and children, were sacrificed, as well as those guilty of rebellion. They were not, it appears, deliberately hanged, but burnt to death in their villages, perhaps now and then accidentally shot. "Englishmen," continues the historian, "did not hesitate to boast, or record their boastings in writing, that they had spared no one, and that peppering away at niggers was very pleasant pastime, 'enjoyed amazingly.'" Such is a picture of Christian civilization and the chivalrous doings of Englishmen in the nineteenth century!

A spirit of evil, it would seem, can dwell even in the hearts of men "not ungently made," as well as in those of murderous Sepoys or

vindictive Britons, or Nathaniel Hawthorne[14] would hardly have given expression to the malevolent sentiment, "I shall never love England till she sue for help, and in the meantime the fewer triumphs she obtains, the better for all parties." The volumes, in which this unpleasing sentence occurs, contains the author's impressions of persons and places in England, records of incidents and experiences in which he was interested, and descriptions of famous localities and beautiful scenes which he visited during the period of his consulship, 1853-1858. For maternal England as the old home of his fathers, Hawthorne had an admiring affection. His poetic feeling, or antiquarian taste, or love of exploration, carried him from one of our populous cities to others, and made him a delighted or interested spectator of our abbeys, castles, cathedrals, and landscapes, rich with natural beauty or renowned by historical or legendary association. Nor was he satisfied with seeing England only: he travelled in Wales and in Scotland; he walked through the picturesque Pass of the Trosachs, skirted Linlithgow Loch, and at Edinburgh inquired for John Knox's house. Besides notes of local description, conveyed in language of great beauty and impressive delicacy, Hawthorne intersperses in this diary of travel and sight-seeing, humorous sayings, critical observations, or amusing anecdotes. At Newstead Abbey, he saw not only the marble statue of Pan, which the "wicked lord" brought from Italy, but a female statue holding a little cloven-footed child by the hand which the gardener assured him was "Pandora, wife of the above-mentioned Pan, with her son!" In the Zoological Gardens he speculates on the final cause of monkeys, and, pending a better solution in a future state, suggests that when God made man, Satan perpetrated monkeys with a malicious purpose of parodying the masterpiece of creation. Among the notable men and women with whom Mr. Hawthorne conversed in England, were Mr. and Mrs. Browning, Lord and Lady Houghton, Miss Martineau, Mr. and Mrs. S. C. Hall, Lord Macaulay, Lord Lansdowne, Douglas Jerrold, Tom Taylor, and Bailey the poet. Of most of these he has recorded his impressions in frank, straightforward language.

Lord Byron,[15] to whom Hawthorne gives a few sentences in his Notes, has found a charitable, yet severe and scrutinizing, biographer in Karl Elze. The author of the new "Life of Byron" shows that he is perfectly acquainted with the literature of his subject, and has proved his competency for the office which he has assumed by the general excellence of his performance. Not that we are entirely satisfied with all his judgments, for we do not think he always does Byron justice, and he is unnecessarily hard on Leigh Hunt. Lady Byron, whether justly or unjustly, is described in language of uncompromising disapprobation. The Stowe romance, Herr Elze criticises and rejects. The charge of incest, he is of opinion, was the creation of a jealous and suspicious nature, fostered by the evidence of misinterpreted circumstances, awakened into life, perhaps, by the poisonous whispers of a female Iago.

[14] "Passages from the English Notebooks of Nathaniel Hawthorne." In two volumes. London: Strahan and Co. 1870.

[15] "Lord Byron." Von Karl Elze. Berlin: 1870.

This accusation, he thinks, was in all probability the secret confided to Dr. Lushington. Herr Elze expresses a confident hope that the truth will some day be divulged, and scant justice as he is inclined to do Byron, he declares that, in his opinion, the discovery of the secret will result in a more favourable view of the poet's character. In the section on Byron's place in literature will be found some remarks rather less commonplace than such critical efforts usually are, perhaps now and then rising into something like originality.

We are afraid Mr. James Calvert's "Missionary Labours among the Cannibals" would not have been much to Lord Byron's taste, however it might have delighted the pious woman whom he had the misfortune to call his wife. The first part of the Sternhold and Hopkins volume, edited by Mr. Rowe, contains a remarkable account of Fiji and the Fijians, of their theological beliefs, their manners, customs, industry, language, and literature.[16] It is a third and more compact edition of the work originally published in 1858, which has been altered and abridged in some parts, and in others augmented, so as to include notices of recent events.

The nature and objects of the "Memorials of Charles Parry" are sufficiently indicated in the words of the compiler, who introduces his book to our notice as a simple memoir of a young naval officer, enriched with no stirring tales of hardship or adventure, as "an uneventful record of an unobtrusive cheerful piety, and of consistent Christian principles, which it is earnestly hoped may be of use to that noble service which Charles Parry never discredited and always loved."[17] The subject of this memoir was born at Port Stephens, New South Wales, and was the son of Sir W. Edward Parry, who, on his return from his last Polar voyage, accepted a commissionership in that colony. His death took place on board the *Arethusa*, while anchored off Naples, on the 10th of October, 1868.

A pre-eminent place among Norman explorers is claimed by his admiring biographer, Gabriel Gravier, for Cavalier de la Salle, of Rouen.[18] According to M. Gravier, De la Salle's enemies, after his death, attempted, but in vain, to deprive him of that glory which the revenge of Time has proved so incontestibly his due. Robert Cavalier de la Salle was born at Rouen, in November, 1643, and perished, during an exploring excursion, on the 19th March, 1687, a victim to the jealousies and intrigues of his compatriots. He was shot at Cenis, in Louisiana, by Duhaut, who himself aspired to the command of the expedition directed by De la Salle. His travels and adventures among the North American Indians, in the valleys of Ohio, Mississippi,

---

16 "Fiji and the Fijians." By Thomas Williams. And "Missionary Labours among the Cannibals. Extended with Notices of Recent Events." By James Calvert. Edited by George Stringer Rowe. London: Hodder and Houghton. 1870.

17 "Memorials of Charles Parry, Commander Royal Navy." By his Brother, Edward Parry, D.D., Bishop Suffragan of Dover. London: Strahan and Co. 1870.

18 "Découvertes et Établissements de Cavalier de la Salle de Rouen dans Amérique du Nord," &c. Par Gabriel Gravier, Membre de la Société de l'histoire de Normandie. Paris: Maisonneuve et Cie. 1870.

and Texas; his discoveries and settlements in the neighbourhood of the great lakes, Ontario, Erie, Huron, and Michigan; his early education and subsequent career, are set forth with sufficient detail in M. Gravier's vindicatory volume.

"Family Records of the Bruces and the Cumyns,"[19] with an historical introduction and appendix, is a portly and imposing volume, compiled, as is stated, from public and private documents "by one who feels honoured by bearing both names." Intended merely for private circulation, it is published at the request of friends who felt an interest in its historical and genealogical communications.

