











THE  
WESTMINSTER  
REVIEW.

' Truth can not be confirmed enough,  
Though doubts divers sleep '

SHAKSPEARE

Wahrheitsluste setzen sich darin, das man überall das Gute zu finden und zu schützen weiß.

GÖTTE.

VOL. CXLVI.

LONDON:  
FREDERICK WARNE AND COMPANY,  
15, BEDFORD STREET, STRAND.

MDCCLII.



## A NEW IMPERIAL HIGHWAY.

THE year 1893 will be memorable for two monumental developments of the spirit of intelligent and practical Imperialism, as distinguished from the somewhat hazy and sentimental Imperialism that had been preached in previous years, and which, from its unsatisfying and unsubstantial character, had raised doubts and difficulties in the minds of many men who sincerely longed to see some progressive steps in the direction of the federal unification of the British Empire. Two such forward and acknowledged advances towards the great goal of Imperial Federation have been made this year by the organisation in the House of Commons of a powerful, influential, and well-informed body of colonial opinion informally but effectively representative of the principal divisions of Greater Britain, and by the establishment of the first direct, regular, well-equipped, State-subsidised steamship service between the two vastest, most vigorous, and most potentially promising of Her Majesty's Dominions—British North America and Australia. The first of these forward movements I discussed at some length in the *Contemporary Review* for November, and I now propose to offer some salient and suggestive observations on the second, to submit a few leading considerations on the subject of this great Australian-Canadian enterprise that, I trust, will help to its better understanding by the British people at home, and to its prompt official recognition by the Imperial Government as a valuable aid and instrument in bringing the two largest, most energetic, and most progressive British communities into closer touch with one another and with the mother country as well.

Now that this direct, substantial, and permanent link of communication between Canada and Australia has been duly and successfully inaugurated, and that its mutually beneficial character, so far as these countries are concerned, and its far larger and wider possibilities of Imperial usefulness are acknowledged and endorsed by all who take a patriotic and intelligent interest in the progress and development of Greater Britain, it seems strange that we should have had to wait until this comparatively late period of the day for the creation of such an eminently desirable and manifestly important channel of inter-Imperial communication. But, as has so frequently been recorded of the inception of great and far-reaching enterprises, it was a case of the hour and the man. The idea of establishing



direct and regular communication between Canada and Australia had been mooted and discussed in a general academic style during previous years, but no definite practical proposals on the subject were submitted until last January when Mr. James Huddart, of Melbourne and Sydney, opened up a correspondence with Sir John Thompson, the Canadian Prime Minister, that was destined to speedily and satisfactorily achieve the long-wished-for connection between the two Dominions of Greater Britain. Mr. Huddart is an able and energetic, shrewd, sagacious, and far-seeing Australian, who has been trained from boyhood in the art and practice of inter-colonial shipping communication. His father, one of the pioneer-mariners of the southern seas, was one of the first to establish systematic and regular trade relations between the ports of Victoria and New South Wales. On the foundation thus laid by the father the son has built up and developed one of the finest, largest, and best-equipped fleets of steamers trading under the British flag. These steamers have for years embraced all the principal ports of Australia and New Zealand within the scope of their periodical circuits, and so, having exhausted all the possibilities of trade and passenger traffic in Australasian waters, Mr. Huddart, an antipodean Alexander sighing for fresh worlds to conquer, cast his gaze across the broad Pacific and asked himself—why not build a bridge between Australia and Canada, and thus bring two great branches of the British race into closer commercial and fraternal relationship. No sooner said than done. Mr. Huddart's communication to the Canadian Premier, offering to inaugurate a service of swift steamers from Sydney to Vancouver *via* Honolulu, that would minister alike to postal, passenger, and commercial requirements, elicited a prompt, sympathetic, and thoroughly satisfactory response from Sir John Thompson. The negotiations were speedily and satisfactorily completed, the Government of the Dominion of Canada entering into an agreement to subsidise Mr. Huddart's monthly service at the rate of £25,000 per annum for a term of ten years. New South Wales responded with an annual subsidy of £10,000, a sum that is certainly far from proportionate to the amount of benefit that the new service will confer upon the colony. Its comparative meagreness is no doubt mainly attributable to the pervading financial depression that hung like a heavy pall over the Australian Colonies during the greater part of 1893, but with the evident lifting of the clouds and the unmistakable signs of returning prosperity now happily apparent, it may be taken for granted that the Australasian Colonies as a whole will rise to the occasion and not allow themselves to be excelled by Canada in liberal and statesmanlike support of a great maritime enterprise so obviously and clearly calculated to confer lasting benefits upon the British communities on both sides of the Pacific and to appreciably strengthen the fabric of our Imperial unity.

In less than five months after Mr. Huddart had broached his felicitous inspiration to Sir John Thompson, the service came into active operation under the most encouraging and influential auspices. The pioneer steamer, with a full complement of passengers and cargo, left Sydney for Vancouver in the middle of May, amid a demonstration of general good-will and pronounced enthusiasm that showed how strongly the racial kinship of Australians had been stirred by the prospect of future close and intimate relations with their Canadian brethren. No less demonstrative and enthusiastic was the reception that greeted the arrival of the inaugurating steamer at Vancouver, after a smart, successful, and pleasurable voyage of twenty days across the summer seas of the Pacific.

It is a perfectly safe prophecy that the direct and regular line of steam communication between Australia and Canada thus auspiciously initiated will not be allowed to suffer any retrogression or interruption; that it is destined to increase in importance year by year; that its varied capabilities will be intelligently and systematically developed; and that it will be accorded a permanent place in the list of our great ocean highways. Already, at this very early period of its career, there is abundant evidence that the commercial possibilities of the new route have powerfully impressed the principal figures of the trading worlds on both sides of the Pacific. This is proved by the number of mercantile embassies that have been despatched from one Dominion to the other with the object of organising future trade relations and utilising to the utmost the facilities for interchange of commodities presented for the first time by the new service. It is shown in a very striking manner by the remarkable and unprecedented circumstance that at this moment the Hon. McKenzie Bowell, the Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce, is visiting Australia as the accredited official delegate of the Dominion Government, and conferring with the Australian Ministers presiding over the same department as to the means and measures to be mutually adopted for bringing Canada and Australia into the closest and most intimate commercial relations through the instrumentality of Mr. Huddart's Pacific service. That the outcome of Mr. Bowell's mission to the antipodean Governments will be gratifying to all the friends and well-wishers of our national unity, that his advances will be cordially welcomed and heartily reciprocated in all the leading centres of Australasia, and that he will have the satisfaction of recrossing the Pacific as the successful negotiator of a memorable commercial treaty between the two great sections of Greater Britain, are propositions that the latest news of the progress of Mr. Bowell's mission at the Antipodes goes a long way to establish. But I do not desire to dwell on the commercial importance of the new departure. Success in a commercial sense is, of course, absolutely essential in order that our latest Imperial highway may be rendered permanently and

effectively available for those Imperial and National purposes that it is peculiarly calculated to promote. That the line will and must succeed as a commercial enterprise, there is little or no room to doubt. Canada and Australia are so admirably situated for the mutual interchange of profitable products, that the speedy development of a large and lucrative trade between them, now that direct and regular steam communication has been established, seems a necessary consequence of the new progressive condition of things that has been brought about by the spirited enterprise of Mr. Huddart. On this aspect of the question the *Times* made some informing and suggestive comments in its issue of October 24 :

“ In round numbers the entire trade of Canada and Australia taken together in 1870 was worth £94,000,000, and in 1890 it was worth £175,000,000. The whole of this was done without any connection across the Pacific, practically none of it, therefore, between Canada and Australia. The amounts are only interesting as showing the extent and the expanding nature of the trade, of which each group of colonies now feels that it would like to have its share.

“ The question remains, what share they can take with mutual profit? According to the reports furnished to the proprietors of the Canadian-Australian line, the amount is considerable. The first and important feature in the future intercourse of the two groups of colonies is the fact of their geographical position in different hemispheres. The winter of Canada is the summer of Australia. Therefore many similar products can be profitably exchanged. Tasmania can give potatoes to British Columbia for half the year, and be glad to take potatoes from her for the other half. The same condition applies to apples, onions, butter, eggs, and all articles of general consumption which are common to both countries, and the effect should be to lower the price of food to the working population of both. British Columbia at present imports about 400,000 dozens of eggs at high prices from Eastern Canada and the United States. With Australia to draw upon, the importers of the British Columbian coast ought instead to be able to supply Eastern Canada and the United States at lower prices. Butter sells along the coast from November to April at wholesale prices of about 1s. 6d. a pound, and nothing is to be gained by importing from Eastern Canada, where the winter is more severe and distance adds a heavy railway freight. At the same season butter is selling wholesale in Australia at 5d. a pound, and the supply of it is plentiful. Beef and mutton also become dear in Canada during the winter months, and are produced in Australia at an average wholesale price of 1d. a pound. All this applies, of course, in a greater degree to the market of Great Britain, which Australia is already supplying with yearly increasing profit to herself, but the distance to Canada is less than half the distance to Great Britain, and the cost of carriage as the trade develops will be proportionately diminished. Nor is it only the trade of Canada which the Australian Colonies hope to secure. The inland waters of Puget Sound afford so easy and cheap a means of communication with the rich commercial towns of the neighbouring American States, that Vancouver promises to become rapidly the distributing centre of that coast, and the trade requirements of Oregon and Washington are not unlikely to swell the volume of the Pacific trade. Seattle, which is one of the most thriving of the new towns of Puget Sound, is the terminus of the Great Northern American Railway. Tacoma, forty miles further south, is the terminus of the Northern Pacific. Portland, with which connection might easily be made, is the terminus of the

Union Pacific. The Australian-Canadian line can, therefore, without any alteration of its course, be used to tap three American lines of railway as well as the main channel of the Canadian Pacific, and as these interests grow the need of cable communication by which they can be directed will become evidently more and more imperative. For, besides the articles of common production which the alternation of the seasons enables Canada and Australia to exchange, there are the still more valuable products which result from permanent differences of climate. Australia, of which a considerable, though as yet very imperfectly developed, portion lies in the tropics, enjoys what may fairly be described as an almost perpetual summer. The great feature of the Canadian climate is its winter. In return for wool and fruit it has lumber and fruit to give. Already the agricultural implements manufactured in Toronto are being eagerly purchased in South Australia, and, as Queensland develops her tropical products, it is probable that they will find a ready market in the country of snow and ice which the new line has brought nearer to her than any other northern country in the world. One successful shipment of her pineapples has already been made, and there is no reason why raw sugar should not follow. Tobacco, hides, and wine are also among the important commodities for which Australia desires to extend her markets."

So much for the commercial actualities and possibilities of rapid and regular steam communication between Canada and Australia. But what I particularly desire to emphasise and to bring into the greatest possible prominence is the Imperial and federalising aspect of this new and deserving enterprise. Just as the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was destined to play a large and influential part in promoting the federation of the scattered British provinces of North America and their consolidation into the now great and prosperous Dominion of Canada, so this Pacific service, by bringing Canada and Australia into the closest and most fraternal relations, by furnishing hitherto unknown and unattainable facilities for mutual acquaintance and reciprocal study, by demonstrating in the most convincing and conclusive manner that there is a solid identity of interest between the two energetic and expansive daughter-lands of Britannia on opposite shores of the Pacific, and by thus visibly and potentially strengthening the inspiring sentiment and the noble ideal of a common nationhood, must of necessity appreciably pave the way towards the accomplishment of that larger and more comprehensive federation which all the well-wishers of the Empire so ardently long to see. Lasting and valuable educational work in this direction must needs be done by the institution of social and commercial intercourse between the Canadians and Australians—family groups that have never before had the opportunity of fraternising and becoming acquainted with each other—by the frequent visits of their representative men and their friendly interchange of views on subjects of common concern, and, a still more important consideration, by the wider circulation and the closer communion of their respective leading organs of public opinion that a swift Pacific service cannot fail to promote.

This enterprise is therefore essentially Imperial in its character, scope and operation, and very little pressure or argument should be necessary to induce the Imperial Government to extend to it all the official support and substantial recognition that it is in their power to bestow. There are two main aspects of the gravest and highest importance under which it is specially qualified to minister to Imperial requirements. In the first place, it provides a new, speedy, and wholly unmenaced postal route entirely under British management and control, and traversing British territory from end to end. At present the mails to and from the Australian colonies are carried across Europe and through the Suez Canal. In the event of a Continental war this route would obviously be either extremely risky or no longer available, and the facility with which an enemy could effectually block the Suez Canal is a matter of universal notoriety. Under these circumstances the value of an alternative route that is not liable to any of the risks or dangers inseparable from international complications does not need to be demonstrated. Moreover, by the agency of this new Pacific service and its British and Canadian connections, it will be possible to deliver the Australian mails in London in twenty-eight or thirty days, a rapidity of transit that is rarely surpassed on the existing Continental and Suez Canal route. This excellent speed will be effected through the mail train facilities provided by the Canadian-Pacific Railway Company, with which powerful corporation Mr. Huddart has negotiated a ten-years' working defensive alliance, and by the expressed determination of the Canadian Government to organise and subsidise a fleet of Atlantic steamships that, for speed and efficiency, will be second to none of the existing Atlantic lines. Canada is evidently determined to make itself the most attractive half-way house between Great Britain and the Australian colonies, and to reap all the consequential advantages of such an enviable and splendid situation. The foremost statesmen of the Dominion, headed by Sir Charles Tupper and Sir John Thompson, have forwarded this great enterprise with a whole-heartedness, an infectious enthusiasm, a generous liberality, and an enlightened sagacity that proclaim their fixed and resolute determination to make this onward movement in inter-Imperial federation a monumental and a striking success. If only a modicum of their earnestness, activity, and enthusiasm can be successfully infused into Imperial Ministers in general, and the Postmaster-General in particular; if the Imperial Parliament can be prevailed upon to act up to its title and not allow itself to be outdone by the Parliaments of Canada and Australia in supporting and encouraging the development of this great Imperial enterprise, then we shall have reason to congratulate ourselves on a good day's march nearer the goal of a contented, prosperous and federated Empire.

Secondly, the steamers engaged on this new Pacific service can be

requisitioned and utilised at any time for the purposes of Imperial defence, and for the speedy transport of troops to the Australian colonies should occasion arise. This, no doubt, is not such an immediately practical or pressing requirement as an improved and accelerated, exclusively British, through postal service; still it is a consideration and a contingency that cannot be lightly dismissed or carelessly disregarded in view of the somewhat disquieting facts that France and Germany have now acquired substantial footholds in Australian waters, and that Russia has for years been perfecting a naval base of operations in the Northern Pacific, from which a hostile descent on the Australian Colonies can be effected with an ease and celerity, the mere thought and ever-present consciousness of which have generated repeated scares and false alarms in Melbourne and Sydney. The Admiralty authorities have recognised the importance and the necessity of supplementing Her Majesty's naval forces in the Pacific by enrolling as armed cruisers the steamers engaged on the service between Canada and Japan, and liberally subsidising these steamers from the Imperial exchequer. But it is obvious that the steamers engaged on the new Canadian-Australian service have far superior claims to an Imperial subvention, seeing that they are actually the only connecting link between the two largest and most important divisions of Greater Britain, and that, unlike the Japanese service, they are acknowledged and highly efficient agents in the fulfilment of a beneficent federalising mission. As the *Times* truly remarked on this aspect of the subject:

“The advantages, from the point of view of national and Imperial defence, of our having on the Pacific a larger number than at present of swift steamers available for war purposes at almost a moment's notice are self-evident. The vessels on the Vancouver and Japan route are subsidised to the extent of £60,000 a year, of which sum the Imperial Government pays three-fourths, and the Canadian Government one-fourth; but the reasons adduced in favour of this subvention apply, if possible, with even greater force in favour of similar support being given to the new route to Australia.”

Having regard to the fact that the steamers already employed on the Australian-Canadian service amply and admittedly comply with the requirements of the Admiralty, and that the plans of the supplementary steamers that Mr. Huddart proposes to have constructed on the Tyne, will be submitted to the Admiralty authorities for approval before final adoption, it is impossible to discover any substantial reason why this new national highway should not have its fair share of the Imperial subvention allotted to armed cruisers in the Pacific. If the steamers trading between Canada and Japan are deemed worthy of Imperial support to the extent of £45,000 per annum, surely the Chancellor of the Exchequer might very properly, patriotically and beneficially, devote a third of that sum to the support and encouragement of a service that is

absolutely free and dis severed from foreign associations, that is essentially inter-Imperial and federalising in its character and constitution, and whose manifest destiny it is to bring two great branches of the British family into closer fellowship and stronger bonds of national union.

By resolving to make Fiji one of his calling-ports, Mr. Huddart has accentuated his already solid and substantial claim to Imperial recognition and support. Fiji is our only Crown colony between Australia and America. It is the pivot of British authority and supervision over an immense area of land and water, for its Governor (Sir J. B. Thurston) is invested with a very large and responsible jurisdiction as Her Majesty's High Commissioner for the Western Pacific. Hitherto he has had no regular or expeditious connection either with the Australian Colonies or with his Imperial masters in Downing Street. There is no cable at his command nearer than Sydney or New Zealand, and the small trading steamers that constitute the one means of communication with these places are only able to furnish a service of a very inadequate, intermittent, and unsatisfactory description. Under these circumstances the swift and regular service supplied by Mr. Huddart's enterprise will meet and remedy a distinctly Imperial requirement by bringing Her Majesty's High Commissioner in the Pacific into close and regular relations with the Colonial Office and the various Colonies that are concerned in his proceedings and administrative acts. Apart from this official consideration the fact that Mr. Huddart's steamers will call in swift and regular succession at the principal port of Fiji must of necessity materially improve the trade and commerce of that Crown colony, conduce to a considerable increase of the European settlers, and consequently promote a large and profitable development of its principal products—sugar, cotton, tobacco, cocoa-nuts, tropical fruits, &c.

The value and attractive recommendations of this new Imperial highway from the standpoint of the tourist and traveller—the revelation of the sublime and majestic scenery traversed by the Canadian Pacific Railway, the cool, smooth, and pleasant steaming over the summer seas that stretch from Vancouver to Sydney, constituting a most agreeable alternative to the Suez Canal route, and the diversified intervals at such interesting calling-places *en route* as Honolulu and Fiji—I do not propose to more than merely mention, as it is an aspect which, though not the least important and suggestive, does not come within the scope of the present article. I am now concerned with the national aspects of this new and peculiarly advantageous link of inter-Imperial communication, and I trust I have adduced sufficient evidence to demonstrate that this gratifying and plucky outcome of Australian-Canadian enterprise is a valuable contribution to our Imperial resources both

in time of war and in times of peace; that it is a wise and statesmanlike step directly calculated to strengthen racial and commercial ties between Great and Greater Britain; and, chiefest consideration of all, that it provides facilities for a through postal service from end to end of the Queen's dominions entirely and exclusively under British management and control—facilities and favourable conditions that it would be a grievous neglect of paramount duty on the part of the Imperial Government and the Imperial Parliament not to recognise and to utilise at the earliest opportunity.

J. F. HOGAN.



## THE PRINCIPLES OF EXCLUSIVE INDIVIDUAL OWNERSHIP IN LAND.

THE object of the present article is to revive the questions, first, whether in the abstract exclusive individual ownership in land is just or unjust; and, secondly, whether assuming such ownership to be just, it is expedient in the case of our own country.

It cannot be denied that land is the source of all wealth, and of the whole machinery of human action.

It is as necessary to us as the air we breathe: apart from land, we cannot carry on the most ordinary transactions of every-day life; and, moreover, land is fixed in quantity, whereas our population is ever increasing. If, then, the land is in the hands of the few, and the many can only obtain access to it with the consent of the few, there is a monopoly of land; and since all wealth depends for its creation upon land, there is a monopoly of wealth by the few. The land problem, therefore, lies at the root of all our institutions, political or social, moral or economic.

That these propositions have the support of the leading minds of both the ancient and modern world will appear from the few quotations which the space at my disposal allows me to give, in the general course of the argument. In Germany there is, and has been for many years, a general consensus of opinion in favour of collective ownership of land.

Professor Ihne, in his *History of Rome*, well represents his countrymen on this point. "The soil of a country," he writes, "is not the produce of human labour. Individual citizens cannot naturally lay any claim to lawful property in land, as to anything produced by their own hands. The State, as the representative of the rights and interests of society, decides how the land is to be divided among the members of the community, and the rules laid down by the State to regulate this matter are of the first and highest importance in determining the civil condition of the country and the prosperity of the people. When land is considered the property of the Sovereign, the consequence for the people is abject poverty and slavery. If only one class among the people is privileged to have property in land, a most exclusive oligarchy is formed. Where the land is held in small portions by a great number, and nobody is

legally or practically excluded from acquiring land, there the elements of democracy are provided."<sup>1</sup>

In *Social Statics*, published in 1851, Mr. Herbert Spencer argues thus : if one portion of the earth may be owned exclusively by one person, other portions may be so owned by one person ; and if other portions may be so owned by one person, the whole may be owned by one person, and every one else is a trespasser, who may be removed, or who may only remain on sufferance. But politically, he adds, we are all said to be entitled to equal rights, therefore each is entitled to a fair use of the earth for the satisfaction of his wants.<sup>2</sup>

In *Political Institutions*, published in 1882, he argues that just as centuries ago it might have been inferred that ownership of man by man was tending to become finally and permanently established, and yet as militancy declined and industrialism advanced this process was reversed, and ownership of man by man has been destroyed, so private ownership in land may disappear, although it might have been argued that such ownership must be the ultimate result of industrialism. "But though," he continues, "industrialism has thus far tended to individualise possession of land, while individualising all other possession, it may be doubted whether the final stage is at present reached."<sup>3</sup> Again : "But there is reason to suspect that while private possession of things produced by labour will grow even more definite and sacred than at present, the inhabited area, which cannot be produced by labour, will eventually be distinguished as something which may not be privately possessed. As the individual, primitively owner of himself, partially or wholly loses ownership of himself during the militant régime, but gradually resumes it as the industrial régime develops, so possibly the communal proprietorship of land, partially or wholly merged in the ownership of dominant men during evolution of the militant type, will be resumed as the industrial type becomes fully evolved."<sup>4</sup>

In other words, private ownership in land is not the final step in the evolution of property in land.