The sole remaining book that claims our attention is an historical pamphlet, or occasional history, which, now that the Second Empire has collapsed, reads a moral that, though eternally true, has already a look of commonplace about it. For it is obvious that M. Beulé's[20] protests against the eulogistic estimate of Augustus, the benefactor of mankind and preserver of Roman civilization, are cryptical reclamations against the adulatory theory which, in the prostrate Emperor of the French, recognised the saviour of modern society and the enthusiastic friend of nations. In an elaborate review of the epoch, M. Beulé discusses the relations of Augustus to his age, to his family, and to literature; exhibiting the moral or intellectual characteristics of the Chief of the State, of his daughter, Julia, his son-in-law, Agrippa, his friend and minister, Mecænas, and the poets of the empire, Virgil, Horace, &c. The literature of the empire has an entire chapter to itself. M. Beulé rightly maintains the intrinsic superiority of Greek literature; but assuming that a knowledge of only one of the two classical languages of antiquity can be acquired, it may still be doubted whether the preference should be given to the Greek. With his general estimate of an age of servility it is impossible not to agree; and the errors, shortcomings, and criminalities of the father of the Roman people may be extenuated, but cannot be denied. Nevertheless, we may still believe, as Heeren believed, that as "the formal restoration of the Republic would only have been the signal for new commotions, the government of Augustus, if not the very best, was at least the best that Rome could then bear."

BELLES LETTRES.

HISTORICAL novels have long been viewed with disfavour by the ordinary reader. Whether this is due to the not infrequent employment of fiction in history proper, or to an entire disregard for

---

[19] "Family Records of the Bruces and the Cumyns, with an Historical Introduction and Appendix, from Authentic Public and Private Documents." By M. E. Cumming Bruce. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons. 1870.

[20] "Auguste. La Famille et ses Amis." Par M. Beulé, de l'Institut. Quatrième Edition. Paris. 1868.

historical narrative on the part of those who largely patronize the circulating libraries, it is needless to guess. The fact is incontestible. Nevertheless, it happens that now and then some one bolder than his brethren ventures into the proscribed domain, and offers for our perusal a fictitious narrative which owes a few of its characters and many of its incidents to a tragical chapter of history. The last adventurer is Mr. Baring Gould, whose varied information and particular knowledge of past events and controversial phenomena entitle him to approach with assurance such a subject as he now treats. "In Exitu Israel"[1] is the story of the religious side of the French Revolution of 1789. It overtakes the earlier movement to establish a Constitutional Church in lieu of the effete and iniquitous system of clerical tyranny. Mr. Gould espouses the side of the Abbé Grégoire; and his hero, Thomas Lindet, is the popular exponent of the liberal religious views for which the party of the Abbé fought. Lindet is the representative of the poorer clergy and the peasants. His speeches are full of fire and vigour. His behaviour to the poor, and his attitude towards the noble, are both in keeping with a nature so tinctured with fearlessness, hopefulness, and an ambition to do good. Two of the best scenes in the novel are when Lindet rebukes from the pulpit the memorable and fatal saying of Foulon, and when he confronts the upstart Bishop Narbonne, and is chosen a member of the States-General. We do not question Mr. Baring Gould's right to exercise an artist's discretion in colouring, somewhat highly now and then, the features of this man. An historical basis of character is the surest ground on which to create a person at once life-like and pleasing. Mr. Baring Gould evidently knows this, and hence the truth and appropriate likelihood of this central person of the drama. On the other hand, we think M. Berthier is made too much of a villain. That a man in his position was enabled so to abuse his power and to revel in the vilest profligacies cannot be denied; but that Berthier was guilty of all that we are here asked to believe against him is simply preposterous. It is true that the author's account of the deaths of Berthier and Foulon is circumstantially correct, for it is copied from history; but we fail in the enthusiasm which he would evoke in gloating over their miserable fates. If these characters had been made less ghastly, the story would not have suffered. It is revolting to contemplate the hideous spectacle of Madame Berthier, the daughter of Foulon, who suffers every ignominy at the hands of her husband and father; and at last, stung and maddened by their dastard conduct, sinks into a leaden-faced hell-cat, whose imprisonment in the Bastile furnishes the incident on which much of the best conceived and most powerfully developed action of the novel turns. Of this Madame Berthier we can only say that she awakens pity not unmingled with disgust in us; and but for one timely act of hers would leave us dissatisfied with Gabrielle's kindness and sacrifices for

[1] "In Exitu Israel: an Historical Novel." By S. Baring Gould, M.A., Author of "Curious Myths of the Middle Ages," &c. Two Vols. London Macmillan and Co. 1870.

her. Gabrielle is a sweet, pure, loving heroine; just as Madeleine is impetuous, daring, and fiercely goaded by the revolutionary blood in her veins. Madeleine is as zealous and patriotic, as Madame Plomb is vindictive and mad. Perhaps the Swiss saints are overdrawn; the Swiss corporal is too sentimental; and Nicholas makes love in the true spirit of a mountaineer turned carver of wooden saints. Madame Deschwanden is charmingly typical. Altogether this is a novel full of the most exciting incidents and ably portrayed characters, abounding in beautifully attractive legends, and relieved by descriptions fresh, vivid, and truth-like.

Passing from "In Exitu Israel," with its eerie incidents, excited groups of Frenchmen, and pathetic and picturesque description, we are brought by a familiar guide to disasters, troubles, and follies happening nearer home. Mr. Wilkie Collins[2] has long maintained a firm hold on the sympathy and taste of a large and appreciative public, and has endeavoured, by the most sedulous devotion to his art, to repay them for the many hours spent in reading his works. In a sense, he was the founder of a school of fiction which rapidly fought its way to fame, depending at first and principally on the skill and mastery of the chief. But when Mr. Collins's utterances became less frequent, and his lady followers abused the privileged acceptance which they owed mainly to his inspiration and influence, the decline of the school was not far off. Even now Mr. Collins has not quite recovered from the injury which so many bad copyists were the means of inflicting; for to parrot a known cry, or to parody a favourite performance to excessive iteration, is one of the sure ways to render it distasteful. Nor is Mr. Collins himself free from the charge of having forgotten much which gave a charmed power to his earlier works. He has fallen on evil days, which some believe he helped to bring, and he has courted the public to the detriment of his art. Faultlessly ingenious, particularly exact in style and conception, seldom dull, and hardly ever verbose, he possessed merits of the very highest order, which reminded one of no contemporary, and stamped all that he did with the impress of originality. True, he has lost but few of his peculiarities; but what he has acquired has been to his disadvantage, and has not harmonized with the better features of his original manner. One could tolerate lurid romance and improbable situations, but cannot tolerate hectic notions of real life, or dreamy wanderings in the byways of philosophy. Novels which are dependent on theories of dreams and homicidal mania are not those which will now win enduring recognition. But whatever inequality of merit may be detected in his works, it must be frankly conceded that everywhere there are evidences of some great merit. Mr. Collins must always command the most respectful consideration, for he has laboured assiduously to deserve it. "Man and Wife," the novel before us, is equal in literary ability to any of its predecessors. It is not less mysterious—especially in the portions relative to Hester Dethridge—and

---

[2] "Man and Wife: a Novel." By Wilkie Collins. Three Vols. London: F. J. Ellis. 1870.

it is more practicable and enjoyable than other works from the same pen. It is notable, moreover, for its dual purpose. Mr. Collins is not at all satisfied with some phases of modern society. To correct or remove these he becomes at once a champion and an iconoclast. He throws his three volumes at the head of the Legislature, as a reminder of the rotten state in which the marriage laws are; and he denounces with vehemence, and in part with reason, the cherished love of athletic sports. The villain of the story is Geoffrey Delamayn, who moves in the best society, trains for a foot-race because he is an acknowledged proficient in this supposed brutal sport, and betrays and deserts a lady to whom, it turns out, he has been legally married —in Scotland. Thus the two evils against which Mr. Collins inveighs are exposed in the same person. But we are inclined to think that while he has properly castigated the abuses, and denounced the continuance of the present marriage laws in Scotland and Ireland, he has too severely handled those who enjoy athletic sports, but take a higher view of their utility than does Mr. Wilkie Collins. However, the story will repay even the fondest readers of sensational novels. It is well told. The situations are marvellously contrived, the descriptions are most felicitous, and a few of the characters are both original and remarkably worth knowing. Sir Patrick Lundie is as distinctive a creation as one can nowadays expect, and it is impossible not to like his sly humour, his sarcasm, his sagacity, and his rare shrewdness. Bishopriggs is quite a photograph of Scotch character. And need we add that, like all Mr. Collins's plots, this is entangled and exciting enough to gratify the keenest lovers of intrigue and stratagem?

Next comes Mr. Harrison Ainsworth, with another novel from his prolific pen. There is as much mystery, but far less probability, about "Hilary St. Ives"[3] than about "Man and Wife." There is, as in nearly all the novels under review, one ill-assorted marriage, out of which the terrible events recorded in the novel are forced to arise. The weird spell of the old story-books is revived in a new form; and among gipsies, highway robbers, poisoners, and ghostly warnings, we become once more familiarized with the life which Mr. Harrison Ainsworth prefers to depict. The customary traveller "wends his way," and of course, after many hair-breadth escapes and tantalizing misfortunes, is poetically rewarded at last. To those who like a stirring tale we recommend "Hilary St. Ives." If the characters look like old ones re-dressed, they perform their parts admirably, and they have enough to do, even in the frequent games of shuttlecock and battledore, of which a young lady's marriage engagement furnishes the excitement. But our impatience of this class of novels is somewhat lessened in this particular instance, when we remember the effective humour of some passages, and the landscape beauty of others, and reflect that when with Lady Richborough in town we may forget the impossible Mrs. Radcliffe and her wretched surroundings, and mingle with a gay and worldly throng who are painted to the life.

---

[3] "Hilary St. Ives: a Novel." By William Harrison Ainsworth. Three Vols. London: Chapman and Hall. 1870.

"The Flower of Kildalla"[4] is another tale of crime and sin. The young lady with this poetical title is at first supposed to have been seduced, but is discovered after many weary pages to be only the victim of a private marriage. Indeed, the whole work is feeble. There are too many characters, and certainly Mrs. Murray has them badly in hand. Their conversation is for the most part unreal, or made up of tittle-tattle. Allan Gordon is the strongest, Lord Cloverdale the most gracious, and Maud Desmond the most improbable. The plot is flimsy and commonplace. There is not a bit of praiseworthy description, but instead much opinionative writing, which again is overladen with piled explanations and weak cumulative clauses. Mrs. Murray is good enough to pour out her full heart, and to betray among other dislikes one settled and vehement enough to disconcert, if not to annihilate, the "strong-minded" and "weak-minded" of her own sex, to either of which, it is implied, she does not belong. Perhaps Mrs. Murray is her own happy medium. Mrs. Murray's genteel horror of shams is not remarkable, for she condescends at every turn to sneer at the middle-class parvenu, the dissenter, and the woman of the nineteenth century. Mrs. Murray cannot bear the wealthier class, so she makes the son of a millionaire play the heavy villain, while his father is recklessly playing the fool, and his sister is consigned to the tender care of one of genteel family, who does not object to her money. But in every sense this is a mischievous book. Its realism is harsh and sickening, and its scornful idealism is irksome to a degree surpassing anything we have met with. Crude in conception, it is poor in execution, and second-rate even among second-rate novels.

After this it is a pleasure to take up a book which is contrived on very different principles, is healthier in tone, and free from the blemishes which are so conspicuous in the "Flower of Kildalla." Mr. Charles Carlos-Clarke has often been accused of unnecessary horseyness, and of a desire to show off the "pinks" and fast youths of society; but much of what has been uttered against him was totally undeserved: and now that his last work is before us,[5] we feel it a pleasure more than a duty to observe that, amid many charming scenes and agreeable persons, he never introduced aught which could disgust or aught which failed to place clearly before us the honest and moral aim of the author. True, some of his novels may be called *technical*, and might even be searched for advice by huntsmen and steeplechasers; but those professedly social, and dealing less with sport than with every-day life, are fresh in description, pure and graceful in style, and admirable in purpose. Mr. Clarke never wrote anything likely to encourage malpractices on the turf, brutality in the hunting-field, or rascality anywhere; and in "Myra Gray" he fearlessly assails the merciless and dishonoured class which preys on the good of society, and defames the character of nations. The heroine loves at first sight, and is entrapped

---

[4] "The Flower of Kildalla." By Elizabeth Alice Murray, Author of "Ella Norman," &c. Three Vols. London: Chapman and Hall. 1870.

[5] "Myra Gray; or, Sown in Tears, Reaped in Joy: a Novel." By Charles Carlos-Clarke, Author of "Charlie Thornhill," &c. Three Vols. London: Chapman and Hall. 1870.

into marrying the worthless object of her devotion; and in her trials and escape from them; in the criminal career of her dishonest and unfaithful husband, and of his partners in guilt; in the plain living and plain dealing of Deloraine; in the manifold situations at home and abroad in which we find them, there is ample material for a novel which, in our opinion, is decidedly superior to the previous work from the same pen, and will fully interest the reader from the first to the last page.

In "Long Odds,"[6] steeplechasing, racing, and electioneering, are severally treated with graphic and humorous power. Our hero is an Australian, whose doings in England are chronicled with taking minuteness, and who is relieved from his impecunious scrapes by the chance purchase of a horse whose winnings replenish his coffers. But there is a second hero of the melodramatic type on whom the burden of the story rests. He marries beneath him, and the *mésalliance* is the cause of the trouble which follows him and the majority of the *dramatis personæ*. "Long Odds" is a strange kind of book, but the author of it is unquestionably a man of sense, intelligence, and observation. We learn from the preface that he is an Australian editor, and we hail this admirable contribution to colonial literature.