In his treatise on "Justice," however, Mr. Herbert Spencer turns completely round. It is impossible, he argues, to readjust claims at this time of day. To the descendants of whom, he asks, are we to restore the land? To the descendants of the Dane who robbed the Saxon, or to the descendants of the Saxon who robbed the Celt, or to the descendants of the Celt who drove primitive man out of his cave-dwelling? And if to the Celt, it could only be on the ground that he had justified his ownership by having killed the cave-dweller. And he further argues that many descendants of former usurpers are now landless men, and many descendants of

<sup>1</sup> Prof. Ihne, *History of Rome*, B. i. p. 175.

<sup>2</sup> Herbert Spencer, *Social Statics*, p. 114.

<sup>3</sup> *Political Institutions*, p. 558.      <sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 556.

former, landless men are now landed proprietors. But, he says, putting this difficulty aside and granting all the injustice of the past, the expenditure by the landowners in shape of poor-rate, fully compensates all the injustice of the past. He comes to the conclusion that £500,000,000 have been received from the ground landlords (rates on houses are excluded) by the poor. And he comes to the further conclusion that, while adhering to his former opinion that the aggregate of men forming the community are the supreme owners of the land, individual ownership, subject to State suzerainty, should be maintained; that nationalisation is financially impossible, and that the vices of officialism would negative any possible good results.<sup>1</sup>

To these conclusions I reply that, because it is impossible to redress the injustice of the past, it does not follow that it is impossible to redress the injustice of the present. A restoration such as Mr. Spencer suggests is not contemplated by any supporters of land nationalisation, but what is proposed is that what is the common property of all should be enjoyed by all. And, indeed, the acts of spoliation are not all so time-honoured as Mr. Spencer would have us believe. We have only to recall the Enclosure Acts of the present century. The poor-rate fell, not upon the landowner, but upon the occupier or the consumer. It is true that occasionally rates do fall upon the landowner, but this is the exception, and not the rule.

And even if the landowners did really give £500,000,000 to the people, they only gave as charity a fraction of that which they had previously exacted from the community, and they gave it as the price of their social and political power. And, moreover, it has been admitted on all hands that the only effect of this charity has been to further pauperise the people.

That the financial objections to land nationalisation as now understood are insuperable is not the case, and it is not so clear that the vices of officialism would inevitably follow any such scheme.

That Mr. Herbert Spencer should have come to such conclusions—inconsistent not only with his former but with his latest opinions, *e.g.*, that the community are the real owners of the land—seems incredible. This conclusion that the land is the property of the community, but that individual ownership ought to be maintained, is thoroughly illogical, and unworthy of his deservedly high reputation. His former opinions are undeniably irrefutable, and the fact that their author has seen fit in his later years to repudiate them does not detract one iota from their power.

Now, although the logical conclusions of Mr. Spencer's former arguments cannot be denied, it may be objected that as a matter of fact the state of things there contemplated is impossible. It is true that at the present time the whole of Great Britain and Ireland

<sup>1</sup> H. Spencer, "Justice," part iv. of *Ethics*, App. B.

is not owned by a single individual; but let us see by how many, or rather by how few, the soil of this country is owned.

The figures have frequently been given before, but they cannot be too often impressed upon the public.

Dealing with England and Wales for the year 1876, exclusive of the metropolitan district, the total area is found to be 33,013,514 acres, and the total number of owners 972,836, or about one-twenty-fourth of the population. From these figures alone it is clear that the land is not distributed among a large number of small proprietors as it was commonly asserted to be before the publication of these Parliamentary returns by such statesmen as the late Lord Derby. And the further the figures are examined the worse become the case for the supporters of this theory—*e.g.* :

703,289 owners under one acre own	151,171 acres
121,983     "     "     ten acres     "	478,679     "
<hr style="width: 100px; margin-left: 0;"/>	<hr style="width: 100px; margin-left: 0;"/>
825,272	629,850

This leaves 32,385,664 acres to be distributed among 147,564 owners, and of this number 293 persons own 5,392,304 acres, or about one-sixth of the whole of England and Wales.

The figures for Scotland are even more startling. The total area is 18,946,694 acres, and the total number of owners is 132,230, or one-twenty-fifth of the total population. Three hundred and thirty persons own 13,179,339 acres, or about two-thirds of the whole of Scotland, and less than 17,000 persons own nine-tenths of the whole.

As in England so in Scotland, the owners in each county are returned as separate owners, but by a little simple addition it is found that twelve persons own 4,339,722 acres, or about one-fourth of the whole of Scotland, and one person owns 1,326,000 acres in Scotland and 32,095 acres in England. The returns for Ireland are not more encouraging—*e.g.* :

32,612 owners of one acre and upwards own	20,152,985a. 1r. 12p.
36,143     "     "     less than one acre     "	9,064a. 2r. 35p.
<hr style="width: 100px; margin-left: 0;"/>	<hr style="width: 100px; margin-left: 0;"/>
68,755	20,162,050a. 0r. 7p.

Upon a further examination of these figures it appears that 292 persons own 6,458,100 acres, or about one-third of the island, and that 744 persons own 9,612,725 acres, or about one-half.

It is obvious, then, that the land of Great Britain and Ireland is in the hands of the few, and it is equally clear, if this be so, that the landowner can exact his own terms from the landless for the use and occupation of his land. Since, therefore, land is in the hands of the few to the exclusion of the many, and since each is entitled to a fair share of the use of the earth for the satisfaction of his wants, exclusive individual ownership of land is unjust.

I now arrive at the second question. Assuming such ownership

to be just, is it expedient? For of course whatever is unjust must be inexpedient, although the converse is not always the case.

In modern societies there is enormous inequality of wealth, and by this I mean not merely a great contrast between the millionaire and the pauper, but between large sections of the nation.

In 1814, lands, tenements, and tithes assessed to income-tax amounted to £58,751,479. By 1879 this figure had risen to £172,136,183. In 1848, property and profits assessed to income-tax was valued at £256,413,354. In 1878, in thirty years time, this figure more than doubled—viz., £542,411,545. With this enormous increase in the wealth of the country, if property is equally distributed, pauperism ought to decrease at a very rapid rate.

But what are the facts? According to the official returns the number of paupers in actual receipt of relief on January 1, 1875, was 815,587, and in 1889 was 810,132, thus showing a decrease only of 5455 in fifteen years. But these official returns are comparatively useless, even for estimating the number of paupers in receipt of public relief. For it is estimated by the highest authorities on this subject that the number in the Unions on January 1, must be multiplied by at least 3, if not by  $3\frac{1}{2}$ , in order to give anything like a fair average of the number of paupers in constant receipt of public relief all the year round. And the return of the expenditure upon paupers, so far from showing any decrease, shows an actual increase—e.g., in 1879, £7,829,819 was spent in actual relief, and ten years later, in 1889, this had risen to £8,366,477. Now, although there may be a relative decrease in the number of paupers officially relieved, there has been an immense increase in the number of paupers privately relieved. This is due to three causes: (1) the official discouragement of outdoor relief; (2) the establishment of casual wards; and (3) the extension of private charity in various forms.

The average number of official paupers is placed by Mr. Dudley Baxter at 3,000,000, by Mr. Giffen at 1,800,000, by Mr. Samuel Smith and Lord Brabazon at between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000. To these figures we must add the number of criminals in our prisons, which averages between 50,000 and 60,000, and persons in receipt of private charity.

Dr. A. R. Wallace and Mr. Joseph Chamberlain place this grand total at 4,500,000, while General Booth, although inclined to agree with them, is content with the more moderate estimate of 3,000,000. Taking the highest estimate, then, we have one-eighth of the population in abject pauperism, and, taking the lowest estimate, about one-twelfth; and, whichever we take, the result is sufficiently appalling.

It may be said, "Oh, those are only the loafers, who would not work if they could; the working men are well enough off, and

amongst the rest of the population wealth is fairly equally distributed."

Let us again turn to statistics. The total wealth of this country is valued at £10,958,134,011, and the working classes own of this £185,036,591, or one-fifty-ninth of the whole.

Half the wealth of this country is owned by persons who leave at death at least £20,000, exclusive of land and houses. They number somewhat over 25,000 persons, or, allowing five to each family—viz., 125,000—one-three-hundredth part of the total population.

It is clear, then, that so far from wealth being equally distributed in this country, there is an extreme depth of inequality.

The wealth of this country is undoubtedly in the hands of the few. If this enormous increase of wealth were equally distributed, it would go either in increased wages or in increased profits, or both. But wages have not increased correspondingly to the increase of wealth and profits—if anything, have fallen, *i.e.*, the rate of interest has fallen. "The large addition to the wealth of the country," says Professor Cairnes, "has gone neither to profits, nor to wages, nor yet to the public at large, but to swell a fund ever growing, even while its proprietors sleep—the rent-roll of the owners of the soil." This quotation has often been attacked, but I am still prepared to maintain its truth. When Mr. Giffen compares the wages of to-day with those in vogue fifty years ago, he takes an unfair advantage. For that was one of the worst periods in our history, the time of the Chartists and the Anti-Corn Law League. According to Professor Thorold Rogers, a labourer of the time of Henry VII. earned £145 of our money, whereas to-day he only earns £75.

In the rent-roll, ever increasing, we have in plain terms the unearned increment. This should go to the State *pro bono publico*, or to the particular community which creates it.

Now, this enormous inequality of wealth is coincident with political power, and those who are excluded from the wealth are gradually increasing their political power, hence a serious danger to society. As Lavelaye truly says, "Either you must establish a more equitable division of property and produce, or the fatal end of democracy will be despotism and decadence after a series of social struggles." We have had our political revolution, but we have not yet had our social revolution, and it rests with the classes whether that revolution shall be a peaceable one, or whether it shall surpass the worst horrors of the great French Revolution. Speaking of socialism, Disraeli exclaimed, "As yet it is only a light breeze which hardly stirs the foliage, but soon it will be the unchained hurricane overturning everything in its path." In all such revolutions it is the scum which comes to the surface, and although the good cause ultimately succeeds, its progress receives a check from which by time alone can it recover.

It will not be out of place here to reiterate shortly the analogies which have been drawn by well-known writers, between the circumstances which existed in Greece and Rome, and which were the cause of their downfall, and the circumstances in our own country at the present time.

There is every reason to believe that the Greek States passed through a course of primitive communism. Communal lands and common meals (*syssities*) survived into historical times. The main object of Greek lawgivers was to preserve the primitive communism in land and produce, and so long as this was maintained so long did political liberty exist, but as the rich acquired land and wealth the poor became poorer, and in the struggle which followed between the classes and the masses, the king, by the aid of the masses, destroyed the power of the classes, and established upon their ruin a despotism which finally destroyed the State. Thus inequality, after stifling liberty, destroyed the State itself. "In fact," says Lavelaye, "when the division of property is too unequal, democracy leads to social revolution, for the man who has the suffrage seeks also to have property. Democratic institutions have only brought man peace, where, as in Switzerland and in primitive time, manners are simple, and conditions are equal."<sup>1</sup> The Greek States fell from internal causes. They were always fluctuating between two revolutions: the one party endeavouring to obtain a share in the wealth of the country, and the other to regain the monopoly of that wealth. Under these conditions they fell an easy prey to Rome, whom indeed one side or the other had not infrequently called in to settle their differences.<sup>2</sup>

In support of this view abundant and overwhelming authority might be produced, but the space at my disposal only allows the following quotations from Aristotle's works. "Each of the Greek States," says Aristotle, "is not really a single State, but comprises at least two; one composed of the rich, the other of the poor." Again and again the great philosopher lays it down that liberty and democracy cannot exist without equality of conditions. Speaking of Sparta, he says, "Some have immense lands, while others have hardly any property at all, so that almost the whole country is the patrimony of a few individuals;" and he arrives at the conclusion that "inequality is the source of all revolutions, for no compensation can make amends for inequality."

To Rome belongs the credit, so far as we know at present, of establishing in Europe exclusive individual ownership in land. Although when first we become acquainted with Roman institutions we find private ownership in land fully established, the *ager privatus*, we also find the collective form of ownership still in existence, under

<sup>1</sup> Lavelaye, *Primitive Property*, p. 162.  
<sup>2</sup> M. Fustel de Coulanges, *La Cité Antique*.

the name of *ager publicus*. And even within historical times this private property was of the smallest extent. Two *jugera* were allotted to every paterfamilias for his house, yard, and garden, which, since it was inalienable, was called the *heredium*; it was the ancestral home of the family, and of its *lures et penates*; and, in later times, when sale was allowed, it was an indelible disgrace—*infamia*—for its owner to part with the possession. It is clear, then, that this *heredium* was not, strictly speaking, private property—it belonged to the family. In addition to this *heredium*, each owner was entitled to cultivate an allotment in the *ager publicus*, and it is probable that this was at first re-distributed periodically. Now, as generally happens, the vesting of the use in certain families resulted in the vesting of the ownership in the same families. These families, then, where they were not so already, became patrician, and, as their power and wealth increased, so did their acquisition of more and more *ager publicus*, as it was seized from the unfortunate foreigner.

At first the patricians let out allotments to their clients and dependents for cultivation, *precario*—i.e., by tenancy at will; but later, as their estates in the *ager publicus* and the number of slaves correspondingly increased by foreign conquest, they employed gangs of these unfortunate persons to cultivate their estates and discharged their labourers. With this increase of wealth they proceeded to buy up the land of the peasant proprietors and yeoman farmers; and these men, who had been the backbone of the army, became a landless proletariat, only to drift into the cities and to become a source of expense and danger to the State.

That these conclusions are correct will be seen, not only by an examination of the history of land legislation at Rome, but by the unbroken testimony of all the leading historians. In 486 B.C. the patrician, Spurius Cassius, introduced measures whereby the exclusive control of the land by the patricians should be limited and the people admitted to some fair share. Of the details of his attempted legislation we know nothing; he fell a victim to the selfish interests of his own class; but, as Mommsen relates, "his spectre thenceforth incessantly haunted the eyes of the rich, and again and again it rose from the tomb against them till the conflicts to which it led destroyed the commonwealth."

At length, in 366 B.C., the Licinian Laws were passed, a real measure of reform; though only a temporary one, since it did not go to the root of the question. By these laws interest on loans or mortgages was cancelled; small freeholders were created, and the dependence of the peasants upon the caprice of the landowners was limited; no citizen was allowed to occupy more than 500 *jugera* of the *ager publicus*, or to pasture on it more than 100 oxen, or more than 500 sheep on his own land; and every landowner was compelled to employ a certain number of free labourers in proportion to



the number of his slaves. The good effect of this legislation was prodigious: "The century which follows the Licinian Laws," says M. Laboulaye, "is the one in which the soldiers of Rome seem inexhaustible. Varro, Pliny, and Columella continually refer to these great days of the Republic as the time when Italy was really powerful by the richness of its soil and the number and prosperity of its inhabitants. The law of the 500 *jugera* is always quoted by them with admiration as being the first which recognised the evil, and sought to remedy the formation of those vast domains or *latifundia* which depopulated Italy, and after Italy the whole empire."<sup>1</sup> Although the Licinian Laws were substantially re-enacted by Tiberius Gracchus and others, they were to a large extent eluded, and by subsequent enactment of three agrarian statutes (121-100 B.C.) the classes repealed such provisions as were obnoxious to them, and the state of things already described ensued, only to end in the decline and fall of one of the greatest and most splendid empires the world had then seen.

I submit that the circumstances which existed in Greece and in the Roman Empire are analogous to those which exist to-day in this country, and arguing from these analogies I consequently submit that exclusive individual ownership in the land of Great Britain and Ireland—even assuming it to be just, which it is not—is inexpedient.

The problem then before us is to effect the equalisation of property in land, and consequently of wealth, and at the same time to maintain such principles of individualism as make for progress.

Let us not, therefore, despise these warnings from antiquity. The situation in Greece and Rome was serious enough, but the situation with us is still more serious. Greece and Rome had slave labour to carry on the business of the country, but the white slaves of modern societies are now practically the rulers. Let us then do justice while we may, lest we all, oppressors and oppressed, perish in one universal cataclysm.

HUGH H. L. BELLOT.

<sup>1</sup> Laboulaye, *Des Lois agraires chez les Romains*, quoted by Lavclaye, *Primitive Property*, p. 157.

## HABITS AND CUSTOMS OF ANCIENT TIMES.

IN a former paper we took a brief glance at some of the customs of uncultured man. We saw how his habits, by a slight refinement, modified through living in a fixed spot, and by receiving the sanction of large bodies of his fellows, merged into a crude civilisation which here and there expanded into fulness and developed unknown and almost miraculous mental and moral growths. It is an extraordinary spectacle. A naked animal, physically weaker than hundreds that roamed around him, exposed to a thousand dangers on every side, overcomes them all by the exercise of cunning and concerted action, and becomes the lord paramount of the earth. Wealth and leisure succeed, and with them intellectual contemplation and inventive energies. Destructive faculties give way to constructive. The savage hunter, leading a precarious life of want and hardships, is led by necessity or genius to tame and cherish the animals that sustain him. But he multiplies faster than his flocks and herds, and again other systems must be devised: he becomes a rude tiller of the ground. New wants and new desires are thus created, and manufactures follow. These breed trade and luxuries. The wigwam has given way to a hut, the solitary hut to a cluster, the hamlets to villages, these to towns, and towns to cities. The descendant of the wandering, naked, wild man of the woods, is a well-clad, sober, thoughtful citizen, a member of a great society in which all are pledged to protect each other, and in which each sacrifices a large part of his freedom for the advantages which he receives.

The first people known to have reached the highest and most ancient civilisation were the Egyptians. Maspero, Morton, and Owen agree that they were a branch of the great Caucasian type, and this is generally admitted, but Professor Huxley supposes them to have descended from the aborigines of an ancient continent allied to the Australian. It is certain that they came to Egypt as conquerors or colonisers, most probably as both. The earth contains many mysteries relating to extinct greatnesses of humanity. Easter Island in the Pacific, for instance, is an insoluble puzzle, and baffles all attempts of scientists to theorise on its remains. Yucatan is almost as difficult to explain. We shall, perhaps, never know how

many embryonic civilisations have perished before one came to maturity. But the farther researches extend, the more it is proved that the civilisation of man was accomplished very many thousands of years ago. The similarity of customs and arts between nations so widely divergent that they could not have copied from each other, would seem to point to older stocks from which much may have been derived in common. Who can say whether the continent submerged beneath the Indian Ocean, and of which Madagascar is a fragment, may not have contained civilisations older than any that history records?

In the old Egyptian Chronicle, the reigns of Cronus and the other twelve deities who governed, probably through hierarchies, occupy 3984 years. These are followed by thirty dynasties of kings, making with the others 36,525 years. According to Herodotus, from Menes, the first Theban king, to the invasion of Cambyses, there were 341 generations of kings in a period of 11,340 years. According to Manetho, from Menes to the Persian invasion was about 5000 years. The pyramids to the north of Memphis were erected more than 4100 years ago, and within 300 years after the Biblical deluge. Many dates can be absolutely proved from astronomical records. When Joseph was carried as a slave into Egypt in the reign of Userseten I., whose accession was 1740 B.C., we know from the invaluable statements of the Bible and from native sources that Egypt was then a great and civilised country. And when the Jews were expelled in the fourth year of the reign of Thothmes III., or, as Lord Prudhoe thinks, in the reign of Pthamenoph, the Egyptians were approaching the zenith of their grandeur, which was reached under the sway of Rameses II. But in the days of the Patriarchs they were as perfectly civilised as at any later period. Sir J. Gardiner Wilkinson says: "They had the same arts, the same manners and customs, the same architecture, and were in the same advanced state of refinement as in the reign of Rameses II.; and no very remarkable changes took place, even in ever-varying taste, between the accession of the first Userseten and the death of that conqueror" (Rameses II.), "who was the last monarch of the 18th dynasty. What high antiquity does this assign to civilisation! The most remote point to which we can see opens with a nation possessing all the arts of civilised life already matured."

The habits and customs of Greece and Rome are familiar to very many. But their civilisation was to an exceedingly large extent derived from Egypt. Indeed, she may be said to have been the mother of almost all European knowledge. Pythagoras, after travelling in Egypt, opened a school in Magna Græcia during the reign of Tarquin the Proud. Hecatæus and Herodotus also spent much time there investigating, and acquiring knowledge. The priests laughed at Hecatæus for claiming descent from a deity as his

sixteenth ancestor, and showed him the statues of 345 high priests, each of whom they said "was a man, the son of a man." For although in their poetic allegories, like the story of Osiris, or the Garden of Eden, they spoke of the gods having ruled in the world, yet they never believed nor taught that they had actually dwelt on earth. This fable, which has been universally asserted through the vanity of all peoples, was emphatically denied by them. Their religious institutions were largely borrowed by the Jews, and were thus disseminated throughout every Christian country. Egypt taught Greece architecture, philosophy, astronomy, geometry, and numerous sciences and useful arts, which were subsequently handed on to Rome. Jupiter was an infant when her gods were hoary-headed with the ashes of a vast antiquity. And the coarseness of the early Greek mind accepted these gods as the untaught commonalty of Egypt received them, in gross ignorance of the great philosophical abstractions which they symbolised, and added to them habits and customs as depraved as their own. Even the Pharaohs were not permitted to learn the highest mysteries of their religion—to enter into "the Holy of Holies"—unless they had long graduated as priests, and only then by virtue of their office on their reaching the throne. We shall, therefore, select this most interesting people to illustrate our subject in ancient times, because it would be obviously impossible, in one paper, to deal with all.