Mr. Anthony Trollope is not uniformly successful in his varied efforts to please. The truth is, that longing after a reputation for versatility is now one of his confirmed weaknesses. Whether writing his travels in America, or defending the "morality of hunting," or attacking anonymous journalism, or throwing himself with full partisan vigour into the Irish Church controversy, he is alike beset with the anxious cares and hopes of one aspiring to be esteemed something more than a mere novelist. Yet the position he now occupies he owes entirely to his merits as a novelist simply. No one will ever care much about his version of Cæsar, and few are delighted with his occasional magazine articles. But if his versatility, or what passes for it, is ill-favoured, his astounding industry is one of the marvels of our day. Mr. Trollope works with a will, and he works long, earnestly, and persistently. He is the author of quite a library of novels, of which but a very few deserve the epithet trashy. If he has not taken a place in the front rank among writers of prose fiction, he has at least secured a conspicuous and recognised position; for although we derive, in every instance, some information and much pleasure from his writings, nowhere save in the pages of his novels do we follow him with the confidence and sympathy he deserves. The life he depicts and the events he chronicles are made supremely worthy of our attention by the skill so peculiarly his. Indeed, Mr. Trollope's strength cannot be mistaken; for his dialogue, if often commonplace, is all the more natural, and no one is really more able to divine what a certain class of people will say in any given circumstances, and what is more, make them say it in the truest manner. Moreover, Mr. Trollope's characters rarely say anything which we are not glad to hear, and never anything likely to

[6] "Long Odds: a Novel." By Marcus Clarke. Illustrated by Thomas Carrington. London: Trübner and Co. Melbourne: Clarkson, Messina and Co. 1870.

repel us. They have all some of the good-heartedness and moral tone of their creator, and we feel that they are fit society for even the tenderest and dearest of our friends. And herein we perceive the charm which has made Mr. Trollope one of the best *liked* of our novelists. Now, in the tale before us this charm is everywhere present. Here there is sympathy enough to atone for the absence of that strength which entitles his novels to be styled works of art. Throughout these stories we are once more made partakers of Mr. Trollope's frank affection for women, and experience anew the indubitable advantage he possesses over the majority of writers of fiction, as a happy, true, and earnest advocate of the worth and sweetness of female character. This is particularly noticeable in the tale about Mary Gresley.[7] This young lady, who has written a novel, a tragedy, and any quantity of verses before the age of seventeen, and who is then engaged to a curate whose influence ultimately causes her to leave the field of literature which she has struggled hard with the editor's assistance to enter, is the subject of a very touching and pretty story, in which are revealed many of the miseries and many of the hearty delights of a magazine editor. It is an amiable contrast to the tale which exposes the shameless persistency of Mrs. Brumby, who wheedles the simple and worried editor out of a sum of money for a worthless article, on the faith of a contract into which he never entered. Between these extremes we have Josephine de Montmorenci, who boldly attracts the editor's attention, in a series of scolding letters, and wins him to her side in a way which it will greatly interest readers to find out for themselves. The attempt of Mr. Molloy to waylay the editor in "The Turkish Bath" has another sort of interest, and is amusingly related. But we fear Mr. Molloy's madness is somewhat too methodic. Again, we have a circumstantial account of the vain effort to establish a magazine—"The Panjandrum"—the title of which might of itself suggest a premature collapse. But the best story is that called "The Spotted Dog"—the name of a public-house frequented by the hero, named Julius MacKenzie, who may well stand as the type of one of the most unfortunate classes in London. He was born a gentleman, bred a scholar, married sadly beneath him, took to infidelity and strong drink, and was disowned and abandoned by his friends. Although capable of doing great things as a man of letters, he is forced to write for what he calls the "Penny Dreadfuls," but in his better moments he seeks our editor, and, after inquiry, is intrusted with the indexing of a learned manuscript in three volumes. He knows and can do his work, and the shifts he is driven to in order to fulfil his promises are graphically yet most painfully told. His wife is an irreclaimable drunkard, and he has no peace either in his miserable woful garret, or in the room kindly given to him for writing purposes by the landlady of "The Spotted Dog." The struggle he endures between love of his gin-debauched wife and the better life within his grasp, is one full of anguish and fearful despair, ending in a drunkard's tragic death by his own hand. Mr. Trollope

---

[7] **"An Editor's Tales." By Anthony Trollope. London: Strahan and Co. 1870.**

approaches in this tale nearer to the stories which formerly gave to *Blackwood* the palm as the story-teller of the age. And although we cannot admit that on the whole there is much skill, or even—with the exceptions already noted—any of the power which peculiarly belongs to our best story-tellers, we heartily recommend the book as amusing and highly interesting.

From Mr. Trollope's pen we have also another work—a cheap edition of the favourite novel "He knew he was Right."[8] In this acceptable portion of the novel-reader's library, we have apt illustrations of the characteristics of Mr. Trollope's genius to which we have adverted; but as this especial book has already been noticed by us, it does not call for further attention here.

"My Schoolboy Friends,"[9] is a most interesting book. It has many attractive qualities which are sure to win for it a wide and lasting popularity among the best sort of readers. Boys, for whom it is especially written, will thoroughly enjoy it. The pluck, forwardness, buoyancy, honesty, fun, mischief, so characteristic of healthy boys, are found here, shaded by the meanness, folly, and premature wickedness which ever cross the path of even the juvenile virtues. But there is no attempt to draw a spotless character to play the part of hero. Best and worst are alike *boys*, and their varied and varying natures are the most significant proofs of their faithfulness to life. The author reports accurately what under the circumstances boys are likely to do, and with evident enjoyment he chronicles their exuberant, joysome common-places. Perhaps there is, however, too much slang. We know it is the slang of boys, but it would be better not to encourage them to repeat it. There is also an inordinate precocity about most of the boys, as an instance of which we may remark that the trial scene is painfully in accordance with the strict laws of evidence. Smith, the assumed narrator of the story, is all but free from precocity, and is quite a typical schoolboy. In his career we have a lively account of the give and take and the give and forgive rules common in boyish society. His pranks and childish waywardness while he suffered "primary education" at the seminary for young girls and boys and at Mr. Brown's private academy, are graphically set before us. We then go with him to Whitminster, there to renew our acquaintance with public school life. The masters are very much like those we have met before, if we except one Paddy Williamson, who is over-indulgent to the boys because they cap his stage-struck quotations from Shakspeare and applaud his bad puns. Surely this half-mad character is not a "counterfeit resemblance." If Paddy Williamson really occupies the position of schoolmaster the sooner he is removed from it the better, although we confess we would miss his good nature and his unctuous humour. On the other hand, the Kennedys are fair

[8] "He Knew he was Right." By Anthony Trollope. With Illustrations by Marcus Stone. London: Strahan and Co. 1870.