When Joseph was carried captive into Egypt by the Arab traders whose camels were laden with "spices, balm, and myrrh," the rustic Hebrew found himself in the heart of a rich and populous country filled with great cities adorned with magnificent buildings—a country governed by ancient and equitable laws—having a venerable church wealthily endowed, and an enlightened priesthood: containing numerous colleges and schools, and teeming with the products of the known world. Linen, glass, ornaments of silver and gold, and beautiful examples of cabinet work and objects of art and refinement, were of home manufacture. Various gymnastic exercises, and the games of draughts, ball, *mora*, and other well-known modern amusements, were common at the same period. The army and navy were well equipped and drilled, and furnished with powerful machines and deadly weapons. Sculptors, painters, and scribes abounded, and three modes of writing were practised. Musical instruments were numerous, and consisted of cymbals, trumpets, drums, harps, guitars, lyres, flutes, pipes, and others. There were bands of music as with us. Yet Troy was not built until about three and a half centuries after. Two hundred years elapsed before Athens was founded, and a thousand before Romulus laid the foundations of Rome: eight hundred before Hercules was born, and twelve hundred before Pythagoras wandered into Egypt and drank from the fountains of ancient learning.

Many of the facts to which we refer were often better known in their day than current events in our newspapers are to us. For, as we learn from the walls of Karnak, the grottoes on the east bank of the Nile, the monuments, tombs, temples, and public buildings, there were on every hand spirited paintings, or hieroglyphs inscribed to the depth of two inches, descriptive of their battles, triumphs, religious ceremonies, and social habits and customs. The untutored slave who passed along could read as he ran the pictorial witnesses of his adopted country's greatness, and the learned could explain the indelible writing on the polished granite. And although slavery was a settled institution, as it always has been in developing civilisation, yet the streets were gay and bright with colour, songs, and dances. Wandering minstrels sang and played, mountebanks tumbled, jugglers tricked, and dancing girls went through their graceful movements for the pleasure of the public and their own profit. The shops were filled with wares, poultry and other food, exposed for sale beneath awnings. All historians agree that they were a light-hearted, happy people, given to raillery and wit, of subtle and sarcastic intellect, and somewhat turbulent when their privileges were threatened.

Under this people the position of woman at these remote times was superior to that in any Eastern country, ancient or modern. Although polygamy was allowed by law to all except the priests, monogamy was generally practised, but they admitted slaves as concubines. These lived in the house, "ranked next to the wives and children of their lord, and are supposed to have enjoyed a share of his property at his demise." It was not reputable to divorce a wife without sufficient reason. Her consent and her parents' were required before taking a second with her. Often marriage contracts stipulated that no other wife should be received. Women held high offices in the temples. Wives and other women were allowed great liberty. They could go abroad unrestrained, and wives could accompany their husbands in visits and entertainments, but sometimes they sat apart from the men on the other side of the room. They were expected to attend the public festivals, when 700,000 men, women and children often came together. Josephus says that "when it was the custom for women to go to the public solemnity the wife of Potiphar, having pleaded ill-health, in order to be allowed to stay at home, was excused from attending," and made use of the opportunity given by her husband's absence to talk with Joseph. Ladies were permitted to drink wine in small cups. In the frescoes they are occasionally caricatured as having taken too much. But in the early days of Rome no woman might drink wine, nor any man under thirty, except at the sacrifices. Afterwards the Roman women were allowed to use it medicinally. Although the Egyptian concubines often waited on the chief wife

and performed other domestic offices, no distinction was made between their children and those of the wife or of any other woman: all enjoyed equal rights of inheritance. This people regarded the child as owing its existence to its father, and the mother as simply a nurse, and they rightly considered it unjust that a father should show preference for either of his children in the division of his property. Legitimate and illegitimate shared alike. Under this and other such equitable laws and customs, Egypt weathered the political storms of thousands of years, and when she fell it was by the hand of a ruthless and insatiable conqueror, who seized or destroyed her objects of art and deported the artists and artisans.

Strict obedience of children was always insisted on. They might not sit in the presence of their fathers, nor eat with them except under rare circumstances. Even the king's sons waited on their father as fan-bearers or followed his chariot on foot. Respect for age was inculcated, and every young man had to give place to his elders and to rise on their approach. Reverence for their parents and ancestors was maintained after their death, and so strong was it for all generations that it became a custom for money-lenders to include the borrower's deceased parent in the mortgage, as this was considered the safest security for repayment. Not to have redeemed the dead would have been accounted infamous, and the defaulting borrower could neither be buried nor bury his children. Plato, remarking on the strictness of their education, says: "They knew that children ought to be early accustomed to such gestures, looks, and motions as are decent and proper, and not to be suffered either to hear or to learn any verses and songs than those which are calculated to inspire them with virtue; and they consequently took care that every dance and ode introduced at their feasts or sacrifices should be subject to certain regulations." Diodorus says: "The children of the priests are taught two different kinds of writing, what is called the sacred, and the more general; and they pay great attention to geometry and arithmetic." The study of astronomy was compulsory in their schools, and music was generally taught, although not deemed a necessary accomplishment. Plato spent thirteen years in Egypt, and in his *Second Book of Laws* he makes the Athenian guest say: "The plan we have been laying down for the education of youth was known long ago to the Egyptians—that nothing but beautiful forms and fine music should be permitted to enter into the assemblies of young people. Having settled what those forms and what that music should be, they exhibited them in their temples; nor was it allowable for painters or other imitative artists to innovate or invent any forms different from what were established; nor lawful either in painting, statuary, or any branches of music, to make any alteration upon examination; therefore, you will find that the pictures and statues made ten thousand years ago

are in no particular better or worse than what they now make." Bruce in his *Travels* remarked of the harps on a tomb at Thebes: "They overturn all the accounts hitherto given of the earliest state of music and musical instruments in the East; and are altogether in their form, ornaments, and compass an incontestable proof, stronger than a thousand Greek quotations, that geometry, drawing, mechanics, and music were at the greatest perfection when this instrument was made, and that the period from which we date the invention of these arts was only the beginning of the era of their restoration." Mr. W. Chappell observed of the Egyptian flute: "It was a custom of the Egyptians, in the early dynasties of the empire, to deposit a musical pipe by the side of the body of a deceased person, and, together with the pipe, a long straw of barley. The pipes were played upon by short pieces of barley straw. . . . These straws give us a new insight into the Egyptian doctrine of the transmigration of souls."

It was an early maxim of this people that the king could do no wrong. Although we consider their monarchs absolute, their power was restricted by custom and minute usage. Every act of their public life was governed strictly by precedent. The occupation of each hour of the day was elaborately set forth, and could not be departed from. As the ecclesiastical head of the empire, the king was supposed to communicate the choicest gifts of the gods to his subjects, and he who benefited his people was never forgotten. No honours and no expense were sufficient for his memory. "For of all people," says Diodorus, "the Egyptians retain the highest sense of a favour conferred upon them, and deem it the greatest charm of life to make a suitable return for benefits they have received; and honour done to one who cannot possibly know it, in return for a past benefit, carries along with it a testimony of sincerity so totally devoid of the least colour of dissimulation, that every one must admire the sentiments which dictate its performance." The national mourning for a king lasted seventy-two days (for a private person seventy), during which time all the comforts and luxuries of life were voluntarily denied themselves. These included bread, meat, wheat, wine, and all delicate foods and drinks. They neither bathed nor anointed themselves, nor indulged in any pleasure. In this way the monarch sought the good of his people, and the people cheerfully accepted his will as law. For when he died he was solemnly judged. Any one could lay an accusation against him. And if it could be proved that he had governed ill or oppressed his subjects, he was condemned by popular vote, and denied the customary honours.

Their cardinal virtue was Truth or Justice. The goddess Ma represented both. Every one of the thirty judges wore a golden chain in court around his neck, from which her image was suspended..

Justice was gratuitously administered. The rich had thus no advantage over the poor. No oratory was permitted on either side. No barristers or solicitors "made the worse appear the better part." All complaints were handed to the court in writing. The defence was made in like manner. Witnesses, if any, were examined by the judges, who decided the case by touching the successful litigant with the image of Truth.

Falsehood was a punishable offence, but perjury was the blackest of crimes, and could only be expiated by death. To calumniate the dead was severely visited, and a false accuser was condemned to the same punishment due to the offence which he maintained.

For the prevention and detection of crime, every one had, at stated times, to present himself before the magistrate of his district and give a full account of himself, particularly as to how he earned his livelihood. A false statement to conceal crime was a capital offence. But their criminal punishments were, on the whole, mild as regarded life, as we also know from what befell Joseph. The *lex talionis*, which suited the fierce temper of the Jews, was not acquired from the milder Egyptians. Their laws were chiefly exercised for the reclamation of the criminal and for the public good, rather than from vindictive motives. The wilful murder of a slave was punished with death just as that of a freeman. The Greeks and Romans could murder their slaves with impunity. It was also a capital offence to witness a murder without trying to prevent it. He who was present without interfering when any one assaulted another, was held an accomplice punishable to the extent of the assault. Every one witnessing a robbery without arresting the thief or laying an information, received a fixed number of stripes, and was kept without food for three full days. Infants were never exposed, nor had a father, as in Rome, any right over the life of his child. In the case of child-murder, which seldom occurred, the corpse was fastened around the neck of the parent for three days and nights under a public guard. But the parricide was "lacerated with sharpened reeds, and after being thrown on thorns, was burnt to death."

In the case of a woman sentenced to death while in a state of pregnancy, her punishment was postponed until after the birth of her child. This law was adopted by the Athenians.

A woman who committed adultery was deprived of her nose. The man received a thousand blows. But he who violated a free woman was mutilated so that he could never repeat the offence. In minor breaches of the law they always resorted to the bastinado, whether soldiers or civilians. The Moslems say, "The stick came down from heaven, a blessing from God." It was inflicted on both sexes. The women sat and received the stripes on their backs. The Jews also learnt to use it, and St. Paul suffered from it.

Capital punishment was rarely required or resorted to. No



representation of it occurs in the sculptures, except in scenes of Hades, and there only decapitation and strangling to represent the annihilation of the impure soul. Hanging never occurs, nor exposure of the corpse. Their laws did not sanction these. But some offenders were allowed to commit suicide. Many of their notions evidently came down from a primitive age, especially where punishment was directed against offending members. Forgers and coiners of base money were condemned to lose both hands. No soldier could be cast into prison, nor any citizen be seized for debt, and only written contracts could be sued for after 812 B.C.

Cleanliness was a habit which it was disgraceful in any one to neglect. Ablutions were frequent with all. With the priests they were a religious duty. These bathed twice a day, and twice during the night. Every three days they shaved the whole body. They detested contact with the long-haired races, because they accounted them unclean. For the same reason they wore linen only next the skin, and practised circumcision. The filthy Jews were an abomination to them, and Lord Prudhoe cites Sysimachus as relating that they were ultimately expelled because they suffered so much from "leprosy, scurvy, and sundry other diseases," that they polluted the temples, spread these loathsome complaints among the Egyptian people, and disorganised the State. A scarcity of food ensued, and the Oracle of Ammon commanded the king "to cast them out into the desert, when the land would recover its fertility." This he did with an army.

There was no strict caste in Egypt. Trades, however, generally descended from fathers to sons. Priests often followed other professions and occupations. Joseph married the daughter of the priest of Heliopolis; and the three great classes—priests, scribes, and warriors—interchanged occupations, and intermarried with the daughters of the others freely. A priest might be the captain of a warship or the commander of a regiment. But it was almost impossible for one of the lower orders to rise into the higher. For "public employment was monopolised by a few great families," and it is almost certain "there was an hereditary territorial aristocracy, holding by a sort of fœdal tenure."

Circumcision was the distinctive sign between orthodox Egyptians and nonconformists, between natives and strangers. The oldest monuments show that it existed in Egypt five and a half centuries before Abraham visited there; and we cannot suppose it commenced with these monuments.

In later times the habits of the people were lax, partly, perhaps, from the influx of so many foreigners and foreign captives. Barley-beer and wine were abundant, and intoxication was frequent. Young lads often indulged in drunkenness, and even ladies at dinner sometimes became inebriated. Eventually lasciviousness and im-

purity were widespread, and men were not ashamed to boast of their obscenities in their writings. The upper classes became sensual and depraved, given over to a succession of pleasures. Their lives were spent in feasting, sport, and enjoyments. The women became loose, immodest, licentious, but not to the extent that the Greek writers would have us believe. Wives, however, like Potiphar's abounded. The men wore magnificent dresses, and drove splendid equipages, and the women adorned themselves with false hair, dyes, and cosmetics. Their dress, too, was rich and of modern style, and the frocks were sometimes flounced. They had all the toilet requisites of to-day. But although softness and luxurious living prevailed, "the men were industrious, cheerful, and even gay under hardships." Like the modern Chinese, notwithstanding their high-flown maxims, they were cruel, vindictive, treacherous, avaricious, and intensely servile. Prostration was common from inferiors to superiors, and all, on small provocation, beat those beneath them. Slaves in the house and the field worked under the rod. But no people were ever so religious. Herodotus said: "The Egyptians are religious to excess, far beyond any other race of men." Their calendars were crowded with festivals, and hardly a week passed without one. Yet they proved indisputably that a people can be highly religious without being moral or pure.

Egypt was divided into twelve nomes, or provinces. They had twelve great gods, and twelve months to the year. Each month was ruled by one of these gods. They knew the correct measurement of the year as we have it now. They divided the week into seven days, corresponding to the seven planets. They were the first to make astronomical records, and the Chaldeans, an Egyptian colony, carried their knowledge to Babylon. The number seven was a mystic number, associated with astronomy and religion. The number three was also mystic, and, excepting nine, was the most important. Various trinities were worshipped in different districts with peculiar veneration. In these triads the third god proceeded from the other two, and was of inferior rank. The Theban trinity consisted of Amen, Mut, and Khonsu. Amen and Mut were two of their eight chief gods, but Khonsu was not. In the triad of Philæ, Osiris and Isis were superior to Horus. Osiris and Isis were twins, and their marriage gave rise to that peculiar Egyptian custom—the marriage of full brother and sister. The acute intellect of this people, exerting itself for ages, fabricated gods without number. Some of them were doubtless tribal, like that of the Lycopolites, who alone of the Egyptians ate mutton because their ancestor was a wolf. The rest kept sheep for the wool alone. As they thought learning inconsistent with manual labour, the working classes were usually illiterate, except slaves specially educated to increase their value or usefulness.

Thus their religion was egregiously superstitious and fanatical. But the esoteric belief of the cultured few—the religious chiefs—was that of pure monotheism. This being the highest mystery, not to be divulged to the ignorant, nor to any but those of purest lives and noblest intellect, caused the popular religion to be degraded to the level of the most polytheistic. As all things in nature were the sensible manifestations of the Divine Soul, animals, plants, and other natural objects were substituted as his emblems. Man was the highest emblem; animals, according to their good qualities, came next; then plants in their order; and last, things without life. The heavenly bodies were accounted as gods, influencing man and mundane things, and hence arose astrology, with all the discoveries and follies to which it gave rise, and which lingers amongst us to this day. But the initiated of highest rank regarded the Sun himself—the great god Ra—as only a glorious manifestation of the unseen power, whose holy name no mortal might pronounce. In process of time his existence was almost forgotten, and his emblems only remained for worship. St. Jerome said: “They would rather eat the flesh of human beings than the flesh of the heifer.” Cicero asked: “Who ever heard of an Egyptian killing a cat?” In cases of fire, a man saved his cat before anything or any one else. They with many other animals were embalmed for their day of resurrection. Dogs were buried in coffins, and all animals except the pig were reverently treated. Their worship of such things as cats, monkeys, onions, and crocodiles was misunderstood, and gave rise to much lively ridicule from foreigners. No religion, however, has been so difficult as theirs to understand or to explain. And although the greatest minds have attempted these, it cannot be said that any have succeeded. What we know, however, proves that it was a most sublime and pure Deism. Their sacred texts describe God as “the only true living God, self-originated; who existed from the beginning; who has made all things; but has not Himself been made—the sole producer of all things, both in heaven and earth, Himself not produced of any.”

He had no name, or if he had, it was unlawful either to pronounce or write it. “He was pure spirit, perfect in all things, all-wise, almighty, supremely good.” Brugsch says: “The forty-two laws of the Egyptian religion in the 125th chapter of the *Book of the Dead* fall short in nothing of the teachings of Christianity.” And he conjectured that Moses in compiling his Book of Laws did but “translate into Hebrew the religious precepts which he found in the sacred books.” Their moral laws and the Decalogue are almost alike.

Their great book, which we call the Ritual of the Dead, they term *The Manifestation of Light*. A portion of it was said to have been written by the finger of Thoth himself. The third part opens with the 125th chapter, known as the “Hall of the Two Truths.” The

soul of the deceased is before the judgment-seat of Osiris to be tried whether he is worthy of Elysium or of exclusion therefrom. Osiris sits on a lofty throne, assisted by forty-two inferior gods as assessors, and avengers of evil deeds. The deceased is interrogated by them in turn, to see if he can prove himself worthy of a future life; whether his spiritual knowledge is sufficient, and if his actions on earth have been pure. He replies to each by name, and declares his innocence and worthiness. He says, "I have not blasphemed; I have not stolen; I have not slain any one treacherously; I have not been cruel to any one; I have not been idle; I have not been drunken; I have not issued unjust orders; I have not been indiscreetly curious; I have not multiplied words in speaking; I have struck no one; I have slandered no one; I have not eaten my heart through envy; I have not reviled the face of the king nor the face of my father; I have not made false accusations; I have not kept milk from the mouth of sucklings; I have not caused abortion; I have not ill-used my slaves; I have not killed sacred beasts; I have not defiled the river; I have not polluted myself." Then to the conclave of gods he bursts forth: "Let me go. Ye know that I am without fault, without evil, without sin, without crime. Do not torture me. Do not aught against me. I have lived on truth; I have been fed on truth. I have made it my delight to do what men command and the gods approve; I have offered to the deities all the sacrifices that were their due; I have given bread to the hungry and drink to him that was athirst; I have clothed the naked with garments. My mouth and my hands are pure." His justification is granted, and he passes away from the Halls of Truth to sail to Elysium.

Their notions of evil are difficult to ascertain, but we can see from the above trial what habits and customs had to be guarded against, and were therefore presumably general. The forty-two avengers of sins were called lords of truth—judges of the dead. Immediately after death the soul of the deceased appeared before them, as just described. Anubis, the Director of the Weights, brings forth a pair of scales, placing the feather of truth in one, and in the other the heart, or a vase containing the good and bad deeds of the deceased. Thoth stands by with a writing tablet in his hand to record the result. According as the scales incline, Osiris gives his sentence. If the good actions preponderated the soul was allowed to enter the boat of the Sun to be conducted by good spirits to Aahla and the "Pools of Peace," and the dwelling of Osiris. But if, on the contrary, the ordeal was not passed, the soul was condemned according to its deserts to a round of transmigrations in the bodies of animals more or less unclean. Ultimately, if purity were not attained, Osiris would sentence the soul to annihilation.

The good soul, after Purgatory, became the companion of Osiris

for 3000 years; it then returned from the Amenti; re-entered its former body; rose from the dead, and lived a man on earth again. This alternation of earth and heaven was repeated for a mystic cycle of years, when the soul became absorbed into the divine essence, "the true end and full perfection of being." It would, however, require a volume to make the religious ideas and customs of the Egyptians fairly intelligible even so far as they are known. The Greeks borrowed from them very greatly, but never understood them.

The Egyptians were very fond of plants and flowers. They grew the latter profusely. Ladies carried a lotus flower in their hands at banquets, or more likely bouquets, as the sculptors and painters often represented many by one. They adorned the necks of their sacrificial animals, and their own at wine feasts, with garlands, or crowned themselves with flowers. They even manufactured artificial flowers, and they grew roses and violets in the depths of winter.

Reading was common, and their literature extensive. They had books on geometry, arithmetic, travels, medicine, morals, philosophy, and above all they had novels; among the last are *The Tale of the Two Brothers*, *The Possessed Princess*, and *The Doomed Prince*—short tales resembling those of the *Arabian Nights*. Their literature, however, was of slight quality. The hand of the priest bore too heavily for the free effort of original genius. Originality was heterodoxy; invention was the sin of witchcraft.

The bow was the arm on which they originally relied. Their archers were the best of their time, and they drew the bow in the same way as the English, the hand to the ear. After the horse was introduced they were strong in chariots. We give a few spirited lines from an epic poem of Penta-our on Rameses II. against the Hittites:

"Then the king addressed his footmen, and his horsemen, and his chieftains—

All who in the fight were backward—' Well it was not done of any,  
That ye left me (unsupported) singly with the foe to combat,  
Not a chieftain, not a captain, not a sergeant came to aid me—  
All alone I had to battle with a host that none could number.  
Nechtu-em-djhon, Nehr-ahruta, they, my horses (and they only),  
Gave me succour in my danger, when I singly fought the foemen.  
Therefore do I grant them henceforth, when I rest within my palace,  
Peacefully to champ their barley in the sight of Ra for ever.  
As for Meuna, who was with me, (doughty) squire and armour-bearer,  
Him I give the suit of armour, clad in which I fought and conquered,  
When with sword of might I battled, and ten thousand fled before  
me.'"

Their mechanical skill was essentially artistic. Take, for example, their furniture and utensils. Chairs, couches, stools, and boxes were of most ingenious construction, and covered with rare devices. Ebony and other choice woods were inlaid with ivory or other rich

materials. Seats of leather were painted with flowers or beautiful patterns. In very early times they had three-legged and four-legged stools, camp-stools, and folding stools; chairs like Solomon's throne, kangaroo chairs, and chairs of all patterns, and couches comfortably stuffed. On the tomb of Rameses III. are beautiful ottomans of different designs. They sat at tables, and these, too, were ornamented. Sometimes they were supported by the figure of a captive standing erect.

Their ewers, basins, and vases were of lovely designs, and in some cases equal to those of the Greeks. Everything bore evidence of taste and culture, even to the dolls and toys for the little ones.

While their sculptures cannot compare, except for size, with those of Greece, their architecture was beyond comparison the greatest that the world has seen or is likely to see. Ferguson, in his great work, considers the temple of Karnak the most perfect and most stupendous achievement of man. It was 1200 feet long and 310 wide, and its grandeur was enough to fill the soul with terror. One of its sacred cells was called "Holy of Holies," and Solomon's Temple resembled it even to the stelaë before the doors, which he named Jachin and Boaz. In fact, Egyptian institutions, arts, habits, and customs enable us to correctly interpret much of Jewish, Greek and Roman, with all their later consequences. But we must tear ourselves from this fascinating people, for there are a thousand points we should like to notice did space permit: their agriculture and medicine—they had special doctors for every disease and specifics for all—their astronomy, manufactures; games like single-stick; sports, as bull-fights; their inventions, as the arch-bellows, and siphon; glass of all kinds, with imitations of precious stones; weaving of linen and woollen, paper, dyeing, rope-making and pottery; their modes of fishing, fowling, and hunting; their art of preserving bodies; their wire-drawing and gold-beating, tanning, and artificial hatching. Their god, Khnoumis, who made man, was a potter, for he formed him out of clay upon a potter's wheel. And we would observe their civil and military engineering, the former of which enabled them to transport blocks weighing hundreds of tons to a distance of hundreds of miles, to move the monolithic temple of Latona to Buto, weighing at least 5000 tons; while the latter taught them to draw the camp as it was 2000 years later drawn by Cæsar. We should like to speculate in what way they separated huge masses of rock as easily as (and with more precision than) we do with gunpowder. We should like to note their astrology and its influence on ourselves, their methods of farming and cattle breeding, including their art of castration. For what is there, except printing, or electricity, or steam power, which this wonderful race did not invent or know? To us the glories of Greece and Rome pale before the older glories of Egypt. She gave

them the key and casket of eternal truth but they knew not how to use them. For whereas she converted all matter into metaphysics, they converted all abstractions to gross materialism.

The other civilisations of Assyria, India, and China ran on somewhat parallel lines, but offer little of interest which did not previously or simultaneously exist in Egypt.

Greece received of Egypt willingly, but claimed the gifts to be indigenous. Rome borrowed of Greece unwillingly and sourly. Europe took her laws from Rome, her art and grace from Greece. Thus the course of habits and customs rolled on until it was checked or overwhelmed by devastating wars and barbaric hordes of invaders: in the East the Moslem, in the West the Goth. In all these struggles the glory was for the men, the suffering for the women.

We saw her as a beast of burden in savage times. In the ancient civilised period her position is improved, but she is still in all things an inferior. In Egypt, where she had much freedom, execution was postponed in the case of a pregnant woman, not from humanity, but because the child she bore was the property of the father, and in a civil community the rights of property must be respected. But no civilisation can be perfect where she is not in all respects possessed of equal rights and privileges with man. Tried by this standard, all other ancient countries fall short of Egypt, and in one important point all moderns also. In our next paper we shall note what changes took place in mediæval times.

LADY COOK  
(née TENNESSEE CLAFLIN).

## THE DECLINE OF ROMANCE.

A MARKED feature of contemporary literature is the growing antipathy to the unreal, and the desire to depict life as it is, without illusion and without exaggeration. Romance is, so to speak, at its last gasp. The attempts made by certain writers to revive it are characterised by a kind of ghastly grotesqueness. What can be more painfully ludicrous than Mr. Rider Haggard's blood-curdling book, *She*—that wretched combination of nonsense, banality, and bathos? What can be more pitifully absurd than the conclusion of his latest work, *Montezuma's Daughter*? Mr. Haggard has sought for his subjects in "darkest Africa," and in the semi-barbaric civilisations of the past. The history of the Aztecs has inspired him with the idea of writing a romance which, from the first chapter to the last, is a mass of crudities and improbabilities. Every one who has read Prescott's *Conquest of Mexico* knows that the Aztecs were a very singular people, who combined with gross cruelty and superstition a high degree of culture and social progress. Mr. Haggard brings out an Englishman to Mexico, where he is placed upon the stone of sacrifice, but is fortunately saved for the purposes of the romance by the future mistress of Cortez. The hero passes through impossible ordeals; and scenes of horror are introduced sufficient to give any ordinary novel-reader a succession of nightmares.

It is time to assign to a writer of this description his proper place in literature. Mr. Andrew Lang has attempted to class Mr. Haggard with the great masters of English romantic fiction. The public have, however, very properly arrived at the conclusion that such works as *She* and *Allan Quatermain* should be set aside for perusal by juvenile readers. They are outside the pale of mature criticism, and, except in a limited sense, are not literature at all. Few grown-up men or women now trouble themselves with a discussion of Mr. Haggard's merits or demerits. To quote the phrase used by the late Mr. Parnell during the Irish land-agitation, they "leave him severely alone."

If, therefore, the revival of romance depends on the efforts of Mr. Haggard, its speedy death may be safely anticipated.

But there are other living writers who have produced romances not unfit to be compared with *Ivanhoe* and *The Talisman*. With a certain degree of reverence, we mention the name of Mr. Robert



Louis Stevenson. His *Prince Otto* was not all that his admirers might have expected from him. *Kidnapped* was an interesting fragment, and he enhanced it by recently writing a sequel to it. *Treasure Island* is a book that boys can read with pleasure again and again. Yet Mr. Stevenson has failed in his efforts to bring back life to the old-fashioned romance so dear to our ancestors. Scott was incomparably the most successful toiler in this field of literature; and yet his best historical romances have been truly described as mere "pieces of mosaic-work." It must be evident to any one who reads Mr. Stevenson's latest story, *The Ebb Tide*,<sup>1</sup> that this gifted writer is abandoning the romantic form of narrative and adopting the methods of realism. In this tale we find three men at Tahiti on the verge of actual starvation, two Englishmen and an American sea-captain. A ship comes into the bay with small-pox on board. The American captain is prevailed upon to take command of this ship, and the two Englishmen accompany him. The captain and mate who had previously been on board the vessel—two men named Wiseman and Wishart—had died facing one another. Herrick, one of the two Englishmen who have accompanied the American captain, says to the latter: "I wonder what they said last?" And the captain's reply is this: "Probably mighty small potatoes. That's the thing a fellow figures out for himself one way, and the real business goes quite another. Perhaps Wiseman said, 'Here, old man, fetch up the gin. I'm feeling powerful rocky.' And perhaps Wishart said, 'Oh, hell!'"

Could anything be more grimly realistic?

We may fairly assume that henceforth Mr. Stevenson will do very little for the revival of romance.

Under the *nom de guerre* of "Q," another writer has produced some startling specimens of romance. Take, for example, that most gruesome and most artificially-constructed narrative, *Dead Man's Rock*. This is a story that might bear favourable comparison with some of Mr. Haggard's works. The subject is the quest of the Great Ruby of Ceylon, and the story is told by Jasper Trenoweth, a Cornishman. From beginning to end, however, the book is not only improbable but unnatural. In the opening chapters a boy of eight exhibits more than the keenness of perception and the reasoning faculty of an ordinary man. A sailor named Simon Colliver perpetrates, without any motive save malice or sheer thirst for blood, a series of murders compared with which Jack the Ripper's performances were child's play. If the reader is satisfied to accept all kinds of situations, no matter how forced or opposed to the laws of nature, he may find something to amuse him in the exciting puerilities of *Dead Man's Rock*.

Such books, however, will in the end be read only by boys. If

<sup>1</sup> Published in serial form in Mr. Jerome K. Jerome's magazine, *To-day*.

their object be to please juvenile tastes, it may be attained in some instances. Boys certainly revel in scenes of carnage; but it might well be asked whether this kind of reading may not tend to brutalise the minds of the young.

If true pictures of the past, no matter how repulsive to modern ideas, were presented to us, the case would be entirely different. Even in dealing with so-called historical fiction, the realistic test is the true one. Victor Hugo's description of the Court of Louis XI. in *Notre Dame* is far more likely to be accurate than Scott's in *Quentin Durward*, though both sin against historical facts. No writer has grappled with the distant past so firmly as Gustave Flaubert, who, both in *Salammbô* and in *La Tentation de Saint Antoine*, has almost recreated a dead world—at least so far as literary art can do so. If Flaubert's method were adopted, there might be some hope of utilising the novel for the purpose of making history more intelligible. Mr. Froude has made an experiment, to some extent, in this direction; but he is not a novelist, as his attempt to write a story proved.

The conclusion to be drawn from the failure of such writers as Mr. Haggard and "Q" to make the mature reader take any interest in what is called romance is that, except in the case of children, fanciful narratives, whether founded on history or not, are repugnant to the spirit of the age. Mr. Hall Caine has wisely refrained from imitating Mr. Haggard, and, though not at all realistic, he takes care to give a rugged background of reality to even his wildest narratives. English fiction cannot long refuse to keep pace with contemporary Continental literature. Mr. Hardy, Mr. Meredith, and Mr. Kipling have torn themselves away from the old traditions. *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* and *One of our Conquerors* are, in the eyes of such critics as Mr. Andrew Lang, unorthodox, perhaps unclean, because they are unconventional. The author of *The Light that Failed* has yet to produce a great novel; but his short tales are splendid specimens of realism—in other words, they have materially added to our knowledge of human life.

The day is gone by when the novelist can be regarded as a mere caterer for the amusement of sentimental old maids or indolent fogs. We are sick of lying and cant and platitude. We want facts, not romantic dreams. Let the novelist use his powers of observation to take in the entire *milieu*, and let him use his imagination to penetrate the hearts and minds of those amongst whom his life is spent. In one village or parish he may find enough of human interest to furnish forth a dozen novels. This is partly what Mr. Hardy has done. If he prefers to travel, let him fix his abode for some time in a place which has for him some natural attraction. If he seeks to revive the buried past, he should collect all the archives carefully, and, when he has conjured

up the life of bygone days, he should describe it with the minuteness and severe simplicity of an artist.

Writers of romance like Mr. Haggard may appeal to the undeveloped imagination of juvenile readers, but the novelist of the future has a higher responsibility, and he must stand upon a higher level. He must possess more extensive, more profound knowledge of life than other men, and he must be able to communicate such knowledge in a narrative form. In this sense, the greatest English novelists are Fielding, Thackeray, and Mr. Thomas Hardy; the greatest French novelists Balzac, Flaubert, and the brothers De Goncourt. These writers, whatever their shortcomings, cannot be described as empirics or dreamers. Their works are a distinct contribution to human history, and present to us the world exactly as they saw it. When reading such books, we feel that we are dealing not with myths, but with realities. Fiction, when it is divorced from fact, becomes childish and ridiculous. For this reason we may assume that Haggardian romance will ultimately take its proper place with the chronicles of *Bluebeard*, *Cinderella*, and *Jack the Giant Killer*, while realistic fiction will rank above the drama as a faithful delineation of life in all its moods and phases.

D. F. HANNIGAN.

# PHASES OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT.

## I.

HISTORY is insistent in her teaching that man is, on the average, a faithful reproduction, or, rather, product, of his surroundings, and that even his dominant passions are moulded and modified by them, in defiance of the popular notion that these passions are entirely beyond the power of circumstances, being part of the essential and eternal nature of mankind.<sup>1</sup>

This idea, like most popular ideas, is false and superficial. No instinct, however strong, but has shown itself, in certain conditions, tame and subservient; no heroism, however great, is beyond the strength of *average* man or woman when demanded as a duty by the creeds of the race. But to this we must add: no crime, however base, no cruelty, however fiendish, is shrunk from when religious enthusiasm dictates, when social law commands, or when the impulses of hereditary savagery have received no check from either of these powers, or from the higher development of the character in other directions.<sup>2</sup>

The existence of customs that sicken and agonise the imagination even to hear about ought to be borne in mind, in order that we may appreciate the forces with which we have to deal in unredeemed human nature, and that we may see clearly how little we dare trust

<sup>1</sup> "Tel est l'esprit qui nous gouverne, nous ne pouvons souffrir ce qui s'écarte de nos vues étroites, de nos petites habitudes. De la mesure de nos idées nous faisons la borne de celle des autres. Tout ce qui va au delà nous blesse."—CHATEAUBRIAND, *Essai sur les Révolutions*.

The notion held by many that the "wisdom of ages" has ordained our institutions can scarcely survive historical research, for this generally reveals them as monuments of centuries of accumulated folly, which can hardly claim admiration from the fact that they have escaped deserved attack for so long.

<sup>2</sup> The records of many religions prove that even the instinct of self-preservation can be overcome without difficulty. Instances of astonishing heroism demanded as an ordinary custom will occur to every one, as existing among savage tribes. Examples of cruelty are still more numerous. Putting aside the more terrible cases, it is strange to read accounts of hunting expeditions among (for example) the North American Indians, which make one realise how very close to the aboriginal state our own sportsmen still are. The savage's skilful method of killing and of snaring the game would kindle enthusiasm in the hearts of men and brothers who call themselves civilised. These same American tribes, who during peace seem to show many good and even kindly qualities, become in time of war nothing less than demons. The description of the tortures that they love to inflict upon their enemies—trying always to take them alive in order to enjoy that pleasure—are too terrible for the imagination to endure. When the victorious band returns home, after the wailing for the fallen has ceased, wild war-whoops are set up to announce the number of captives. And then the whole settlement turns out and the prisoners are led, through two rows of women and children who are eager to commence the horrible ceremony of torture and execution.

to the traditions of our ancestors as fountains of goodness and wisdom.

• It must be understood that man, in any age and country, is liable to revert to a state of savagery if the conditions of existence favour such a retrogression. His surroundings gradually persuade man into harmony with themselves, not only by direct action upon his nature, but by exterminating those individuals who are unable to endure them. The race therefore, even more than the individual, is clay in the hands of the potter—circumstance.

It is impossible to obtain a just view of the facts of human destiny, unless we have a vivid realisation of the extremes of good and evil which may be deduced from the race, according as its conditions encourage the one or the other of its tendencies. These extremes may be found side by side, even in the same person, if one part of his nature has been cultivated while the other has been left unaltered. Thus we may find men who might justly be called good, committing deeds that are really atrociously evil, simply because in certain directions their instincts have not been redeemed from the primitive state. There are plenty of very good men—as we half-civilised beings esteem goodness—who are simply and obviously savage as regards their treatment of animals, inflicting upon them, for the sake of what is called “sport,” or “science,” protracted tortures perhaps, without a qualm or a suspicion of offence. In modern life we see a sort of dual conscience; active as regards human beings, but scarcely awake at all in respect to other races of suffering creatures. It is not the capability of pain and pleasure in others which arouses man’s sense of responsibility, but the fact of belonging to his own division of the animal creation. It is not good or evil; it is not moral development, but tradition, that decides the conduct. Clearly, therefore, exemplary characters afford no presumption whatever that the institutions which they support are worthy of respect. There is nothing so atrocious in itself that habit will not reconcile and even endear to human beings of excellent disposition. But they will not commit an atrocity that belongs to a past epoch. It is only those who fall below the average who revert to forms of savagery that are disallowed by their century. To this fact we owe our progress. The conduct of the average man fluctuates around the accepted standard as a centre, and thus we slowly make way by a successive raising of the standard.

On either side of the average man, who constitutes the immediate ruling force of society, we have those below and those above the average. From the one class we get our criminals; from the other, the makers of new standards. Our aim then must obviously be to raise the standards, and therefore the average man, until these have succeeded in holding in thrall and finally extirpating the original savage who still utters his disturbing war-whoop in the heart of

our most respectable citizens. We must seek to play upon the more human elements of society so that the desires and ambitions become, on the average, more rational, more beneficent, more fruitful in happiness of the lasting and true sort than are the desires and ambitions of the half-developed being who now, *faute de mieux*, is known as civilised man.

It is all a matter of conditions. These can work miracles. The fatal and common mistake is to take human nature as we happen to find it in our age and country, and fit our measures to its evil and its ignorance. We must on no account admit that local "human nature" as a constant factor, but must regard it merely as a register of the forces that chance to be at work upon it at the moment, and the forces that have been at work upon it in the past. We have to remember that the character of a man is the product of all the events of his past: of the impetus that he has received, hereditary and otherwise—the creeds through which his right and wrong, his ideas and ambitions, became established. Different centuries produce different types of humanity, though born of the same race. The best of men will commit deeds in one era at which the worst would hesitate in another. The standard obviously therefore is all-important in determining morality, and not less so than is the supply of air and food and water in regulating the public health. Standards, be it observed, may vary from the sublime to the ridiculous.

Italy during the Middle Ages affords an interesting example of their influence. Without a central authority to hold the nobles in check, the country became a prey to the powerful families, whose perpetual struggles between themselves and with the Republics which attempted to defend their freedom show clearly the result of arbitrary power upon the nature of man. It is certainly not probable that Italy, during this period, produced a sudden increase of abnormally ferocious and evil-minded men, foredoomed to crime from their birth. The worst of the Borgias and the Visconti were merely the product of their age, which encouraged crime and rewarded the finer qualities with contempt and failure. The story of the little son of the chief Minister of the Duke of Athens, who, during the latter's rule in Florence, used to delight in being present at the tortures ordered by his father, is a striking example of the effect of circumstance upon character. The child had acquired a taste for these scenes, and used to plead that the tortures might be prolonged beyond the time appointed, asking for special kinds to be inflicted because he enjoyed witnessing the extreme agony that they caused.<sup>1</sup> This seems almost diabolic to the modern conscience, yet in all probability there is not a child in a British nursery at this moment who might not, under certain conditions, have developed the same

<sup>1</sup> *Histoire des Républiques Italiennes du Moyen Age.* Sismondi.

ferocity as that which horrifies us in the little savage of the Middle Ages. The cruelty of boys is proverbial. Tradition checks them, at a certain point, but not the sense of pity. The savage is overcome in man exactly so far as his tradition takes him. At that tide-line his mercy abruptly stops. Woe to those whom he encounters on the wrong side of it. During the period of the Renaissance, the possession of power seems to have induced in most of the seigneurs of Italy a sort of insanity of cruelty such as we find among the Roman Emperors after their rule became absolute. When there is no criterion but a man's own conscience, even if that conscience be originally of exceptional nobility, he ends by losing all balance and proportion in his ideas: he becomes morally dizzy or insane. Among the Italian tyrants this "blood-madness," as it was named, recalls the conduct of the savages who torture their prisoners to death—as when one of the Visconti ordered that a captive enemy should have the agony protracted during forty-eight hours, or when the seigneur, in a fit of anger, thrust an offending servant on to the fire and held him there until he died. It would be inexcusable to bring these painful instances before the mind of the reader, were it not that these facts in human nature are generally either ignored or attributed to wrong causes.

Such facts *have* to be kept in mind, for they warn us how alarmingly dependent we all are for our peace and safety on the conditions that are everywhere busy around us, forming the ideas of average humanity, that average which is becoming more and more the real potentate in the democracy. The sentiments thus created decide the fate of the race for the present and the future.

Past events may serve as warnings; for wherever arbitrary power has existed, there in greater or less degree, in exact correspondence with the degree of the power, tyranny and suffering have sprung up as a result. From the Emperor of all the Russias to the irascible father of a family who makes his subordinates tremble at his voice, cause and effect are identical. Moreover, this law is equally well established: that the victim of tyranny will tyrannise when his chance comes. He has never seen any other use of authority, and not being inventive he does not presume to strike out a new line for himself. He would probably not find his fellow creatures encouraging if he did so. Remembering that most people imitate but do not evolve, we need not feel surprised that this should be the law of human nature. It may be laid down as a maxim that ordinary men and women will always oppress their neighbours exactly as severely as their neighbours will allow themselves to be oppressed. Conscience is no check, for they will force others to act upon the conclusions of that conscience, and feel rather a glow of self-satisfaction than any suspicion that they are committing an act of violent oppression in so doing.

In the domain of the conscience, above all others, a man demands to be free; yet it is in that domain especially that others seem to feel themselves most justified in coercing him.

Now it is obvious that just such conditions of power, on the one hand, and subjection on the other, have been busy for centuries in the very heart and centre of our existence. We must not be deluded into the belief that any of the relationships of life, however close, form a safeguard against the abuse of power. As a matter of fact, it is generally the nearest and dearest over whom the most rigid tyranny is exercised, for here the opportunities are greater, the excuses more numerous, and for some mysterious reason, the desire of rule more eager than in any other case. The amount of interference and of unsolicited criticism that people accept from even their distant relations would never be offered or endured on any other plea.

Here and there, indeed, we come upon exceptional natures to whom these remarks do not apply. In the annals of crime, even in the worst epochs, some finer, more pitiful character shines out to redeem the world; honourable in the midst of treachery, merciful and tolerant when his contemporaries seemed unable to conduct their affairs without the help of the thumbscrew and the rack.<sup>1</sup> Such natures, happily for us all, have appeared in every age at rare intervals, but it is not by any means inconceivable that the conditions of life, already unfavourable to their development, should become so hopelessly untoward that they should grow rarer and rarer, and finally perhaps die out altogether. In other words, society might become incapable of producing the finer types of mankind, and might gradually sink in its standards till it destroyed itself. Such may almost be said to have been the fate of some of the stagnating Eastern nations.

Society, as a whole, does not conduct itself on any reasoned scheme or system, but works very much after the fashion of a hive of bees, who, with all their apparent intelligence, are blind victims of some inborn force, and differ from human beings in never developing a variation in the type distinct enough to modify their social organisation. Perhaps their lack of the recording faculty deprives their variations of influence, so that apparently their habits never alter. There is seemingly the same tendency in certain human races (as for example the Chinese), and this must be, because there is also something in *their* social form that renders nugatory the existence of those individuals who differ from the average.

Now it is clear that (among other probable causes) the subject condition of women must tend to this effect by rendering more infrequent the birth and influence of these necessarily exceptional types.

<sup>1</sup> "He only knows how to conquer who knows how to forgive," was a saying of Lorenzo di Medici, a maxim which he adhered to even in the case of treacherous attempts upon his life. See Roscoe's *Life*.