[9] "My Schoolboy Friends: a Story of Whitminster Grammar School." By Ascott R. Hope, Author of "Stories of School Life," &c. Edinburgh: W. P. Nimmo. 1870.

and agreeable specimens of the schoolboy order, as are also Abbing (a *little* overdone) and Lessing, who is in fact precocious as boys *are* precocious *with opportunities*. There are the usual fights, escapades, and sports; the close friendships and the spasmodic enmities; but not in a single page the merest approach to hysterical sentiment or uncalled-for preaching. In short, the author combines the power of vivid reminiscence of his own early days with the keen observation of a frank and good schoolmaster, and eminently demonstrates his fitness to become the authoritative writer of books of this class. As such we welcome him, feeling certain that he will prove a benefactor to the younger public, who are too much led away at present by the insane, unhealthy, and heightened stories of daring crime and sin belonging to the "Boys of England" school of literature. To this poisonous cheap drug, Mr. Hope's stories are a sure and safe antidote, for while his characters and incidents are real, they are described in a style graphic, pleasing, interesting, and amusing. For the good work he is doing Mr. Hope has, therefore, our hearty thanks and recommendation.

In painful contrast we have a novel written by a Mr. Worth.[10] Were the two authors to be re-christened we are sure their names would be exchanged, for a more sanguine yet absurd book was never printed than this "Letter of Recommendation." The wretched nonsense which is meant to pass current as an elucidation of the Eastern difficulty is interlarded with letters from the author's mother and brother praising his genius. Such well-meant flattery is all very well at home, but the public should not be made the victim of it. We cannot find a line in the book which is not far below notice.

The authors of the stirring "War Lyrics," which foretold great dramatic and lyrical power, have again essayed to tread the fields of their conquest.[11] They are conscious of their kind of strength, and are content to employ it in a restricted yet in the best way. With their remarkable classic purity of thought and expression they might hope to write poems in many metres and on the most diverse subjects, but they are satisfied with the praise which should ever await those who seize upon one uncommon theme and treat it in a sweet and philosophical spirit. There is much in their book which we fancy we may have heard or read before, but all comes fresh upon us with the force and vividness of which L. says (in "The Lost Son")—

"Old truths
Flash sometimes back on us with startling newness."

For, what is not new in this volume is newly said. This is inseparable from the writings of those who go in search of the truth and hitherto unknown beauty of what has long been but superficially understood, and whose most notable characteristic we might call *questioning*, for they seek and probe and question till they realize sufficiently the full

---

[10] "The Letter of Recommendation: a Romance of the Levant." By Frank P. Worth. London: Effingham Wilson. 1870.

[11] "Fra Dolcino, and other Poems." By A. and L. Authors of "War Lyrics" and "Hannibal, a Drama." London: Smith, Elder and Co. 1870.

import and tendency of the object of their devoted inquisition. In A. and L. there is this questioning, such as Annabella expresses—

> "I oft have wondered if a crime, a great
> Irrevocable crime, may not be sometimes
> The one exceptional action of a life . . .
> Linked neither with the past nor with the future
> By any evil bias of the soul. . . .
> A thought to put aside."

In "Annette Meyers," the story of an unfortunate wretch who murders the villain who seduced her, there is an analytic piece of criticism on woman, only a part of which we quote, but enough to show in what mood A. deals with such a subject. Woman—

> "Can rival man in her deceptive zeal,
> Laughing to scorn what she's forbid to feel.
> Yet oft, when cased in that cold mail of pride,
> She casts, like cobwebs, olden ties aside,
> Her heart, for all the iron case above,
> Swells with strong achings to forgive and love;
> And when the sternly severing words she writes,
> She dreams of meeting tears and reconciled delights.
> And, though the struggle of that twofold state
> A strange and bitter semblance may create,
> Yet is the bitterness more love than hate."

In many passages we are reminded of *In Memoriam;* and in such lines as—

> "What is, is hidden, and what's seen misleads;"

and

> "The more I see he is no mere ne'er-do-well,
> That will work hard at all things, save his business;"

we have instances of the paradox to which A. occasionally tends, and of the apt definition which L. so happily affects. In such phrases as "the fortress of despair" (a nunnery) and "his eyes *flash* blue"—phrases studded like brilliants over every page, we detect the intensified command of expression which proves the most seductive attraction. In *Fra Dolcino* we have the complete story of the religious hero and of the brave "Margaret of Trent," but we could not hope to convey an adequate idea of the variety and excellences of the work either by quotation or by the meagre examination we could afford it. Of it we need only say that it is a poem impregnated with the purest spirit, and sustained and finished with remarkable power. The "Lost Son" is the best drama of the sort we have read for a long time. The over-mastering sense of duty which dissipates the new-found love and happiness of Bernard, and hurries the drama to a brilliantly fearful requital and close, indicates the germ idea of the whole piece. There is not a miserable or bad poem, and hardly an imperfect line, in the whole of this volume of wonderfully good verse.

The "Echoes" of Mr. Watman Smith are sadly disappointing.[12] The

---

[12] "Echoes of the Past, Present, and Future, with other Poems." By W. Watman Smith. London: Trubner and Co. 1870.

subject is most ambitious and treated in verse far from dignified. The poem is written in the paraphrase style, or we might say that it is the representation of an elementary knowledge of Genesis, and suns and spheres, and misty views of art, science, and religion, turned into indifferent verse. There is no redeeming novelty, no thought which is not either paradoxical or commonplace, no image which is not borrowed. The verses are a succession of spasms—for there is no consecutiveness of ideas or language. The poem is divided into three parts. Each part opens with an invocation and a prayer that the author may be helped in his hazardous task. Incidentally, he thus furnishes us with some curious information, for we discover that "The Lyric Muse" is the best inspirer, and "a telescopic mind" the best assistance in a metrical examination of "the past." In treating "the present," similar service is to be rendered by the "Angel of Light," who is afterwards called the "Handmaid of Deity" (whatever that may mean), and this august personage is invited to comply with the author's request that his

> "Soul in ecstasy may fly
> In cloudless heavens to sing!"

The "Prophetic Sybil" is then implored to grant the author every needful aid to examine "the future," and among other boons, to endow him so as to

> "With preternatural sight inspire,
> And photograph his mind
> With views about which all inquire,
> And which th' immortal find."

Here and there we meet an unexpected beauty. Yet even then we find it in a mist of wordiness. More often the originality is of the following sort:—

> "Like the hapless maid whose bosom with little billows swells,
> We anchor on the past, o'er which remembrance fondly dwells."

The author believes in prefaces, and gives us a long one, of which it may be said that nothing could be less inviting, in the vain hope of bespeaking a consideration which he neither possesses nor will receive.