Varieties are obviously unlikely to occur often in a race, when half its numbers are placed in similar conditions, trained in the same fashion, excellent though it might be, and when precisely the same set of qualities and instincts—to the discouragement of others—are called forth age after age, and exaggerated as far as possible in every individual of that vast multitude.<sup>1</sup> Chances of variation, in such circumstances, must evidently be few. Moreover, the unusual natures, when they did appear, would be likely to be destroyed or neutralised. In short, the subjection of women, whether it be complete and logical, as in the East, or modified and irrational, as among ourselves, is like a vast machine carefully constructed to stamp out and mangle smooth all varieties and all superiorities of the human race. Among nations where the influences to which women are exposed are most completely uniform, and most effectually destructive of their intelligence and their initiative, there we find the fewest men of remarkable character, the least movement, the least vitality, the least liberty, even among men, and the most wretched social condition generally. It obviously must be so; yet these are the circumstances that so many people still cling to with perverse affection, mistaking for a safeguard that which is in truth the element of danger in every society.

If it be acknowledged in theory that man is the product of his surroundings, it is ignored in practice. We shake our heads over "human nature," or we pin our faith to its inherent goodness; not seeing that such optimism and pessimism are dependent rather on the state of the liver than on that of the judgment. Man is neither an angel gone astray, nor a devil struggling to reform; he is the result of his past—and its accuser.

When once this fact is taken into account, many of the social problems that seem so insoluble become simple, or rather the cause of the evils which beset us is easily understood. We can detect the origin of our woes, and observe the storing up of woes for our successors which our present sins against health, moral and physical, must have for a result.

It is not indeed that conditions are all in the formation of character and original nature nothing. That is a theory which common experience disproves. But their power in moulding, and calling forth or leaving dormant, as the case may be, the various qualities of that original nature, itself *au fond* the handiwork of past conditions, has surely never yet been fully comprehended. What we call character depends upon the balance of certain forces and their proportionate influence on the thoughts and actions. A large family of children brought up under one roof are often strikingly unlike, although the influences have been the same in every case. But who can doubt

<sup>1</sup> The encouragements, threats, and rewards, that have been employed to induce women to spend their lives and energies in bearing children are shown in striking fashion in *Woman Free*, by Ellis Ethelmer, a volume that should be read by all who are interested in sociology.

that if those influences had been radically different, each one of those children would have grown up with other characteristics than he now possesses? Is it possible to suppose that an obstinate child would turn out precisely the same under the care of a wise and sympathetic mother as he would become in the hands of one who was bad-tempered and stupid?

It is the chemical union of native bias with daily circumstance which has for product a human character. The same processes are going on in the race on a larger scale: the characteristics of class, of profession, of sex, forming for good or ill in strict harmony with the predominating forces.

To any one who thoroughly realises all this and its far-reaching consequences, the study of history gathers an extraordinary interest, though often a somewhat painful one. If the human race may be likened to the obstinate child, his past has certainly been to him an ill-tempered and a stupid mother!

In Sismondi's account of the defence of Cesena by Marzia, wife of the seigneur of Forli—who was himself engaged at the moment in withstanding the siege of that town—we find a striking example of the action of surroundings in moulding character where the original forces were evidently very strong. It also gives a general idea of the sentiment of the age regarding the duties of women. The influence of their position upon the nature of the race, with its effects direct and indirect, would afford the subject for a new science.

With a young son and daughter, and a counsellor of her husband's choosing, Marzia shut herself up in Cesena, prepared to hold out against the Papal forces to the last extremity.

The people soon surrendered the lower part of the town, and Marzia retired to the citadel with a few followers. Finding that the councillor was in secret treaty with the enemy, she promptly had his head cut off on the walls of the fortress, taking upon herself the duties of governor and captain. "She never after that took off her cuirass, and the enemies saw her perpetually at the head of her soldiers."

The besiegers were throwing huge blocks at the citadel, and they were busy undermining the walls, so that the situation became desperate. At this juncture Marzia's father appeared with a message from the Legate that he would offer her honourable terms if she would surrender the town. The old man used ever entreaty to induce her to avoid the last horrors of a siege. Marzia's reply is characteristic: "My father, when you gave me to my lord, you commanded me above all things to obey him always; that I have done up to to-day; that will I do unto death. He confided to my care this fortress, and forbade me to abandon it for any reason whatsoever without having received fresh orders from him. That

is my duty ; what is death or danger to me ? I obey, and I judge not."

Here we see the strange effect upon a proud and resolute character of the traditions of the time. Marzia does not disdain to speak of herself as being "given" to her "lord"; she who is seemingly almost without fear, "obeys," but "judges not." Her father was unable to persuade her to alter her resolution. She held out until the soldiers refused to remain to be buried in a town which was now perilously suspended over the excavations of the besiegers. The Legate assigned her a ship in the harbour of Ancona for her prison. With such steadfastness and determination great things might have been accomplished ; but this singular woman threw all the force of her character into a sort of arrogant meekness. Throughout her life she had been suppressing her own powers by her own will-force, cultivating a spirit of blind obedience, while encouraging in her lord that tendency to abuse unquestioned authority, which the merit of the angel Gabriel would scarcely be proof against under temptations so importunate.

What conditions have been at work in determining the qualities of women, and in what manner have their qualities, so acquired, reacted upon the state of society generally, upon the nature of man, and upon the morality of the race ? Let us suppose that we had to explain, as clearly as possible, the dominant facts of our social history to some mature mind entirely unfamiliar with our customs and ideas. In order to make our present order even intelligible, it would be necessary to point out that it consisted in a vast agglomeration of remnants of other and earlier systems—a sort of pudding-stone of spiritual geology ; half of our usages being the expressions of beliefs belonging to states of manners long since past. Among us—we should explain when questioned as to our educational modes—the fate of each human being was arbitrarily determined at birth. The fact of their sex, and that alone, decided us to educate our girls in a certain restrictive fashion, irrespective of their characteristics ; the fact of their sex, on the other hand, decided us to educate our boys with the view of developing their special qualities and of encouraging whatever talent they might possess.

The unbiased intelligence might here object that it would be just as reasonable to classify our population according to the colour of their eyes or the shape of their nose, and might point out that if such a division *had* been made (the possession of a Roman nose assuring one a liberal education and comparative freedom), there would undoubtedly have grown up a firm belief that Nature had bestowed certain eternal characteristics on that happy race, while she had ordained that the less fortunate owners of upturned noses were for ever to content themselves with an inferior position.

The unequal training and the great difference in surroundings

would, in a generation or two, create certain real differences between the two groups, even in the absence of any unlikeness of physical constitution to accelerate the divergence, and thus the prejudice would have received apparent justification. Yet on equally good evidence might one argue that the nature (for example) of lawyers was eternally and by natural ordinance different from that of doctors and clergymen. Circumstances create habits, needs, temptations; they assail their victim with incessant urgings in certain directions, with incessant arguments that appeal to one side or other of his original nature; they lull to rest other impulses that might have been vigorous; they thrust and lure and soothe and manipulate, till the man becomes their own, not of necessity their slave, but none the less their handiwork.

We should only laugh at any one who urged that, for instance, a sailor had been from birth incapable of taking any other stamp from the hand of circumstance; that had he chosen instead the legal profession, he would to the end of his days have betrayed an inherent and ineradicable tendency to dance the hornpipe.<sup>1</sup>

Now it is popularly understood that "Nature intended" the whole race of women to occupy precisely the position which they now occupy among civilised peoples, neither more nor less; for the happy moment has apparently arrived when matters are just right, or they would be so, if these destructive modern tendencies could be checked. Nature also in her wisdom apparently intended soldiers to hold themselves rigidly erect; doctors to possess a peculiar gait as of intending crime; ballet-dancers to stand for hours comfortably on one toe, and so forth.

Let us consider the fate of those two divisions of humanity who are grouped according to their sex, and ask ourselves whether they have equal chances of development. It is not usually denied that women have small opportunity, as a rule, for intellectual progress; but nobody seems to doubt that the best conditions for their moral career are assured. But this, too, is open to dispute; for to be forced by popular clamour into a blind self-annihilation is not really conducive to the health of the moral faculties; and this is why the goodness of so many women has in it a morbid quality. Such training does not make clearer the rights of other classes and kinds of beings, human and otherwise: it does nothing but enjoin a narrow duty: obedience to the demands of immediate conditions, and reverence only for those ties that are fortuitous or that are sanctified by legal forms. Not tenderness and sympathy for all that lives and can suffer is the underlying idea of feminine goodness, but devotion to individuals picked out by accident of birth or hazard of circumstance.

<sup>1</sup> There are indeed cases of very marked bias which nothing can overcome entirely, but these are rare. Even upon these, moreover, the power of the magician is exercised in subtle methods and devices.

For even the one rôle that is assigned to them women receive no training. Those who have the misfortune to possess a talent or bias strong enough to survive the discouragements of their existence, have to endure the spiritual malady of its perpetual importunities and the gnawing regrets that are inseparable from a faculty denied. While such tragedies are not infrequent among men, they are, from the nature of the case, almost certainties among women. Tradition demands the surrender of individual powers; and custom, social organisation, the necessities of daily life, coerce even the least submissive woman, or wear her out in an incessant struggle to reconcile the irreconcilable. Popular feeling, of course, is dead against her. If, after keeping the house, with its minute and multitudinous demands and interruptions, bearing and training children, and performing all her duties to her relations and friends to their entire satisfaction, a woman finds that she has strength and courage for any work of her own, then she may, without serious offence, so employ the odds and ends of her energy and time. But even then she runs the risk, nay, incurs the certainty, of being dubbed selfish. Woe to her if the force within her is strong enough to make its imprisonment painful! Woe to her sisters if the immemorial maxims laid by in lavender, generation after generation, for the instruction of her sex, induce her to renounce the more essential part of her nature and win the applause of the orthodox, or, to put it more accurately, to avoid their censure! For every such submission adds to the strength of the tyranny from which she suffers, and increases the burden for her successors. Renunciation thus often becomes a form of luxury. To a modern woman self-sacrifice is generally the path of least resistance. It is doubtless much easier to submit. Mephistopheles, in Clough's poem, is always whispering humble counsels. To cultivate a sense of virtue which self-sacrifice, however blind and stupid, is always warranted to produce, demands far less courage than to stand out against aggression and submit to be classed with the unregenerate. Yet that is often the real duty of those who desire to aid in the progress of their generation—that blindfold generation which has not yet recognised the meaning of the fact that a woman is still placed, by the combined force of law and sentiment, between the devil and the deep sea, between the alternatives of submission in marriage to whatever may be required of her, injuries and insults if need be, or the surrender of her children into hands that she regards perhaps, as of all others, the most unfit. This is the handle by which many a wife has been forced to obedience as by the application of the thumbscrew. The feeling that was aroused in the public mind by the character of Ibsen's *Nora* shows what a mother would have to contend with in popular sentiment who dared the terrors of the torture and thus threatened the efficacy of this venerable instrument of government.

The education which prepares the wife for this rôle is begun in childhood. If a girl shows a tendency to any consecutive work of an unorthodox kind, she is looked at with disfavour; and more than half her energies are consumed in struggling against the innumerable petty obstacles that are placed in her way; still more is her power sapped by the deadly atmosphere of discouragement which works its way into the heart of her initiative forces and benumbs her very desire. Cases of this kind are far more frequent than most people are ready to admit, and who can tell how much serviceable power is not thus turned into morbid and evil developments, physical and mental. A girl has to contend with extraordinary and insidious difficulties that no amount of strength could entirely resist. Her confidence in herself is starved or battered to death. Instead of working on without question, she stops to wonder morbidly if, indeed, she has the gift or the justification. The training that she has received tends always to make her readily accept moral censure. When she is repeatedly assured that she is selfish, she loses heart, and in most cases can be finally talked into the belief that it is her true duty to make antimaccassars, or that she lives the higher life by playing dominoes with her maiden aunt. By this means the community is deprived of the result of work performed with the ardour and efficiency that is assured by a natural bent, and it is further impoverished by the loss of the fruits of the strengthened character that follows any end faithfully pursued: an effect which carries invigorating counsels far and wide, just as the influences disintegrate and slacken of those who allow the forces and emotions to form at haphazard tyrannical habits, necessities, and petty peculiarities without the generalship of thought or experience.

This process of suppressing the variant types among women has been going on amongst us age after age, the suppression being even more complete in the past than it is at present. There were always plenty of maiden aunts to play dominoes with, and generation after generation grew up with the same old traditions and views of life—girls who did not marry and produce daughters to entertain the maiden aunts, themselves becoming maiden aunts to be entertained.

To all these harassments that pursue a woman from childhood is added the fact that she is taught to regard marriage as the end for which she was born, and the goal for which she must strive. Such teaching has even succeeded in blinding her to the indignity of the wife's position when accepted in this spirit, so that many girls, otherwise self-respecting, will not hesitate to adopt marriage as a profession, or to confess openly to the transaction.

The strange part of the matter is, however, that they should feel justified in despising and condemning so pitilessly other poorer women, who also follow in a cruder, though one can scarcely call it a franker, fashion, the universal system of barter.

Such, then, have been, roughly speaking, the conditions to which one-half of the race have been subjected during the most favourable epochs of their history. Their fate in earlier times was, of course; more tragic, for then manners and morals were more brutal. We have already seen that the health and vigour of society depend upon its power of producing variations in the type and individuals of exceptional qualities and power: the stagnation of certain nations being the result of a failure of this faculty, or the fruits of an organisation which suppresses their development and influence. For that reason, then, if for no other, the conditions of life for women have been evil; no race can afford to risk the results of such paralyzing uniformity.

That is *one* of the dangers of the system. But now let us consider what must be the effect of the status of woman upon the character of man.

From babyhood he has been brought up to regard her as of less importance than himself: he sees her trained to minister to his comfort, and to make herself pleasing in his eyes. He finds the respectable British matron eager to see her daughters marry well (does she not know, poor woman, that if they do not marry well, society offers them small chance of doing well in any other way?). Among the classes for whom the man of the world would feel called upon to profess respect, the voices of duty and religion mingle with that of self-interest in counselling submission; while in the class that he would despise, the necessity to earn a living, and the dread of slaving at starvation wages, provide a motive for the bargain which, according to popular incoherence, disgraces beyond redemption one of the parties to it, while it leaves the other a pillar of society. Is any one so optimistic as to believe that from conditions such as these it is possible to produce a healthy community wherein all the worst instincts of mankind shall not run wild? If it be true that character is the product of native impulse with daily circumstance, what is the character that might be expected in the average man? Is he not foredoomed to corruption? What chance has he of escaping unharmed from such a conspiracy of destiny? Had it been the object of some untoward spirit to create a corrupt and desperate community, how could that evil genius have done it better than by placing one sex at the mercy of the other, and teaching both to regard the arrangement as ordained by God and sanctioned by man? Leaving the doctrine to do its work, we should find it capable in a few years of ruining the character of a company of saints; much more that of a race of ordinary sinners.

This must be so, even if influences were otherwise favourable. But so far from this, they all conspire to the same disaster. In the struggle for a livelihood existence for the majority is lacking in savour, unredeemed by that interest in the mere pageant of life

which may bring moments of happiness even in the hardest lot. Without internal resources to brighten the dull ways of daily toil, the imperfectly developed human being, subject to all the burdens of civilisation without enjoying its highest gifts, is liable to find only pleasures of the grosser sort attractive, and he is likely to be at the mercy of the mere savage within him, whose appetites nothing in his home teaching or in the philosophy of the world seriously urges him to control.

Thus the plot thickens, and the hero of the drama of life finds himself mercilessly attacked from every side by formidable enemies. If he escape one foe, he falls into the power of another.

There is so little to help him. Not only is the whole scheme of life inimical, but all its details bring contributions to his downfall. His nervous system, and therefore his self-control and will-force, have been more or less weakened, and his whole nature rendered by so much the less fresh and sound in its instincts by the mode of his bringing up, extremely careful training being often, through ignorance and prejudice, as injurious as the haphazard treatment that most boys receive, their welfare, physical and moral, depending rather on good luck than on good guidance.

The mere minor customs of the time tend in the same direction, the perpetual stimulus of alcohol upon the nerves, "moderate" in quantity though it be, causing at least a harassment to the system, and working in concert with the thousand circumstances of modern life that tend towards over-excitement and exhaustion. Boys in their school-days begin to levy this lifelong tax upon the nerves, tobacco soon demands its milder tribute; each payment being perhaps small in itself, but all helping to swell that big debt which the average man sets to work to incur as soon as he has liberty to continue, on his own account and on a grander scale, the errors of his early training. Under this burden, which daily increases, as a river swells with the tributes of tiny streams, he generally finds himself, in middle life, a debtor without hope of clearing himself of his liabilities. Morally he also suffers, for worn-out nerves are poor servants to the will and the conscience. In his earlier years he has enjoyed but few chances of companionship with girls whom he respects, because the arrangements and prejudices of society discourage that relationship of good comradeship which is so essential to the development of a healthy feeling. In consequence of this a false sentiment springs up, and men and women tend to forget that it is their common humanity, above all and first of all, that forms the ground of mutual interest, the accident of sex being allowed undue importance and dragged out of all proportion to the facts of existence. The young man is thus too often deprived of the help which the friendship of women might have given him in time of need.

Look where he will there are temptations and snares to his better



self, and the whole pressure of life is against him. Heredity is his enemy, for have not these very same forces been at work upon the temperament of his ancestors, weakening his own defences, exasperating his primitive "nature?"

Man, the creature of his conditions, out of which he is fashioned and compounded, body and soul, has small hope indeed of resisting the influences at work upon his character from the cradle to the grave. Liberty being denied to a whole sex, what can be expected from the other but licence? It is partly because the overwhelming difficulties of the situation are recognised that nothing else is expected of them. The marvel only is that society has survived at all on such a system. To place the sexes in the relations of possessor and possessed, patron and dependent, is almost equivalent to saying in so many words to the male half of humanity: "Here is your legitimate prey; pursue it." The existence of the Game Laws regulates but does not alter the ultimate relations of sportsmen and their quarry, neither do the laws of marriage change the fundamental facts in the relations of man to woman. They only render legal and respectable that in them which is lowest and most savage.

The freedom or rather the licence that has been accorded to men, to their own detriment, has obviously been obtained by encroaching on the liberties of women. What has been called liberty was in fact impunity in aggression. The dual standard of morality proves this beyond question. Our laws at present express the sentiment of a society that loves to see its women helpless and imprisoned. It is not a little remarkable that the present position of the married woman corresponds in outward features with that of a serf or slave in early ages. In an article in an ancient number of the *Quarterly Review* (December 1823) the beginnings of the institution of slavery are traced to the custom of retaining prisoners of war as bondsmen instead of killing them in accordance with the older usage when agriculture was in its infancy. "In an early state of society," says the writer, "an agreement to serve is understood to be for life, and as the equivalent given (maintenance) forms apparently a slight sacrifice on the part of the master, it seems equitable to purchase such service by a payment to the parent or whoever has defrayed the expenses of infancy and education." In return for maintenance and the sum paid for his possession, the bondsman surrenders himself, with all his service, for life, and gives up his liberty. He may be well treated, well lodged and fed, but his toil brings with it no independence, no right to self-direction or hope of respite, should the conditions of his lot prove painful. This constitutes the real difference between freedom and slavery. To be maintained, however luxuriously, without earning anything over which there is undisputed control, is to be, in so far, in the position

of a slave. Other conditions may, indeed, be very unlike those of servitude, but such a situation presents the essential features of that institution. The married woman, in nearly every case, sustains at least half the burden of the household by her toil: in all but the very wealthiest classes her work is extremely severe, and in all it is more or less harassing, yet it differs from work performed in every other case in not procuring her the privilege of independence. She is the working partner in a firm in whose profits she has no share. Her share is only in the labour. She has to ask for every penny she spends, to wear out her youth in harassing toil, and yet her husband imagines that he is supporting her. This fact is at once an outcome and a buttress of the purchase system. It forms perhaps the most redoubtable of its supports, for it paralyses the action of women themselves, even when they are painfully alive to the corruptions of the social state. Their lack of freedom constitutes the principal force of the arguments by which the existing order is defended. It is the eternal dependence of one sex upon the other that holds together the purchase system with all the suffering and degradation, obvious and hidden, that it engenders.

It is appalling to consider how that system and its branches has been at work for ages, inflaming, and tempting, and justifying the primitive instincts; instincts which must inevitably create horrible suffering under conditions so complex and so difficult as those of modern life. It is scarcely too much to say that all the most terrible evils that pursue us in the civilised state are the result, direct or indirect, of this fatal influence. There is scarcely an importunate appetite—savage and cruel—a vicious tendency, a low-minded jest, a degrading custom; scarcely a disease, a temptation, an unjust usage, a base and paltry standard, that cannot ultimately be laid at the door of that unholy doctrine and that insane practice through which the human race is placed, under conditions which offer incessant stimulus to all that is tyrannical and all that is unlovely in the soul of man.

MONA CAIRD.

*August 1892.*

## THE HUMOUR OF HERODOTUS.

“HERODOTUS,” says Colonel Mure, “is deficient in the sense of the comic properly so-called.” Professor Rawlinson disputes this statement, and cites stock examples of laughable stories related by the Father of History—Alcæoon coming out of the treasure-house, and Hippocleides’ *malapropos* exhibition of his accomplishments. My own view, after some study, is that Herodotus belongs to the class of unconscious humorists. He never sets himself to be droll. What tickles us in reading him is his *naïveté*, a *naïveté* like that of Chaucer’s—“a childlike simplicity of heart,” as Dahlmann calls it. Mr. Pepys is like Herodotus in this respect, though lacking the dignity of the Greek historian. He says the most delicious things without in the least meaning them; indeed, it is his gravity which gives the flavour to his style. When, for instance, he describes his “she cosen as a ‘silly long-nosed jade,’” he saw nothing ludicrous in it. So in his account of the inimitable domestic scene in which Mrs. Pepys, in a fit of jealousy, made demonstrations with the red-hot tongs at her husband’s nose, there is nothing to show that the humour of the situation appealed to him. It is the same with Herodotus. When after Salamis Xerxes was in full flight for Asia, and the overcrowded vessel, so the story ran, was labouring in the storm, Xerxes, getting frightened, asked the captain whether there was any chance of safety. “None,” said the captain, “unless the ship is lightened of some of its passengers.” Whereupon Xerxes, turning to the Persians, exclaimed, “Now is the time to show your loyalty to your king, for on you my safety depends,” and without a word the well-trained courtiers made obeisance and leapt into the sea. Thus unburthened the ship arrived at the land, whereupon Xerxes presented the captain with a golden crown for having saved the king’s life, and then ordered his head off for having caused the death of so many noble Persians.<sup>1</sup> This is *un bon histoire*, invented by the paradox-loving Greek mind; but Herodotus takes it seriously and proceeds to controvert it with Herodotean arguments, and, among others, that Xerxes would have told the Persians to go down into the hold and ordered the Phœnician sailors to jump overboard—which, by the way, not being so versed in Court etiquette, it is more than probable they would have

declined to do. Still more delightful in its ingenuousness is the account of a certain tribe of cannibal Indians called Padœans. One of the customs of this thoughtful tribe, as Herodotus relates, is that when any one is ill his most intimate friends kill him off at once, alleging that if he is allowed to pine away with disease his flesh would be spoilt for the table. "But he" (the interesting invalid) "says that he is not ill at all. They, however, will take no denial, and having killed they feast upon him."<sup>1</sup> If it is a woman, her lady friends do the same for her. "Supposing any one reaches old age his kinsfolk assemble and offer him up in sacrifice. But not many come to this, for every one is pretty sure to have had an attack of illness first." This being feasted off when they get old, the Massagetæ, like the Padœans, esteem the happiest ending (*ὀλβιώτατα νενομίσται*).<sup>2</sup> If a person dies of disease they do not eat him but bury him in the ground, bewailing his ill-fortune that he did not come to be sacrificed. There is a "sublime simplicity," as Dahlmann would call it, about the telling of these merry customs which convinces us that Herodotus is not in the least facetious. It is the same when he tells us of another tribe who show their respect for their parents by eating them, and who, when they were asked by Darius what they would take to burn their dead parents as the Greeks did, cried out with horror and bade him be silent ;<sup>3</sup> on which Herodotus does not fail to remark how various are the opinions of men even on the commonest subjects ; but it is noticeable that what strikes him is the diversity of custom, not the peculiar mode of evincing filial respect. Again, among the Scythians the greatest oath is by the king's hearth. The king falls ill. Somebody has forsworn himself : so the suspected person is dragged before the priests. He denies it, saying that he has not forsworn himself, and protests vehemently (*δεινολογείται*). Then the king sends for other priests, and if, on consulting their art, they agree with the others, it is "off with his head." If not other priests are invoked, and so on, and if the accused is finally found not guilty, the accusing priests are packed in a waggon filled with lighted brushwood and started off.<sup>4</sup> There is an exquisite irrationality here, reminding us of the good old man that Bishop Latimer tells us of, who set down the Goodwin Sands to the building of Tenterden steeple ; but Herodotus never notices it. He is intent throughout on explaining how the priests confirm or contradict one another. When he goes on to relate another example of Scythian custom, how when a cauldron is not at hand they put the flesh of the ox into his stomach and light a fire underneath with the bones, and how the ox thus boils himself,<sup>5</sup> this is laughable to us ; but to Herodotus it is a remarkable fact in natural history. So of the Egyptian fisherman's net, "contrived a double debt to pay," to catch fish in the day-time and for the fisherman to sleep in at

<sup>1</sup> iii. 99.<sup>2</sup> i. 216.<sup>3</sup> iii. 38.<sup>4</sup> iv. 68.<sup>5</sup> iv. 61.

night; Even in the delightful story of Hippocleides's<sup>2</sup> wooing, it is far from clear that Herodotus is not gravely relating an interesting episode of family history. Kleisthenes's proclamation at Olympia, inviting suitors for the hand of his daughter, has a humour of its own, but only to our Western nations; so has his setting the suitors to athletic and other contests to test their mettle and watching them at their feasts. *In vino veritas*, as it proved in the case of Hippocleides. This brilliant young man was first favourite till vanity or levity proved his ruin. The suitors had got into a quarrel about what we should call the fine arts, like the German philosophers in *Brown, Jones and Robinson* (probably dancing in particular), and Hippocleides, warming as the wine went round, told the piper to play a dance, and, on the piper doing so, he danced much to his own satisfaction. Cleisthenes looked on and regarded the whole thing with distrust. Hippocleides waited a little, and then told some one to bring in a table, and when it came he danced on it, first Laconic figures and then Attic, and finally, planting his head on the table, he flourished about (*ἐχειρονόμησε*) with his legs. This was the climax. Cleisthenes had stood the first two performances, but the impudence of the last was too much for him, and when he saw Hippocleides flourishing about with his legs he could no longer restrain himself, but called out, "Oh! son of Tisander, you have danced away your wife!" Hippocleides, elated at his own cleverness, pertly replied, "Hippocleides don't care." It is observable in this story that it is the levity, the indecency of the thing, which shocks Cleisthenes and strikes Herodotus, not its absurdity. The story of Alcmaeon<sup>3</sup> coming out of the treasure-house, with his pockets, hands, mouth and hair full of gold, is laughable enough, and is meant by Herodotus to be so, but it is broad farce, the sort of thing the children roar at in the pantomime.

What Herodotus does appreciate, however, is a smart repartee, like that of Artaphanes to Histiaeus, feigning ignorance of the Ionian revolt which he had plotted: "You sewed the shoe, but Aristagoras put it on;" or that of Themistocles to Adeimantus at the council of war on the eve of Salamis: "In the games," said the Corinthian commander, jealous of Themistocles's ascendancy, "those who press forward, Themistocles, are chastised." "And those who hang back," retorted Themistocles, "are not crowned."<sup>5</sup> Or, again, the sarcastic remark of Gelon, when the Greeks refused him the hegemony: "Athenian stranger, you are like to have all officers and no men."<sup>6</sup> Or, again, when Themistocles was trying to get money out of the Andrians for the Greece Defence Fund, and told them that the Athenians would come with two great gods, Persuasion and Necessity, the Andrians replied that the Athenians were well off with two such serviceable gods, but they had two gods who always dwell

<sup>1</sup> ii. 95.<sup>2</sup> vi. 128, 129.<sup>3</sup> vi. 125.<sup>4</sup> vi. 1.<sup>5</sup> viii. 59.<sup>6</sup> vii. 162.

in their country—Poverty and Impossibility.<sup>1</sup> Cyrus's bitter jest about the fishes to the wretched Ionians who had declined his overtures, and then, after the taking of Sardis, wanted to come to terms, has too much cruelty to be humorous. "Say," said the insulting victor, "that a piper, seeing fishes in the sea, were to pipe to them, thinking they will come out to the land, and when he was disappointed of his hope, took a net and enclosed a great multitude of the fishes and drew them to land and, seeing them flopping about, said to the fishes: 'Cease dancing to me since you would not come out and dance when I played.'" <sup>2</sup> There is more genuine humour—or is it sarcasm?—in the remark of the man of Abdera, who advised his fellow-citizens to go to the temples and give thanks that Xerxes had not supped as well as dined with them.<sup>3</sup> One of the neatest and most adroit compliments ever turned out was probably that of Croesus to Cambyses.<sup>4</sup> That hare-brained monarch once, when the Persians and Croesus were sitting with him, asked what sort of a man they thought him compared with his father Cyrus. The Persians, of course, like good courtiers, replied "That he was better than his father, for he had all Cyrus' possessions and Egypt and the sea as well." Thus spoke the Persians. Croesus, however, not being pleased with their opinion, spoke as follows: "Now, to me, O son of Cyrus, you do not seem equal to your father, for you have not such a son as he left behind him in you." This is wit, but it is not humour. To our western notions there is an exquisite humour in the Spartan king Demaratus's question to Xerxes when he asked about the fighting qualities of the Greeks: "Shall I say what is true or shall I say what is pleasant?" <sup>5</sup> Herodotus—familiar with Oriental servility—saw nothing incongruous in it. It is not only smart sayings that we are constantly meeting with as we read him but sagacious observations on life. Take him on the grumblers. "I know this much," he says, "that if all men were to bring their private troubles into the market-place with the wish of exchanging them for their neighbours', when they came to peep into their neighbours' troubles they would all of them gladly walk off with the burden they brought."<sup>6</sup> In the story of the Samian refugees going to ask help of the Lacedæmonians there is an irony very like humour but still not humour. The Samians, at first, in the earnestness of their appeal, made a long oration: but on the Lacedæmonians dryly remarking that they had forgotten the first part and did not understand the last, they made their next appearance in the Council with a bag, and merely said, "The bag wants bread." The Lacedæmonians replied that the word "bag" was unnecessary but passed a resolution to help them.

After Plataea, when the Greeks were sacking the Persian camp, Pausanias, entering the pavilion of Mardonius, and beholding with amazement the gold and silver couches and tables, the embroidered

<sup>1</sup> viii. 111.    <sup>2</sup> i. 141.    <sup>3</sup> vii. 120.    <sup>4</sup> iii. 34.    <sup>5</sup> vii. 101.    <sup>6</sup> vii. 152.

hangings, and all the other magnificence, ordered the cooks and bakers to set out such a banquet as they were wont to serve Mardonius, and side by side with it a frugal Spartan meal. Then, turning to the other generals, "I have called you here," he said, "to show you the folly of this leader of the Medes, who, having such a *menu*, could march against us with such a sorry table."<sup>1</sup> It is this singular mixture of shrewdness and simplicity which gives such piquancy to Herodotus. The sentiment that good masters make bad servants and bad masters good servants<sup>2</sup> is distinctly modern. So is the rationalistic view that dreams come from what has excited us in the day-time.<sup>3</sup> His remark about Xerxes making off after his defeat at Salamis is vastly sarcastic. Xerxes had been asking, first Mardonius what he should do, and then Artemisia. Both, of course, saw what he wanted, and advised him to be off, and off he went; but, adds Herodotus, "I don't believe, if all the men and women in the world had counselled him to stay, he would have done so, so frightened was he."<sup>4</sup> He was in a state like that of Mr. Joseph Sedley when the news came to Brussels that the English army at Waterloo was cut to pieces. This shrewdness makes Herodotus sceptical enough at times. When the Egyptian priest, for instance, pretended to know all about the source of the Nile and the mountains Krofi and Mofi, he tells us he had his suspicions that the priest was chaffing him (*ἐμοὶ γε παίζειν ἰδόκει*).<sup>5</sup> So when the Scythians told him that Targitans's parents were Zeus and the daughter of the river Borysthenes, he takes leave to doubt it (*ἐμοὶ οὐ πιστὰ λεγόντες*).<sup>6</sup> "Still they do say it," he adds (*λέγουσιν οὖν*), as if there might be something in it. He explains away the story of Cyrus having been suckled by a bitch,<sup>7</sup> and, referring to the one-eyed men who were said to steal the gold, he goes on to say naively, "I am not convinced that there are one-eyed men."<sup>8</sup> As to the men who were said to sleep six months at a stretch, he refuses to believe it altogether,<sup>9</sup> or the story of each of the Neuri becoming a wolf once a year for a few days, though the Scythians positively asserted it. He tells us the current story of Skyllos, the best diver of his time, and how it was said that in deserting to the Greeks he dived into the water at Aphetæ, and came up at Artimisium, a trifle of ten miles. "This," he says, "is said, and other things about him that look like falsehoods (*ψευδέσι ἔικελα*), but my opinion is that he went in a boat"<sup>10</sup>—an explanation which, if more probable, detracts somewhat from the feat. So, of the man with the iron anchor attached to his belt by a chain, which in battle he launched among the enemy, so that he might stand his ground however hard pressed, Herodotus, in a sceptical spirit, remarks that it was probably only an anchor em-

<sup>1</sup> ix. 82.<sup>6</sup> iv. 5.<sup>2</sup> viii. 68.<sup>7</sup> i. 110.<sup>3</sup> vii. 16.<sup>8</sup> iii. 116.<sup>4</sup> viii. 103.<sup>9</sup> iv. 25.<sup>5</sup> ii. 28.<sup>10</sup> viii. 8.

blazoned on his shield.<sup>1</sup> When the Scythians talked about the land being inaccessible because of the feathers, he expresses an opinion that what they meant was snowflakes. "I laugh at their maps of the world," he says (secure in his own geography), "with the ocean running round the earth as round as a top, and making Asia as big as Europe."<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, he has no objection to believe in the oxen that graze backwards, because if they did not their horns would stick into the ground,<sup>3</sup> or in the sheep with tails so long that the shepherds have to make little trucks to carry them; the asses that never drink,<sup>4</sup> the houses built of lumps of salt,<sup>5</sup> where luckily it never rains, and other "merveils," as Sir John Mandeville would call them. The accounts of the goat-footed men he is inclined to disbelieve (*ἔμοι οὐ πιστὰ λήγοντες*),<sup>6</sup> but he treats it as a matter deserving of consideration. We smile at this, and call it credulity, but credulity is hardly the right word for it. To children, what are called wonders are no wonders, because the world is for them full of wonders, and Herodotus belongs to the childhood of the world, with its freshness, romance, and mystery (*οὐδέ τις ἔχει φράσαι*). In such matters as natural history or geography he had no canon or criterion of probability, or a very inadequate one; and, after all, may not his attitude in the presence of the wonders of the universe be a more rational and becoming one than our nineteenth century knowingness? In matters with which he was at home, such as men and cities, he is shrewd enough. History, for the same reason, like the source of the Nile, resolves itself with Herodotus, into a process of ingenious guessing. He had not the necessary materials or the critical faculty to deal with them if he had. He inverts the philosophy of history, and delights in showing us

"What great events from trivial causes spring."

Greece, for instance, would never have been invaded unless Atossa had happened to have a tumour on her breast<sup>7</sup> and the Greek physician, Democedes, had been called into requisition. So Darius's horse, neighing at the right moment, determines the prize of the Persian empire, though Herodotus had shrewdness enough to prefer the story which assigned this opportune performance of the horse, not to the will of Heaven, but the trick of a cunning groom.<sup>8</sup> In these and many other instances Herodotus confounds the occasion and the cause, but the personal incidents, if they detract from the philosophy of his work, more than make up for it by the picturesqueness and dramatic effect which they give to it. This view of history has an element of truth, too, in it. It is derived from what Herodotus had seen of ambitious intriguing men in small Greek States,

<sup>1</sup> ix. 74.  
<sup>5</sup> iv. 185.

<sup>2</sup> iv. 36.  
<sup>6</sup> iv. 25.

<sup>3</sup> iv. 183.  
<sup>7</sup> iii. 133.

<sup>4</sup> iv. 192.  
<sup>8</sup> iii. 85.



men like Themistocles, and later on Alcibiades, who really did determine the course of history.

Gossipy as he is, Herodotus can always rise to the greatness of his theme. He can be "nobly censorious" in the cause of patriotism or of liberty. Witness the words which he puts into the mouth of the Spartan king Demeratus in speaking of his countrymen to Xerxes. "For though they are free," he says, "they are not altogether free. For they have over them a master, to wit, law or discipline, which they fear far more than thy soldiers fear thee. They do whatever it may order them, and it orders always the same thing, not suffering them to fly any number of men in battle, but remaining in their ranks to conquer or to die." It is such passages as this which give throughout a moral dignity to Herodotus's work, this and his simple religious faith. For whatever may be Herodotus's scepticism on other points, there is no trace of it in matters of religion. He never scoffs or makes light of such matters. The ambiguous utterances of the Delphic Oracle are treated with grave respect. So is the account of the priestess growing a great beard when any calamity was going to befall the Pedanians.<sup>1</sup> In relating how the rumour of the Greek victory of Plataea ran through the camp of the faraway Ionian Greeks on the very day of the battle, Herodotus observes, that "the divine nature of the thing is manifest."<sup>2</sup> So of the rocks rolling down on the profaners of the Delphic shrine.<sup>3</sup> Retribution, though halting, was sure sooner or later, in his view, to overtake the profane person, the violator of divine or human law. When Pheretima took such dire vengeance on her revolted subjects and afterwards came to a bad end, Herodotus remarks that such violent revenges are displeasing to the gods.\* When Xerxes, on crossing the Hellespont, dropped a golden cup and a Persian sword into the water, Herodotus naively asks was he sorry for scourging the Hellespont, and in reparation for it made the sea a present?<sup>5</sup> Witness, too, the case of the Egyptian king who insulted the river by throwing a spear into it and was blinded.

"Good phrases are and ever were commendable," Justice Shallow observes, and they are found plentifully sprinkled about the pages of Herodotus—a "great thing of a pig" (*σὺδὲ μέγα χρῆμα*); the Egyptians who "prefer to be clean to being good-looking" (*προτίμοντες καθαροὶ εἶναι ἢ εὐπρεπεστεροὶ*);<sup>6</sup> Cyrus getting in a rage with the contumacious river (*ποταμῷ ὑβρισαντι*),<sup>7</sup> and threatening it; the crocodile that does not "grow" a tongue.<sup>8</sup> A charwoman at the writer's old school once described a youthful scholar there as the "inkspillingest boy" in the whole school—a superlative which might plead in its defence Carlyle's "beautifullest," or Milton's "virtuousest." Herodotus's epithet, "*πολυπροβατωτατοί*,"<sup>9</sup> sheepiest, is more felicitous still.

<sup>1</sup> viii. 104.<sup>6</sup> ii. 37.<sup>2</sup> ix. 100.<sup>7</sup> i. 189.<sup>3</sup> viii. 37.<sup>8</sup> i. 118.<sup>4</sup> iv. 205.<sup>9</sup> v. 49.<sup>5</sup> vii. 54.

The grass of Scythia being "the bilious<sup>est</sup>" known (*ἰπιχλωδάτη πάσων*), is good too. The shopkeepers in the vicinity of Trafalgar Square would appreciate the phrase "*δήμου συνοικημᾶ ἀχαριώτατον*" (the very unwelcome proximity of the unemployed). We sometimes hear of people "enjoying" bad health. Herodotus inverts the phrase in telling us how the Egyptian priests "*πάσχουσιν ἀγαθὰ οὐκ ὀλίγα.*"<sup>1</sup> "Anything might happen in a long enough time" is another phrase no less true than profound. Indeed, it might parallel Archimedes's famous saying as to moving the world with a long enough lever. But Herodotus's felicities are inexhaustible, "ever charming, ever new." May we not say of him as Dryden does of Chaucer, "Here is God's plenty, a perpetual feast" of good things.

EDWARD MANSON.

<sup>1</sup> iv. 58.

## AMERICAN TAXATION AND POLITICS.

JUST seven years ago it was my privilege to give to the readers of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW a brief description of the political situation in the United States, as it then existed, from the standpoint of a follower of Mr. Henry George, who at that time stood, not only as the exponent of his own especial doctrines, but also as the chosen leader of the labouring men of America organised for political action. During the period which has since elapsed, American politics have undergone in every direction a radical transformation. Before the lines appeared in print which I had written in the summer of 1887, the United Labour party, in its canvass of the New York State election, with Mr. George as its standard-bearer, suffered so crushing a defeat that almost immediate disintegration was the result. Following closely upon this came President Cleveland's famous message to Congress on the tariff question, a really crude and halting document in itself, which yet served to raise the half-awakened public sentiment of the people on the issue of liberating the industries of the country from the legislation in behalf of special interests under which we had lived for a generation, and at once plunged the nation into an economic discussion that absolutely displaced the old strictly political controversies.

The change in American politics which, in my former article, I pointed out as being at hand, has now become fully established. War issues, race questions, disputes over the relative sovereignty of the nation and the states, and over our relations with foreign powers, have all disappeared or assumed a strictly secondary position; and in their place have come to the front matters of taxation and, more latterly, of the currency. The year of excited political strife over the justice and wisdom of the protective tariff principle, which ended with Mr. Cleveland's defeat in 1888, so far from satisfying the newly awakened hunger of the people for economic discussion, was only the prelude to another four years of thought and controversy and struggle, that culminated in his triumphant success upon again coming before the electors on the same issue as before, only greatly broadened and extended. Mr. Cleveland himself, as well as his supporters and the great popular jury to which they submitted their arguments, advanced very noticeably during those four years along the lines on which they had started; and what at the first was

in the main only a question of expediency, soon became a question of principle, reasoned out to very radical results. The followers of Mr. George, now known more specifically as Single Taxers, after their apparent overthrow in 1887, abandoned all attempt to maintain a political organisation as the medium for their agitation, and with it their affiliation with the distinctive labour elements; and finding themselves so much more than before in accord with the motive spirit of the Democratic party, permeated the latter to such an extent as to influence its action to a most astonishing degree. Not only have a very considerable number of the most active Democratic leaders become converted as individuals to the idea of more or less rapidly abolishing the tariff on imports, with the ultimate view of resorting for revenue in its place to the appropriation of the income accruing from the ownership of land, but the whole tariff campaign of 1892 was modelled upon this basis, to the extent of its being largely directed to pointing out that the only ultimate beneficiaries of tariff protection are the owners of land, from which is drawn the materials used in producing protected articles, all other interests concerned in their production, whether as manufacturers or labourers, or as in their exchange, being regulated by competition from which the mere mine or forest owner was free.

And now, scarcely a year after a victory won on these arguments which had generally been deemed a conclusive one, and when the Democratic party seemed to have been entrenched in power for a generation to come as the result of that victory, a most extraordinary reaction has occurred in the election decided only the other day. How much of the Republican success this year, as unexpected to themselves as to any one, may fairly be attributed to a genuine reversal of the verdict given in 1892, cannot easily be conjectured, but it is impossible to deny that the tariff question has been at least one among other factors of the change of front. It would seem incredible that after the unquestionably deliberate judgment pronounced on the principle of protection only a year ago, after a discussion lasting for nearly five years previous, and during which the subject was presented in every possible phase, any great number among our electors should purposely attempt to veto their own decision before any trial of the new policy had even been begun. Their only conceivable motive for such attitude would be that the cry which ascribed to the mere fear of a change in the tariff, the panic which our industries have suffered this summer, was really an effective one.