"The Wrath of Echo"[13] is a volume that will variously affect different classes of readers, but all will agree in praising the author for those superior qualities of which he is unquestionably the fortunate possessor. If he is not distinctively an original poet, he is one of the most tasteful and discriminating of imitators. The "echoes" we hear when he sings are the echoes of our best poets. Now we catch the refrain of Cowper's music, and anon experience the flushed delights of Keats. But throughout we note with pleasure the choice language, the easy and graceful rhythm, the felicitous description, and the general freshness, vigour, and accuracy of the style. His similitudes are charmingly apposite and never far fetched. His narrative is flowing, clear, and interesting. But his chief excellence is to be discovered in his sketches of scenery and the poetical expression of his sympathy with living nature—in the bits of landscape which are seen with the

[13] "The Wrath of Echo, and other Pieces in Verse." By G. M. London: Basil Montague Pickering. 1870.

eye and painted with the skill of a master artist, and in the vocal communing with every breathing object which can inspire a love of creation in man. The only detraction from this praise which we feel bound to accord, is to be found in the infrequent monotony, repetition, and false rhymes; and in the feebleness of the lyrical pieces. In addition to these lyrics, there are two long poems in the volume, and the first, "Marshalls," we prefer in many respects before the other, which gives its title to the volume. "Marshalls" is fuller of mellow thought, of more sobered fancy, and of more correct description. It seems the work of a man who has lived in a retired, beautiful, and happy spot, and has there during a long life meditated on the inanimate and animate surroundings. This poem strikingly conveys an impression of maturity in every and the profoundest sense. But when we come to "The Wrath of Echo," this sobriety is nearly dispelled, and the air of calm and earnest musing is peopled with gossamer fancies, and illuminated by flashing and dazzling lights from Fairyland—inasmuch that we are constrained to believe that the author is a young man panting after the glory which was not Keats' while living, and putting on as a contrast, in the first poem, the garb of "the old man eloquent." If "G. M." is young, he may in due season avoid the temptation to over luxuriance and racking fancies, without losing any of the true poetic wealth of power of which in part we have the evidence. If not young, then he doubtless already feels that the "Marshalls" mood is more conducive to the cultivation of a higher class of poetry, and to the making of a reputation worth having. He will feel that there is now-a-days little interest taken in Arcady, Cyprus, and Olympus; in Satyrs, Naiads, Oreads, and Napææ, in the contentions of gods and goddesses; for among these the author's fancy more than once runs into absolute riot. The higher kind of poetry is the poetry which possesses a human interest, and deals with the stirring thoughts, the touching incidents, and the loftier and holier aspirations in the life of man. Contact with myths teaches none of these things. We thus blame the subject, but we cannot say anything more than we have done against the art with which it is treated. As a tale of unrequited love and immortal vengeance it is incomparable, and the conceits, phantasms, and coy asides, are charming reliefs amid the imagery of narrative and splendid scenery through which we are enchantingly led. We regret our inability, for want of space, to quote—as we could very many passages—in support of our judgment, and we must content ourselves with the following pretty conceit, so akin to many others in the book. It is descriptive of the Hours in attendance on the Sun, whose dawn is classically described—

"Around him float the glowing Hours,
All knit with never-dying flowers,
From morn till eve they share his way,
And one by one adorn the day."

"Catalina" is the versified romance of the renowned Spanish nun.[14]

---

[14] "Catalina, the Spanish Nun, and other Poems." By J. Wimsett Boulding. London: Bemrose and Sons. 1870.

Mr. Boulding's manifest aim is to detail with careful exactness all the incidents in a career of wonderful adventure, and this is the secret of his non-success. The view of his task—for task it is—is fatal, and would be fatal to any poetry.

> "And he who this essays to rehearse
> Must tell the truth, tho' it spoil his verse."

And the verse is certainly spoiled. There are many fine and some highly poetical lines in the poem; but the defective and measured-by-fingers lines are more common. In such a poem sartorial lines are surely out of place; yet we have more about tailors than nuns. Whole pages are devoted to the mysteries of tailoring and clothing, and from these we take the following attempted *facetiæ*: —

> "At his suit of fine 'black' what swell ever looked 'blue.'
> And the tailor and debtor looked up in (a) maze.
> For she belonged to the race (not rare)—
> The females of masculine gender."

And then it is shown what frightful consequences would ensue if the tailor

> "Chose to turn 'tail'
> On the dandies who rail."

And so *ad nauseam*. We seriously counsel Mr. Wimsett Boulding to avoid what he may like to hear called poetic-historical narrative in variegated verse, next time he is unfortunately induced to undertake a long poem. Catalina's story might be told in good prose, and indeed we think it was in Cassell's Magazine a year ago. Of the "other poems," it may be said that they are suited to the "Poet's Corner" of a local newspaper, and this is about all we can venture to say in favour of their acceptance anywhere. We are treated to the iterated truisms respecting virtue and domestic bliss, and the customary ravings about stars, birds, snows, kisses, dearies, and the like. In short, Mr. Boulding merely traverses the beaten track of aspiring but incapable rhymesters. Yet Mr. Boulding might consider grammatical trifles even if he remains indifferent to metrical proprieties.

In our opinion Mr. Glennie does not improve: he perseveres, yet never was perseverance expended on a more useless and thankless toil. If he has a clear notion of the work he undertakes to do, so far it is well with him: to others his plan appears cloudy and ambitious. Mr. Glennie may be an industrious antiquary, a painstaking student of philosophy (which some read to their hurt), but he is no poet. The waste of power in collecting, and the irritation of soul in versifying, the materials so collected, must be enormous and depressing. Indeed so perverse a misdirection of ability it would be hard even to imagine, had we not the sad proof of it. Here we have a second volume, and the threshold is not passed.[15] Out of two hundred pages we have over forty pages of general and special advertisements—kindly efforts to elucidate the mazy verses; to say nothing of an introductory note,

[15] "King Arthur: or, The Drama of the Revolution." By John S. Stuart Glennie, M.A. Vol. II. London: Trübner and Co, 1870.

several mottoes, and two pages of "dramatis personæ"—i.e., animals and men. It may readily be perceived that we have so far made the acquaintance of few of the actors, for there are thirty-two characters, including animals, but exclusive of Avalonians, Fairies, Mayors, Men-at-arms, and Patriots. This gathering of men and beasts is in itself a revolution, and one is curious, to say the least, as to their destinies. When the "Revolution" is consummated, we may be able to judge them and the author, which at present it is utterly impossible to do with any degree of certainty and success. For we humbly confess that we have not the faculty to discern so far any poetry or any true dramatic proportions. After the agony of craving and seeking for something specially meritorious, we have failed—failed signally. Mr. Glennie must bear with us He may find appreciative readers, for among our vast population there must be many of a kindred nature, just as there are assuredly many whose judgment is blinded by their sympathy in a time of imminent need. Hence Mr. Glennie may have his thousands while Mr. Tupper has his tens of thousands. Our charitable wish is that he may—if they enjoy his drama. For if Mr. Glennie is misjudged, he has himself to blame. His iterated and reiterated prefaces and explanations will not avail to shield off the censure he has incurred—that of offering, in morsel after morsel, the *beginning* of a work, the recited proportions of which are stupendous enough to appal the most credulous. And this all the more, because in the section of this gigantic framework already given to the public there is little to redeem the work from the charge of incoherency, twaddle, verbosity, and insipidity. What is really worthy of notice, fits in badly with something else wholly despicable. There are, indeed, some forcible and happy thoughts expressed in language becoming a scholar and a poet; but these clear spaces of expression are so afforested with meaningless absurdities and dull commonplaces, that it will fully occupy a diligent reader to find them out. We have neither inclination nor room to cite good or bad, and now only give, and that with regret, our candid impression of Mr. Glennie's labours. Future instalments of his work may remove or modify our unfavourable opinion; but meantime we think little of this attempt to trick out hazy philosophism in the dress of poetry.

We are presented with other two dramas this quarter, both of which are, so far as subject and treatment go, worthy of the closest attention, but neither of which is likely to win from managers of theatres the approval indispensable to their production on the stage. The spirit of both is thoroughly classical. "The Fall of Palmyra"[16] is a fit theme, and here it is spiritedly dealt with by one who has evidently all the scholarly qualifications, and no inconsiderable dramatic power. There are many passages of great beauty; and our interest in the piece is never permitted to flag. The other drama[17] before us is in five acts, and it is brimming with powerful and animated

[16] "Zenobia: or, The Fall of Palmyra." A Tragedy in Three Acts. By W. Marsham Adams, B.A. London: Longmans and Co. 1870.

[17] "Ariston." A Tragedy in Five Acts. 1870.

expression. The mechanism of the play is well contrived, and scrupulous regard is paid to the time, place, and characters represented. Some of the songs are more than pretty. Yet, strange to say, this pamphlet is a foundling, having neither author's, publisher's, nor printer's name on it.

This is an interesting account (taken from the *Times*) of the Passion Play,[18] enacted every tenth year at Ober-Ammergau, in Bavaria. The representation commenced in May this year, but was interrupted, we believe, by the war. In this little volume, we are furnished with all the particulars in reference to going to, and staying in, the now classical region of Ammergau. In fact, Mr. MacColl gives us a sort of half-guide, half-history, and a graphic and highly enlightened criticism of the characters and features of the play offered to the world this year. The devotional aspect of the Ammergau performance is in striking contrast to the gross indifferentism of the Spanish in their Passion plays. Mr. MacColl has unfortunately overlooked this; but if we take one character, say Judas, we see the difference at once. In Bavaria we have an avaricious, weak, sinning, and afterwards penitent man; in Spain we have an ill-tempered rascal, whose only symptom of humour is clownish, and whose descent to hell is the occasion of fierce merriment. He is a villanous merry-andrew, at once removed from the comic Satan of the old mysteries and the significant "example" of the Ober-Ammergau villagers. Those who have not read, should read what to most of us is strikingly novel and inexplicable in the present age. The introduction, on Mysteries, Moralities, and Miracle-plays, is carefully compiled, and supplies all the information necessary to the proper understanding of what follows. Mr. MacColl tells us we find the relics of the Moralities in the pageantry of the Lord Mayor's Show. And surely the burlesque tomfooleries of the Moralities could not be more glaring than in our pitiful caricature of civic pomp and dignity.

Dr. Barlow has conferred an immense boon on the lovers and students of Italian literature.[19] This examination and analytical elucidation of Lord Vernon's "Dante" furnishes those who have never had the opportunity of seeing the grand and costly work of the Mæcenas of Italian literature, materials out of which it is easy to form a notion of the value and importance of this contribution to critical literature. After a first and fervent tribute to Lord Vernon's industry, scholarship, and munificence, Dr. Barlow deals carefully and successfully with the parts of the "Vernon Dante;" and we cannot do better than heartily commend his excellent labour of love.

Following up some excellent specimens of poems in classical metres, Valerius[20] now favours us with his views of the differences between the styles of the ancient and modern poets, supporting with great force of argument the quantitative system. What he advances is

---

[18] "The Ammergau Passion Play." By the Rev. Malcolm MacColl, M.A. London: Rivingtons. 1870.

[19] "The Vernon Dante." With other Dissertations. By H. C. Barlow, M.D., F.G.S., &c. London: Williams and Norgate. 1870.

[20] "Remarks on Quantity and Metre." By Valerius, author of "Poems in Classical Metres." London: Smith, Elder and Co. 1870.

expressed in charming prose, remarkable for clearness and sententiousness. If Valerius does not establish his theory, he at least establishes his right to be closely studied.

Mr. Moore's satire,[21] so far as it may be so called, has no reference, as some readers might suppose, to London adventures. The poem gives us an account, in very good Latin hexameters, of the various scholastic and athletic competitions of Oxford men. Of tips and betting, too, we have a hint. "Bookmakers" are not to be desired—

> "Hinc aberant, qui gaudent codice facto
> E damno alterius certos educere nummos."

The systems of prize-giving among the ancients and moderns are contrasted to the disadvantage of the latter—

> "At non Graia hodie cursori sufficit illa
> Simplicitas: non parva comas crinxit oliva:
> Concisum argentum in titulos, inscriptaque vasa
> Præmia victorum statuunt:" &c.

This is a mistake. The Greek athlete received a substantial reward, in addition to the garland which was the mere symbol of success—as the medal is in our own day. A reference to Virgil may satisfy the author that this Greek custom was copied by the Romans, for we read of the splendid prizes Æneas conferred upon the successful competitors in the funeral games. Æneas commemorated, by a public sacrifice, the anniversary of the burial of his father, just as Achilles had ostentatiously mourned the dead Patroclus. The distinction between these instances is but slight, and does not amount to any denial of essential similarity. It is mainly this, that in the "Iliad" there is a chariot race, and in the "Æneid" a galley race. The aim and reward were identical in the Greek and Latin poems. "Pericula Urbis," a poem highly creditable to the author, concludes with a spirited and well-executed description of the Oxford commemoration. The rest of Mr. Moore's book is taken up with translations, many of them far above the average exercises of the sort. If we except one or two translations, such as the poor and spiritlesss one of Ben Jonson's ode beginning—

> "Still to be neat, still to be drest,
> As you were going to a feast,"

we have nothing to do in the way of fault-finding; on the contrary, we feel grateful to Mr. Moore for the pleasure he has afforded us.

This volume of the series of "Ancient Classics for English Readers,"[22] was to have been undertaken by the late Mr. Conington, whose position among scholars eminently qualified him for the task; but the lamented decease of that leading authority on Virgil left the editor of the series free to give us his own exposition and opinion of

---

[21] "Pericula Urbis: a Satire; and other exercises in Latin, Greek, and English Verse." By William Moore, B.A. London: Longmans and Co. 1870.