But the American voter has a delightfully illogical way of visiting his displeasure with hard times upon the party which happens to be in power when they occur, even though the trouble had actually begun before the new Administration took office, as in this case. If this blind desire to wreak vengeance on something, was really

associated in any degree with an idea that the community as a whole was panic-stricken at the thought of having carried into effect its own wishes as expressed at the preceding election, the fault lies to a considerable extent with the tariff reformers and free traders themselves, who devoted themselves almost entirely to the anti-silver agitation and endeavoured to turn the current of public thought in that direction, instead of boldly meeting the issue and showing how, as could easily have been done, the paralysis of trade was a direct legacy from the burdens which had been imposed upon it by the protective policy and which had year by year been growing more oppressive.

As a matter of fact, paradoxical as the assertion may appear, we have had no genuine panic in America, and the money question has been grossly exaggerated in importance by both sides to the dispute over it, as it always is in this country. With the already almost universal and continually extending use of cheques, we are practically independent of any particular form of currency; and while our silver coinage is thoroughly idiotic in principle, and the system of steadily buying bullion which has just been repealed is particularly so, it is nevertheless true that the currency thus put in circulation had been readily absorbed by the simple process of displacing the use of cheques to that extent, and that this process might have gone on without difficulty for several years to come. Long before even the bankers had begun to feel more than the most remote uneasiness about a silver basis being reached, for fully three years back, indeed, general trade had been growing more and more unprofitable. The banks had begun to seriously restrict their accommodations even before Mr. Cleveland's election, not from any fear of silver coinage but merely because of distrust of the general outlook. The shutting down of mills and factories began early in the summer of 1892, and was one of the strongest arguments used by the Democrats to show the stifling effects of Protection. The culmination of this happened to coincide with Mr. Cleveland's inauguration, and with a drain on the Treasury resources, which for the first time began to make bankers feel a little timorous as to the ability of the Government to maintain gold payments.

But before they had taken action as the result of this fear, and before the business community as a whole had at all assimilated the idea of immediately impending currency difficulties, the failures had begun which ushered in the "panic." A direct sequence can be traced back, indeed, to the great strikes in the railway yards at Buffalo, in Carnegie's steel works at Pittsburg, and the silver mines at Leadville, which were the first indication to the public mind that tariff regulation of industries was operating disastrously to them. Yet clearly as all this can be demonstrated, the ever readiness of the commercial and even more of the journalistic mind to confuse

causes and effects and mere coincidences, fastened on the immediate phenomena, and lost sight almost wholly of the underlying forces; and it looks very much as if, with the basis for logical reasoning thus disturbed, the spectre of an imaginary money scare had been overshadowed in the minds of many voters by that of an equally imaginary tariff scare, which can only be exorcised by prompt action by Congress with its certain resultant good effects, in removing at least some of the burdens which a Protective tariff has imposed upon us.

One other cause of the reversal of public opinion is certainly to be found in general disgust with the Democratic party at not being able sooner to stop the disgraceful spectacle displayed by what was once our most honoured legislative body, but which has been gradually and deliberately converted by its members into a machine for the promotion of their private interests, the United States Senate. For this, too, the Democratic party was not really to blame, except so far as it was responsible for the behaviour of that wing of it which represents the Southern States, the least advanced section of our land, and one which is now as ever, overbearing, grasping, and selfish in the last degree. The lamentable spectacle of incapacity which the Senate presented was in reality due to the structure of rules and precedents which had been carefully reared for the very purpose of blocking any action which might endanger any of the special privileges for the securing of which a considerable percentage of the Senators seek their seats; and the silver members were only doing in a particularly offensive and public manner the sort of thing which is ordinarily accomplished in the privacy of executive session, and the committee rooms. Laid open to public gaze, the Senatorial practices have undoubtedly been rebuked most emphatically by the people, and it is fair to presume that the ballot of November 7 was in some degree influenced by this spirit of condemnation; the dominant party being, naturally enough, held responsible for either action or inaction by any part of the Governmental machinery.

That portion of the agitation for silver coinage which arises from clamour for more currency, and not from direct interest in silver-mining, is a curious phase of our political life, with an occasional spasmodic strength that threatens to engulf all our politics, and then fades away to utter impotence. Shortly after the war of the rebellion it had considerable vigour even on the seaboard, and was generally dominant beyond the Alleghanies. To-day, the growth of cities in the West, and consequent greater familiarity of the Western people with the benefits of banking, and the extent to which it supplants the need for actual money by the substitution of paper methods of exchange, have made Chicago a "sound money" centre, and transformed such States as Ohio from hotbeds of Greenbackism to

fortresses of opposition to anything which may debase the monetary standard, the cry for more and "cheaper" money of whatever kind now coming almost wholly from the district beyond the Mississippi, where it is even now becoming fainter, and from the South, which is just beginning to have convictions of any sort on the subject, and is therefore in the preliminary stages of development of thought.

The agitators for the idea, however, remain fixed in their belief, and as each set of followers fall away from them, look about for a new field for propaganda; seizing eagerly on each new movement that arises to engraft their opinions upon it. When the organised labour movement seemed likely to grow into a power, seven years ago, they promptly organised the Union Labour party in close imitation of the United Labour party which had so nearly won the mayoralty of New York with Henry George as its candidate; all the familiar names which had been prominent in the councils of the Greenback party again coming to the front; and now the same leaders have obtained sole possession of the Populist party, which like the rest has nearly run its short course, having probably had its deathblow in the repeal of the Sherman Act, since it cut almost no figure at all in the subsequent election.

That it should be out of the way is a consummation devoutly to be wished in the interest of genuine political reform, and advance upon the line of battle by which Mr. Cleveland won last year, since it only served to detract from the more vital issues; for, as before remarked, the battle is by no means fought out as yet, with however optimistic an eye one may look upon the various influences bearing upon the recent election. Looking the whole field over, indeed, the one section of the Democratic party which has not received a serious setback is the local organisation in New York City, known as Tammany Hall, and that reaction against the current which had been making for Free-trade has not something to do with it, is hard to believe. Tammany alone held precisely the same percentage of the total vote as it had a year ago, although the jubilation of the anti-Tammany element over the killing defeat of the Hill machine in the State would naturally lead an outsider to suppose otherwise. While Tammany has been closely allied with the Hill faction, it is not really a component part of it, but stands rather as an independent power, whose strength is derived from the definite delegation to it by the great mass of the citizens of New York (among those who stand socially beneath the professional classes), of the functions of local administration, and the conduct of the machinery of politics. The fact is, that as we have no leisure class in America with either the ability or the inclination to engage in politics, the tendency in our large cities, where most of the people are too busy to look after their political affairs themselves, is to contract, as it were, with some organisation as a matter of business to handle for them the inevit-

able details of political work, and Tammany being, after all, really undeserving of the reputation for corruption which it has acquired, at home and abroad, is entrusted by the great majority with this duty, as being the organisation in which they have most confidence.

Outside of New York City, however, the wave has undeniably turned the other way, if only momentarily; and even if it had not done so, there would still be need for much sustained effort to bring our nation to a sound economic standpoint. The excesses of tariff legislation from which we have suffered so long, are only the most virulent phase of a system of taxation which has fostered special interests until it has already converted America from a land of equal prosperity to a land of paupers and millionaires, with, sandwiched between them, a rapidly weakening strata of working citizens of moderate but independent means. We have bound our industries hand and foot by saddling our national taxation upon consumption; and we have further encouraged the choking-off of productive enterprise by adjusting our local taxes, for, as your readers doubtless know, our local budgets are administered in entire independence of the national government in such a manner as to bear most heavily upon the users of the natural opportunities for labour, and least heavily upon the mere speculators.

As a natural result, we not only have, as fully established as in the great cities of Europe, our whole families of landlords, who live in luxury from a lion's share of the labour of others, but we have also closed the avenues of employment in even the smaller towns; while through whole sections, wherever there was a prospect of industrial advance, a spirit of land speculation has run riot which has killed off the growth of industry before it was fairly started, and wrecked even the speculators. Our free land in the West having all gone now, the conditions of life in our country have become almost, if not quite, as bitter, as in any of the older countries of Europe. The public conscience is being slowly awakened to this state of affairs, and the agitation for the removal of all taxation and the subsistence of the community on that portion of the results of labour which is secured by virtue of the occupancy of favoured location, is steadily growing, having already passed out of the realm of something new and therefore dangerous to that of entire respectability, to which most of the radical tariff reformers and free-traders have been more or less attracted. Not through the medium of a separate political organisation, as we once thought it would come about, but by steady progression along the lines of effort which are sure before many years to break down our tariff walls against commerce, and by use of practically the same men and methods, we hope yet to see the single tax accomplished.

With the reassembling of Congress in regular session, less than a month hence, will be renewed at once the struggle between the



opposing theories of government—that which favours the paternal direction of industries by legislation and that which endeavours to minimise the influence of the State over private enterprise; for it has got to be much more clearly defined than a mere difference of opinion between the details of a tariff schedule. The radical nature of the Bill just announced by the Ways and Means Committee of our National House of Representatives, is sufficient guarantee that the members of that Committee, at least, have in no way lost the courage of their convictions because of the recent elections. There are some duties retained by it for purposes of revenue which have a Protectionist bearing, some sops thrown to the Protectionist spirit; but for the most part these are in lines where we would, under any conceivable circumstances, supply our own wants by domestic production, and where domestic competition is sufficiently free to ensure reasonable freedom of enterprise and to prevent excessive prices. The principle of removing obstacles to industry which is involved in freeing raw materials, is very decidedly emphasised in every schedule; and while it does not come as near to abolishing the tariff as might be wished for, it is a long step in that direction. It cannot be said, of course, how surely Congress will adopt this Bill or how much it may amend it; but its presentation is an assurance that the battle is still on. Should the Democratic Members of Congress have the courage of their convictions in the same degree as the members of the Committee, we shall experience an upheaval of our economic conditions far more reaching even than that which was produced in Great Britain by the repeal of the Corn Laws.

That was primarily a measure to afford cheaper food for the working masses of the country, thereby increasing their productive effectiveness, just as the economy of a machine is increased when the cost of its fuel is reduced. The English labouring classes have never wholly lost their share of the increased results of production, mainly because the natural inertia which they opposed to a lowering of their standard of living happened to be strengthened by a coincident bringing closer to them, through the medium of steam transportation, of the cheap lands of our Western Territories, of Canada, and of the Australian Colonies. But it can hardly be disputed that they have not gained in equal proportion to the increased production of wealth in the British Isles, and that the great gain has been made by landlords only, though of a different kind of landlords from those to whom the term had chiefly been applied; the main beneficiaries being now the owners of town lots and mining properties.

With us, the problem of Free-trade is not concerned with the obtaining of cheap food, but with securing more cheaply certain classes of material, such as wool, for our industries, and the removal of obstacles generally to the expansion of our trade. This once

obtained, the direct function of our national Congress really ceases; for while the volume of our national taxation is very large, a far larger one is collected through the State, county, and municipal administrations, over which Congress has absolutely no jurisdiction. A strong effort is now being made to make the separate localities independent even of the states in this respect, permitting them to select their own objects of taxation. It is in this portion of the field that the Single Tax idea, dissociated from the Tariff controversy, will come into play. We already levy local taxes to a considerable extent on land values, but they are assessed in the main on the actual and not the potential earnings, and are combined with taxes on improvements something like English rates; all of which tends, of course, to encourage the withholding of desirable land from use, awaiting a greater demand for it. This is held by Single Taxers to be an indirect interference of Government with private enterprise and in favour of the most harmful form of speculation; and it is on this system that they will direct their assaults as soon as the breaking down of the tariff is accomplished, to which they are now lending their best aid. So confident are they that public opinion is rapidly being educated in this direction, that they believe that the most active portion of the Democratic party is already prepared to go with them along this road as soon as its present war upon the Protective tariff system has been rewarded with a substantial measure of victory.

EDWARD J. SHRIVER.

## THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

RECENT political events have once more brought into prominence that question of such perennial interest, what is to be done with the House of Lords? Let us see what are the constituent elements of which the Upper House is composed; what is its position as a Legislative Assembly; and what are its relations to the other Estates of the Realm, that we may be able to consider whether the Second Chamber should be "mended or ended."

If a member of the Commons House of Parliament were asked by what right he sat and voted and helped to govern this country, he would answer, by the right of the free choice of this or that constituency. Were the same question put to a peer, in the majority of cases he would reply that he sat and voted in the Upper House because his ancestors sat and voted for so many generations before him. Suppose, for argument's sake, we make the considerable admission that this man's ancestors by reason of personal fitness, or as a reward for eminent services, were justly entitled to so high a distinction, we have still to consider the claims of their descendants.

The best advocates of the hereditary right to rule rest their case on the transmission of fitness from father to son. Now this transmission, as a rule, not merely of general ability, but also of special faculty, proves a great deal too much. This natural law which we share with the lower animals cannot be made to narrow itself even for patrician purposes into the notion that all the fitness becomes concentrated in the eldest son, and that even his fitness does not arrive at maturity until his father's death, when the hereditary right to govern is handed down to him along with the patrimonial acres and the family plate. Here, you observe, the argument squints horribly. This right to rule by hereditary fitness if consistently carried out, would require that all the sons of peers, when of age, should sit with their fathers in the House of Lords. The multiplication of peers by this simple and natural method would have one great advantage, in dispensing with the very delicate duty of making so many new creations. Then would the "blue blood" be free from the taint of any muddier mixture.

But it might be said that all the sons of a peer could not possibly maintain the dignity and position necessary to a member of this august

assembly. Here, you observe, a new element comes in. Fitness, hereditary fitness even, is not sufficient title to govern without a certain income of nobody knows how much ; although it is notorious that many peers who have squandered their inheritance on riotous living, still retain their right to rule, as well as their children after them. The fact is that this plea for hereditary rulers, although nominally resting upon the transmission of fitness to govern, really indicates a lack of faith in this natural sequence, which needs no such artificial buttresses. The chief result of this system is to enable the worthless sons of peers to trade upon the reputation of their ancestors, and to exercise a power as legislators to which their personal character plainly shows they are not entitled ; whilst, on the other hand, able and worthy sons of a nobleman have no difficulty in securing by election seats in the National Councils without the aid of any such artificial law of legislative primogeniture.

If any one claimed admission to membership say of the Royal Academy, or the Royal Society, or the Royal College of Surgeons, not upon grounds of personal fitness, but on the merits, real or visionary, of some ancestor, he would be considered a fit subject for a Commission of Lunacy. Yet this is precisely the plea which is seriously urged by men, otherwise quite sane, who claim the right by birth to control the destinies of the British Empire.

Leaving the hereditary division of the House of Lords, take a somewhat numerous section of the remainder, the soldiers and sailors. The talents requisite in the commander of an army and the admiral of a fleet are exactly the reverse of the qualities necessary to a successful legislator. The rules of political life are as different as possible from the strictness of discipline that belongs to the military life, and the autocratic government of the camp is quite a contrast to the freedom of speech and action in the Commons and the Cabinet. The general is accustomed to command his men, whilst the politician is expected to convince his followers. The soldier's weapon is brute-force, cutting every knot with his sword, whilst the statesman's only power is persuasion, settling every question by appeals to reason, history, and experience. This very marked distinction was never more conspicuous than in the person of the greatest soldier of this age, who became about the worst statesman who ever tried to govern England. Wellington's reputation would have stood higher to-day had he stuck to the art of war and never meddled and muddled in politics.

These men richly deserve the very highest honours for their eminent services to their country ; let them be made

“ A marquis, duke, and a' that,”

but why associate with these distinctions duties as legislators

which there is not the least likelihood they possess any fitness to discharge.

The same objection, in a lesser degree perhaps, applies to the bishops, and to the very few men who have been raised, as it is called, to the peerage for mere literary and scientific distinction.

We now come to a small, but by no means insignificant, section of the House of Lords, the Lord Chancellor and ex-Chancellors, Judges and ex-Judges, who, though few in number, exert a very powerful influence. Nearly all students of political philosophy are now agreed that the legislative and judicial functions of a nation's government should be kept strictly separate and independent of each other, in order that the passion and excitement which frequently accompany the passing of a law may not even appear to affect its calm and judicial administration; that the decisions of a judge may thus be as far as possible above the suspicion of preference or partiality. On this account it is surely a mischievous anomaly that the very highest judicial authority in the land should be a leading member of the Cabinet, and that his tenure of office should thus depend on the rise and fall of Ministries. Further, the Supreme Court of Appeal in this country consists of the Lord Chancellor, ex-Chancellors, and a few retired judges, all, it may be, active political partisans. It is no answer to say that these learned gentlemen seldom abuse the difficult position they are permitted to occupy. There is no argument that applies to their exclusion from the House of Commons that does not equally apply to the House of Lords.

Apparently the most plausible peerages are those of men who have done good service in India or one of our colonies, in the Commons, perhaps in the Cabinet; but when analysed, they will not stand the slightest scrutiny.

One section of this class consists of able members of the House of Commons, who have lost their seats and have no hope of election elsewhere. Now, when a really distinguished man, from no fault of his own, has fallen a victim to the fickleness of his constituents, there is never much difficulty in finding him another seat. But if, as is much more probable, this fate is merely the natural result of his own crotchety conduct and reactionary opinions, there is surely the strongest objection to making a permanent and irresponsible legislator of a man who has lost the confidence of that portion of his countrymen who ought to know him best, and who has been unable to secure the suffrages of any other constituency.

The remainder of this class consists of ex-Governors of colonies or dependencies, ex-Ministers, ex-Judges, and ex-Members of Parliament, who have been obliged to retire from their respective posts from age or illness. Now, does it not seem reasonable that the same causes which have incapacitated these men from discharging

duties with which long habit must have made them familiar should also prevent them from becoming permanent legislators, undertaking fresh work in an unaccustomed sphere. If we are to have a House of Lords, it should not consist of disappointed and broken-down, aged, and infirm men; it must not be a refuge for crotcheteers or an asylum for incapables.

It is hardly conceivable that any capable man in the vigour of health and strength, desirous of serving his country as a statesman, could commit the folly of resigning his seat in the Commons to become a peer; on the contrary, many of the ablest statesmen in the Upper House would gladly forfeit the empty dignity of a seat in that gilded chamber could they only thus become eligible for admission to the House of Commons. It is generally believed that the gentlemen once known as Lords Cranborne and Hartington look back with regret upon their so-called elevation, and reckon it as a substantial sacrifice of political influence.<sup>1</sup>

William Pitt, when a boy, used to say, "I am so glad that I am not the eldest son, that I may go down to the Commons, like papa, and fight my own way," and this preference remained unaltered. Whilst lavishly bestowing these honours on others, he himself died as he had lived, plain William Pitt, England's great Commoner. If this sentiment was sound a century ago, much has happened since to strengthen it.

It may be said that occasions might happen when the services of those specialists would be valuable. For instance, generals and admirals, in time of war, the consideration of army reform and national defence; economists on questions of taxation, currency, and finance; medical and scientific men on sanitary matters and poor-law reform; judges in questions of law; the clergy and schoolmasters in matters of national education. The answer to this is, that ample means now exist for utilising such special ability whenever the occasion arises. One of the earliest stages of every great political question is the appointment of a Commission of Inquiry to take evidence and report, when it is customary to select for this purpose, not merely members of both Houses of Parliament, but others specially qualified.

There is a view of the Upper House, not often referred to now, that it represents the landed interest, giving point to the old Radical sneer that it is a "House of Landlords." This may have been true once, but it is certainly less so now, for there are not a few landless noblemen, as well as several others in speedy process of becoming so. Probably there are as many and as extensive landlords in the

<sup>1</sup> Were there no House of Lords, the Commons would have retained for several years more the political genius and remarkable abilities of Benjamin Disraeli, and the practical wisdom and keen intelligence of Robert Lowe. Many men are now tempted by the ease and dignity of a seat in the Upper House, to abandon before their time a position of far greater power and influence.

House, of Commons. But even were this plea true in fact, the question remains why the possession of land should entitle any man to political privileges denied to the owners of other kinds of property ; and further, and more to the point, why should any kind of property entitle its possessor, altogether apart from personal fitness, to lord it over his less fortunate countrymen ?

This mischievous theory of representation of classes, not individuals, of property, not persons, of money, not men, is based on the pernicious assumption that our country consists of a mass of conflicting interests, and not a commonwealth where all have an equal right and a common interest in being well governed. This caste feeling of social and sectarian antagonism has been the fertile source of much injustice in the past, which it is now the aim of every enlightened statesman to remedy and remove.

Such then, apart altogether from personal considerations which are never the same, are the constituent elements of which the House of Lords is composed, and upon which its claim rests to share in the legislation and government of this country. What now is its present relation to the other elements of the British Constitution ? There is nothing so old nor yet so new as the British Constitution. It stretches back into unwritten history, and reaches forward to the Acts of Parliament passed last session. Though so venerable in many respects, in the mouths of many of its admirers it has its comic side. At the farmer's dinner, held in the county town, when the hiccuping orator's patriotic feelings are beginning to choke his utterance, you may be certain that he is approaching his peroration about "the glory and the grandeur of the British Constitution." When the speech of the Parliamentary candidate gets into a condition of general bewilderment, and he begins to look like a crow in the mist ; after several vain attempts to draw up inspiration from his boots, then a beseeching gaze at the ceiling, and a fruitless search in the lining of his hat, he feels it is high time to play his trump card ; so solemnly laying his right hand on his waistcoat, he informs his audience that, come what will, he means to stand by the British Constitution. Every one does not always know the proper time to cheer a speech about land tenure or tithes or the Eastern Question, but everybody clears his throat as he listens to the stately approach of the British Constitution. The unfailing applause encourages the timid orator, and the drouthy speaker has time to refresh himself, and then, like a sponged prizefighter, he is ready for another round. "These traitor Whigs and rebel Radicals, gentlemen," says the true-blue orator, "these political Guy Fauces, want to blast our country's greatness, they want to blow up into eternal smash our glorious British Constitution." Of course, after all these explosive changes are carried out, the good old Constitution is as grand and glorious and lively as ever.