[22] "Ancient Classics for English Readers: Virgil." By the Rev. W. Lucas Collins, M.A. William Blackwood and Sons. 1870.

the Mantuan bard, and it would be hard to discover elsewhere finer and stronger elements for the production of such a work. A more elegant, concise, trustworthy, and interesting abstract of the writings of Virgil it is impossible to meet with. As in previous volumes of the series, no opportunity of referring to modern sentiment and habits bearing on the different subjects is permitted to slip. And this end, a manifestly popular one, the arrangement of the book facilitates. The twelve books of the "Æneid" are represented by twelve chapters, bearing titles which indicate the diverse contents of each book in the original. Of these, perhaps the chapter most attractive to the English reader will be that entitled "Dido." The famous love scene between the Queen and Æneas is pithily narrated. Besides the "Æneid," which of course occupies the larger part of the volume, there are capital digests of the Pastorals and the Georgics. The whole is prefaced by a short account of the reception accorded to the writings of Virgil, and an equally brief and succinct life of the poet himself. There is, indeed, everywhere an appearance of condensation and completeness. The book is a gem of literary workmanship. After it one has no patience with works inferior in every respect. Without novelty, either of design or treatment, save where the novelty is peculiarly bad and unhappy, [illegible] versions of the classics have no claim to more than passing and no respectful attention. And in such a category we are afraid Mr. Millington's publications must be placed. All that he does has been better done before. In various translation he is but his own rival. It is easy to praise his industry and attainments, for of these we have unquestionable evidence, and of these he ought to be deservedly proud; but to extol the qualities displayed in weak and needless versions of Horace and Virgil is not quite so easy. Mr. Millington is not able to compete with the many scholars whose taste and proficiency in a like walk, have long been ungrudgingly recognised.

The "Satires of Horace" have been translated in many ways, but seldom successfully, and to the list of the unsuccessful we must add the name of Mr. Millington.[23] He makes no attempt to read aright plainly what has hitherto been both obscure and imperfect, and his choice of the metre used by Goldsmith in "The Retaliation" is in no wise justified by the manner of using it. Apart from the question of the fitness of the metre for such a purpose, it is clear that Mr. Millington is not sufficiently master of it. The easy lines of Goldsmith are cramped when they are not merely parodied, and altogether it is more a penance than a pleasure to witness the frequent distortions and malformations which they undergo. But the articles on Roman subjects treated in the satires are fairly written; and the book is embellished by many well-selected illustrations.

Mr. Millington's translation of "Virgil's Eclogues"[24] is designed

---

[23] "The First Book of the Satires of Horace, in English Verse, with Illustrations from Rick's 'Antiquities'—a Life of Horace: and Articles on the Roman House, Amphitheatre, Theatre, and Circus." By R. M. Millington, M.A. London: Longmans and Co. 1870.

[24] "A Translation of Virgil's Eclogues into Rhythmic Prose, with Notes based

for the student, who will appreciate the translator's effort to produce a version not in "awkward English." This merit does belong to it. Professor Conington's notes are a sensible attraction to the student still ignorant of them.

We have another book of Mr. Millington's before us.[25] It is a key to a book by the same author, entitled "Selections for Latin Prose, and Critical Questions," &c. The object is to aid those preparing for the Army Examinations; but unless the papers and questions are always the same we see little to recommend in these books. The Latin renderings in the present volume are worthily done, and the meaning of the words and phrases is fully and correctly given. But the English is here and there tame and diffuse, and the definitions are occasionally sprawling and incorrect. As a rule, indeed, we regard books of this "coachy" nature with aversion; but the present little aid to classic learning is not without its suggestiveness to those who are anxious to know what an Army Examination is like.

This recent number of the *Catena Classicorum*,[26] is an excellent and supremely useful edition of the well-known plays of Terence. It makes no pretension to extraordinary critical research, and yet, perhaps, within the limits, it is all that could be desired. Its aim being merely "to assist the ordinary students in the higher forms of schools and at the Universities," numerous, and, upon the whole, very scholarly notes and references have been given at the bottom of each page of the text. Perhaps they are a little on the side of excess, seeing that but two of the six extant plays with which Terence is credited are comprised in this moderate sized octavo. In previous school editions of the Classics, the error has been generally the other way, thus making the author somewhat difficult and uninviting to boys of the ordinary age and capacity. We trust that the text of the plays will be edited in a like neat and able manner, and heartily commend the present instalment to the notice of all heads of schools.

We can hope and wish for nothing better than this edition of Milton.[27] It is "got up" in the usual choice style of the Clarendon series, and there is not in the slightest degree anything left to be desired. The text is correct, the notes, carefully selected from the best annotators and critics, are full, genuine, authentic, and thoroughly suggestive. The book is divided into three periods, in which are respectively grouped, "Early Poems," "Sonnets," and "Last Poems." There is a chronological table, further elucidating the literary progress

on those in Professor Conington's Edition. By R. M. Millington. London: Longmans and Co. 1870.

[25] "The Latin Rendering of the Selections for Latin Prose." By R. M. Millington, M.A. London: Longmans and Co. 1870.

[26] "Catena Classicorum: Terentii Comœdiæ; Andria et Eunuchus." Edited by J. L. Papillon, M.A., Fellow of New College, Oxon, and late Fellow of Merton. London: Rivingtons. 1870.

[27] Clarendon Press Series. "English Poems." By John Milton. Edited, with Life, Introduction, and Selected Notes, by R. C. Browne, M.A., Associate of King's College, London. Two Volumes. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1870.

of Milton's life, and at the same time clearly setting forth the contemporaneous events in English and foreign history and in English literature. The life of the poet is brief yet full; and the long introductory essay on the genius of Milton and the times in which he lived, is searching, curious, just, appreciative, and eminently trustworthy. These two volumes might well be bought for the sake of this essay.

Lord Neaves sends us another little work,[28] which reminds us of some scientific verses of this old contributor to "Maga." The author of so many *jeux d'esprit* and witty papers on important questions of the day now enters the lists as a comparative philologist, but with all the modesty of one possessing his inestimable talents. His lordship read the work in papers before the Royal Society of Edinburgh, but as it is less original than his Songs, it does not, he affirms, merit a place in the "Transactions of the Society." Hence he publishes it independently, and we think rightly. It is indeed a short, sensible paper, laying no claim to novelty of research or discovery, yet affording us a pleasant and instructive view of the interesting domain of comparative philology. Another slight contribution to philological study comes to us in the shape of a second edition of Dr. Stratton's admirable little book on the Celtic origin of portions of the Latin and Greek languages.[29] It is easy to detect instances of far-fetched analogies, but these detract little from the true value of the work. Dr. De Firas has published the thirty-third edition of his systematic, exact, and complete French Grammar,[30] which is deservedly in great demand. And from Messrs. Routledge comes a new French Dictionary, which has the recommendation of cheapness.[31]

[28] "A Glance at some of the Principles of Comparative Philology, as illustratd in the Latin and Anglian Forms of Speech." By Lord Neaves. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons. 1870.

[29] "The Celtic Origin of a great part of the Greek and Latin Languages, and of many Classical Proper Names." By Thomas Stratton, M.D., Edinburgh, Deputy-Inspector-General, Royal Navy. 2nd Edition. Edinburgh: MacLachlan and Stewart. 1870.

[30] "Grammaire des Grammaires." By Dr. V. De Firas, M.A., F.R.G.S. 33rd Edition. London: Lockwood and Co. 1870.

[31] "A New Pocket Dictionary of the English and French Languages." By J. E. Wessely. London: George Routledge and Son. 1870.