So wonderfully composite a piece of patchwork is this British Constitution that its theory is somewhat puzzling, quite as mysterious as the original colour of the Irishman's breeches, but, happily, in practice it is very plain and simple. Nominally, the three Estates of the Realm are of co-equal authority, but practically their power is anything but equal. As the Sovereign can only discharge legislative functions through her Ministers, who are in turn responsible to the representatives of the people, for the practical purpose of this argument the Sovereign and the Commons may be considered identical. The only alternative would be for the Sovereign to govern without a Parliament and without "supplies," a practical impossibility. A Commons vote of "no confidence" in Her Majesty's Ministers would be followed by immediate resignation, whilst a similar vote by the House of Lords would be immediately followed by "jeers and laughter." True, every law must obtain the sanction of the peers as well as the consent of the Sovereign, but should they refuse to pass the measures sent up by the Commons, the Minister for the time can, with the sanction of the Sovereign, send up as many peer's eldest sons, or create as many new barons as may be needed to reverse the vote. Should the Sovereign decline to adopt this extreme measure, the alternative is as before, no Parliament and no "supplies."

The extremity of adding to the peers for this purpose, though frequently threatened, and lists of names actually prepared, has never been required since the reign of Queen Anne, the mere possibility having been sufficient on each important occasion to induce the peers to yield, either by staying away or remaining to vote against their consciences. Seeing that, unlike members of the House of Commons and Ministers, peers cannot resign their position as legislators, it does seem a shame to drive a large body of honourable men to the sad necessity of choosing between cowardly flight and slavish submission. This compulsory degradation is of itself sufficient to stamp the system as an organised hypocrisy.

In admitting that it would be the duty of the peers, whatever their personal opinions might be, to yield to the clearly expressed will of the nation, they are always careful to add that the mere vote of the House of Commons would not be sufficient evidence of the permanent desire, as distinct from the passing feeling, of the people; but that the peers by a first refusal to pass any measure should virtually have the power to dissolve Parliament in order to obtain the nation's final decision at the polling-booth. Were this claim admitted, and should the settlement of one important measure be attempted each Session, not an extravagant expectation surely, it would follow that we should have Annual Parliaments. Extremes meet once more; Chartism and Toryism, the ancient foes, are reconciled. Like Jacob and Esau, they embrace each other.

Again, it is urged that the nation only decides questions of broad



principle, and that the details are open to revision by the peers. Is it reasonable to suppose that the opponents of any measure are the most competent to decide the extent or the method of its operation? This is too much like handing over army administration to a committee of Quakers. Surely those who have been chosen to carry out any principle are the best judges as to all its details? Under this plausible plea there is concealed a disreputable device to obtain by unfair means what cannot be claimed openly. Weak animals, when baffled by superior strength, invariably resort to cunning. Acquiescence is pretended to the general principle of a Bill, which they do their utmost to cripple and render inoperative by some addition or mutilation.

Besides the fruitless delay in important measures, the often unscrupulous attempts by alteration to defeat the desires of the people, and the accompanying exasperation and increasing bitterness, perhaps the greatest practical mischief is caused by the successful obstruction for a long time of very important, though secondary measures. No Minister would be justified in putting the country to the trouble and Members of Parliament to the expense of a general election upon every minor measure; and were any attempt made to group two or three such questions in a single appeal to the constituencies, it would certainly lead to wilful misunderstanding. When Bill No. 1 was being discussed, it would be said that the decision of the country had mainly been taken on Bill No. 2, and *vice versa*. It is not easy to discover by what process of reasoning a House, whose decisions on great primary measures are invariably overruled, can be accepted as an authority to settle secondary questions.

A favourite plea is that the House of Lords supplies an admirable check upon hasty and improper legislation. The notion seems to be that, like a coach rushing down hill, our country is "shooting Niagara," fast going to the dogs or the devil or some such locality, and that the peers are a drag upon the wheels of the British chariot in its downward career. But what is the use of a drag which only acts when there is no strain, and immediately there is some pressure proves powerless and has to be flung aside. No matter what side you take in politics, these facts cannot be denied. You are, we shall suppose, a Tory of the good old type, and you consider our past legislation to have been not progress but retrogression. Catholic Emancipation and the removal of the Jewish and Dissenting Disabilities; the first Reform Bill and the Corn Law Abolition; Household Suffrage in town and country; National Education and the Irish Church Disestablishment; if all these and many others were mischievous measures, unwise concessions to the evil spirit of Democracy, will you please say of what use was the House of Lords as a check, which only put off the evil day, but could not avert this succession

of calamities? On the contrary, did not their first refusal of mild and moderate measures result in their being eventually obliged to swallow much stronger physic, along with an extravagant waste of money and time and temper.

If, on the other hand, you are a Liberal or a Radical, you believe that the course of our legislation has been progressive, a veritable ascent up the Hill of Difficulty, then you are not likely to see the value of a drag before the wheels. You believe that the measures that have been named, and many more questions still awaiting solution, are but footprints in the grand march of national justice and the extension of liberty; what must be your opinion of a House the bulk of whose members were so deaf to the pleas of justice, so indifferent to the cause of liberty, so blind to the growing light of reason and experience, that they were amenable only to force?

There are many who admit that the House of Lords as at present constituted is quite indefensible, but who believe it may be reformed. It may be charitably supposed that no one at this time of day defends the purely hereditary principle. It may also be assumed that none will advocate the present method of appointment which places the Upper Chamber at the mercy or the caprice of the Sovereign or the Minister of the day. It is out of the question that the peers should be self-elected, having power to add to their own number, and it would be still more absurd to leave their selection to the House of Commons whose decisions they are expected to review. The only remaining alternative is that the peers be elected in some way or other by the people; whether by a double process and for a term of years like the American Senate, or directly and for life as is generally supposed to have been the constitution of the Roman Senate. Now if it can be reasonably shown that a more enlightened and independent house of representatives can be obtained by election for a longer period or for life or by a double election, this would be a very good reason for constructing the present House of Commons upon one or other of these plans; but it is no sound argument for continuing *one* House by this confession, unenlightened and dependent, in order that its blunders may be rectified by the superior intelligence of *another* House. If both Houses were really representative, they could not possibly differ, and the divided and double discussion would be sheer waste of talent and time and temper. Both claiming to be representative would make it a much greater difficulty than now, in the event of a deadlock as frequently happens in America and our Australian Colonies, which ought to give way. This delay, instead of insuring a calmer reconsideration of measures and a more judicial choice, creates needless irritation and ill-feeling, giving opportunity for intemperate politicians to be more clamorous and immoderate in their demands.

There is not a single reason in favour of *two* Legislative Chambers

that does not apply with greater force in favour of *three*. If one check is good, *two* must be better, and *three* better still, and so on like interminate decimals. It is very remarkable that if government and legislation by *two* Houses are such admirable things, that no other of the thousands of institutions of this country is constituted in the same way. Who would recommend the government of a parish or a town or a city or a county to be conducted in this style? What bank or insurance office, or commercial, industrial, or charitable institution would prosper whose affairs were managed in this fashion? Why are not the boards of directors and committees of management of such associations divided into upper and lower chambers, each revising and reviewing the proposals of the other, no business being done or question settled until both were quite agreed? How long would it be before the bank would have to close its doors, and the insurance company flourish in the *Gazette*? This would be a certain source of weakness and indecision, not of strength; a duplication and not a division of labour.

Just observe how ridiculous is the bugbear of hasty legislation. Think of the years an idea takes before it obtains a reasonable hearing in Parliament. Even when a measure, after years of agitation, is sure of a majority, count the numerous opportunities for consideration and criticism at its various stages: First, leave must be obtained to bring in a Bill; then it has to be read a first time; then a second time; then considered in committee word by word and clause by clause; then it must be reported; then the report has to be received; then it must be read a third time; and, finally, it must be directed to pass. At every one of those stages the opponents of a Bill may challenge a debate and a division, besides an infinite number of other opportunities of adjournment and reporting progress, surely securing more than enough of delay without the addition of revision by an irresponsible chamber.

This question has hitherto been discussed altogether apart from the personal merits and defects of the present peers, unwrapping the mere accidents which are always changing in order to test the principles upon which the structure rests. The fact that there are at present a great number of men of the highest ability in the House of Lords is no reason at all for committing to irresponsible hands any portion of the government or legislation of this country. A full meeting of Her Majesty's Privy Council would form the most select assembly of statesmen in the world. The learned societies of London could produce a vast display of genius and talent. For practical political ability scarcely anything could rival or excel a convocation of the editorial staffs of the London and the best provincial Press. Each, or all of those assemblies combined, would include a vast variety of ability and wide and rich experience; but who would therefore dream of entrusting to any such random convention of able

men the responsible trust of a nation's government. Their criticism and counsel would be valuable; their right to govern we emphatically deny.

The high character and ability of many of the present peers makes it all the more desirable that they should be removed from a false position, where their talents are practically lost in the formation of public opinion, in order that they may be available as the chosen representatives of their countrymen. There is not a single peer of any note or ability who would have the slightest difficulty in obtaining the suffrages of some constituency. Indeed, many fear that when peers become eligible as Members of Parliament, they would have too easy a triumph over an untitled candidate. This would soon rectify itself, and in a mixed assembly mere rank would soon find its true level, and the most obsequious constituency would not be long in discovering that

“The man's the gould for a' that.”

At present the House of Lords is a source of danger not only to its own existence, but also to the Conservative principles it professes and to the political party to which it mainly belongs. The abolition of the Second Chamber might well be advocated as a Conservative measure. For a time at least the Tory party would be a decided gainer by the change. Its strongest men, instead of being in the front of the fight, are now, by their position as peers, kept back until the country has already made up its mind and the question in dispute is practically settled, when this strength is worse than wasted and the political influence they might have exercised at an earlier stage is lost. The new House of Commons would combine the wisest and strongest and best men in all parties and in both chambers.

It is this periodic renovation that has made the history of our country a history of continuous progress. It is this that amidst the dismemberment and extinction of so many other nationalities; this steady progressive reform, sometimes slow, but always certain, ever marching forward, never looking back; to this we owe it that one generation succeeds another, and the centuries come and go, but England is merry old England still.

B. D. MACKENZIE.

## A PHILOSOPHICAL TOUR IN SEEN AND UNSEEN REGIONS.

THE term "Nature" seems convenient for the purpose of expressing in a single word the idea of that wondrous organisation wherein all things are supposed to be comprised. It includes whatever is—whether it be material or immaterial, physical, moral, spiritual, or any other kind. It comprehends all matter, and everything that hath life—all the forces, influences and laws which may be in operation in the universe, and all the ordinations and provisions in accordance with which it may be imagined that the proceedings of Nature are compulsorily effected.

Such of the facts of Nature as the human faculties can in anywise interpret and understand, are, of course, only to be regarded as the merest atom, or as but the merest infinitesimal fraction of an infinitesimal fraction as compared with the whole of them.

While most of us can perceive, even upon a superficial consideration of the phenomena in the midst whereof we live, that Nature's procedure takes place according to what seems to be method and order of the perfect kind, yet we are personally affected in innumerable ways by natural circumstances so as to induce the suggestion, in many minds, of there being much that is seemingly incongruous, and out of harmony with that all-controlling principle of beneficence to which it is conceived the performance of Nature's various functions ought to be subordinated, even from the very least to the very greatest of them.

Why should there be pain and suffering and misadventure in thousands of different ways? Why should human beings have been so constituted that they can be prompted to act with dishonesty and cruelty? And why should the innumerable ill-effects of human error and wrongdoing be part of the "plan" of Creation?

Such are some of the questions often asked by folk who seem to suggest that if they had had the arrangements of the universe in their hands, Nature would have been ordained upon far more enlightened principles than those to which it is man's misfortune to be subject.

Throughout the decades of centuries during which mankind has sojourned upon the earth, orthodox theology has offered to its dis-

ciples professedly true solutions of these conundrums. The numerous kinds of religious belief of which history informs us, and those now traceable to times anterior to the written record, plainly show that Nature has been over and over again appealed to for explanations respecting her apparently enigmatical procedure. But it can hardly be said that inquiries at her shrine have been pursued in that docile and scientific spirit which would seem to be a requisite qualification for understanding the language wherein she speaks. Hence misinterpretations of natural phenomena have over and over again occurred, and upon the false inferences so derived, illogical and pernicious creeds have from time to time been built up and formulated. and being specially and skilfully adapted to those passions and unreasoning proclivities of the human character which have been common to our race in all ages, they have become stereotyped as sacred institutions amongst some of the most ancient and populous nations of the earth. In that respect, many of the tenets and practices of Hinduism, Confucianism, and Mohamidanism afford familiar illustrations; and Christianity itself cannot be exempted from the charge of incorporating into its teachings, and of utilising for its secular purposes, monstrously false and absurd deductions from some of the more conspicuous natural effects which are ever taking place around us.

Without doubt there are many questions connected with the circumstances of our lives which are of the keenest interest to nearly every intelligent member of our race; and we all know how numerous and various have been the theories propounded from time to time with the view of satisfactorily solving them, and how far the attempted explanations have come short of satisfying the human craving for absolutely certain knowledge respecting them.

In attempting to define briefly what is usually meant by the term "science," it seems reasonable to regard it as consisting of an acquaintance with the general laws and principles according to which such operations of Nature as we can investigate appear to be carried on. It embraces a knowledge of the properties of different kinds of matter, and the modes of their interaction together. It includes the departments to which the mathematician, the chemist, and other physicists give attention, and those wherein moralists, theologians, and ethical experts in general are wont to disport themselves.

If that is a correct idea of the meaning of "science," it follows that a scientific inquirer *is* an inquirer, and in no sense an arbiter. His functions are those of an explorer, and his rôle is rather that of a learner than of a teacher; that of a witness to fact, and not that of a judge. He is, or ought to be, an accurate observer, and a rigidly truthful recorder of the phenomena concerning which he prosecutes research.

What, then, is the practical outcome of such a view of the

scientific method of interrogating Nature concerning enigmas which provoke the anxieties and exercise the minds of many people?

The first suggestion which presents itself by way of answer to that question, is, that it is as utterly futile as it seems to be altogether senseless to be discontented with or to protest against the conditions to which our mortal being is subject.

To enable us to become convinced of that fact needs no deep searchings amongst the mysterious labyrinths of natural phenomena, nor any attempted flight towards the high regions of learned speculation, for we experimentally know how powerless we are, individually or in any numbers collectively, to frustrate or divert even to the extent of a hair's-breadth, the action of those all-dominating influences to which everything in Nature seems absolutely subordinate. To a degree vastly more than sufficient for every purpose of our existence, we are endowed with intelligence, with instincts and with will-power, so that we can perform or omit to perform actions beneficial or the reverse to ourselves or to others, but in every step we take and in everything we do, we have no alternative but to act conformably with Nature's own methods. It is part of our lifelong education to learn that grievous effects ensue if, in any sense or in any particular, we violate Nature's laws, or attempt to evoke Nature's forces to a degree greater than that to which she has limited our powers of control. That painful or fatal consequences follow upon temerity in these respects is being continually illustrated in thousands of ways, whether, for instance, by our stepping over a precipice and injuring or killing ourselves, or by exercising our chemical ingenuity in producing compounds which, through careless or unskilled use, occasion a calamitous destruction of human life and property, or by constructing floating or other locomotive machines, which as to design and strength are inadequate for the purposes wherefor they are employed, or, in short, by any of the innumerable modes in which through human imperfection in knowledge or conduct "accidents" and casualties occur.

Obviously, however, it is not only through human mistakes that calamities and accidents are produced. Earthquake, storm and flood in various forms, and the violence of the natural elements generally, occasion from time to time disasters of the most appalling kind. It may be that a populous city has grown up on the fertile slopes of a mountain in a volcanic region. A few ominous symptoms suddenly declare themselves in utterances of terrific import. They are such as the living folk of the locality have never experienced, and have only heard about through uncertain traditional report. Very soon fearful earth-tremblings are felt; buildings topple over in all directions; the air is filled with dust, vast quantities of débris are projected hither and thither as if the very world was being shattered to pieces; and numberless people are buried beneath the accumu-

lating materials. The utter wreckage, to which the entire city and every human structure are being subjected, is accompanied by tremendous volcanic outbursts, and red-hot stones and cinders are being rained down as if from heaven itself. That which was not long since a flourishing city, is becoming buried in ashes, or more or less submerged beneath fiery lava-streams. Human beings and animals perish by the thousand; vineyards, orchards, pastures and homesteads are utterly destroyed. Wreck and ruin most complete are now the dominant features over an extensive district which ere-while was a very earthly paradise. Nature, in a seeming vagary, has stricken a region which had appeared to be one of her specially favoured spots. Her smiles had long been lavished upon it; fresh and ever-vigorous life and fertility, with abiding peace, had reigned there for centuries, and now, behold! it appears as though a blighting curse from heaven had suddenly descended upon it! No wonder that amidst the abounding misery so suddenly produced and in the presence of such seemingly supernatural violence intermittently repeated, the reason of many folk should lose its balance, nor that famine and pestilence should be among the consequences of the dread calamity.

But there is many a kind of raid that the forces of Nature sometimes make upon human communities and their belongings, and upon the other living things of the earth. It may be that for ages an extensive region lying between widely separated mountain ranges has formed a general collecting ground for all the water there produced, and is the site of a great lake or inland sea. Every such lake or sea occupies a part of some larger or smaller trough or valley, and in fact exists through its waters being prevented from flowing onward by a partial obstruction or barrier of such a kind that it admits of the escape of only the surplus outflowing accumulations, and of that but at a feeble rate of exit. But in course of time the barrier becomes weakened by the wearing action of the outflowing stream, and the power of its endurance, which depends upon the nature of its component materials, and upon the surface-contour of the surrounding country, becoming greatly diminished, it yields more and more to the vast pressure behind it. Perhaps for some decades of centuries it had been amply sufficient to resist the ever-continuing tendency of the water to discharge itself from the great basin wherein it was confined; but at length it succumbs, and lo! the water-floods are set loose upon that doomed region!

It is not difficult to conceive what would be some of the calamitous effects of such a disruption. The ensuing inundation might well suggest itself to any surviving sufferer that the catastrophe was a world-wide deluge, and the moralists of a succeeding generation would have no difficulty in seeing in it a judgment of the Almighty for the sins and iniquities of mankind.



In our own days of rapidly diffused intelligence, we are becoming somewhat familiar with extensive natural catastrophes. The overflowing along its entire course of a great Chinese river, with its thousands of individual fatalities, and an enormous destruction of cattle and crops and other descriptions of property, followed by a long epidemical scourge arising through numberless corpses being left to decay when the ultimate lowering of the waters caused them to be exposed upon malarious mud-banks; a great volcanic outburst in Java, with its many concomitants; an extended line of earthquake along numerous Japanese valleys; the tremendous onset, now here and now there, of some mysterious tidal wave whereby anchored ships are overwhelmed and wrecked, or landed high above the shore-line, and the habitations of seaside dwellers are swept away, are a few recent illustrations of the ravages brought about when some of the forces of Nature apparently deviate to a small extent from their ordinary pacific course of action.

After all, however, such signal catastrophes are but few and far between, and while their effects are probably only what in the ordinary course would occur by slow degrees, their painful action in connection with human life and human interests are but transient. In operation they are strictly local and limited, and, comparatively regarded, they are but trifling accidents in the working of the apparently self-adjusting machinery of Nature. As seeming examples of the inexorable character of Nature's procedure, they appear as nothing in comparison with the hundreds of thousands of instances of pain and death which are taking place in every hour of every day of the world's existence.

Some of the detailed effects ensuing through the human race and all living things which exist upon the earth's surface, being physically subject to Nature's methods, afford a vast field for the exercise of pessimistic philosophy, and probably no patronising apologist for Nature is ever likely to find an adequate excuse for the seemingly ruthless and incongruous ordination in virtue whereof suffering is experienced by animal existence in general, and for the inevitable doom of decay and death which, sooner or later, overtakes every mortal being.

The constitution of universal Nature, however, is not like a human document wherein are inscribed the principles upon which a community or nation of its own will elects to be governed. Nor is it a "plan" such as some theological and moralist experts enunciate as having been devised in Omniscient councils and miraculously made known to mankind. But, in that its several departments are, so far as the infinitesimal capacity of human science discerns, co-relative with each other and co-operative in action, it would appear to be regardable as an inconceivably vast combination of forces, influences and existences—in regard to space, as unbounded immensity;

respecting physical and material elements, as a limitless organisation ; concerning intelligence, capability, and moral characteristics as an omniscient, omnipotent, and all-beneficent infinitude.

In whatever aspect any member of the self-important human race may deign to regard the constitution of Nature whereinto he is born, and whereof he is, in fact, an atom, the reality abides that it is supreme, and that its dictates are exercised irrespective altogether of the will of the beings who are governed by it.

Can Nature, then, be deemed a personality, whom we may petition for an explanation respecting effects which appear to be of so inexorable a character? Would it avail if she were asked to show how it comes about that some of her proceedings include the infliction of pain, decay, death, and the innumerable effects ensuing from those inscrutable incidents? And why her living offspring should be subject to diseases of body, of the affections, and of the mind, so that, whether by accident, or by mistake, or wilfulness on man's part, he should be liable to be stricken with fever, with pestilence, with famine, or with cause for anguish of heart or mind, or with bodily deformity or mental aberration?

Although there may be among us many a hollow form whence oracular sounds issue forth in response to the anxious inquiries of the faithful, and although the world has never been without its professedly inspired interpreters, yet a large phalanx of heretics remains to be converted to orthodox beliefs in that respect, to whom, except by Nature's own methods, there seems to be no way of obtaining a solution of such momentous questions.

However wonderfully the most complicated as well as the very simplest arrangements of Nature seem to act—even as though each one were instinct with thought, judgment, and reflection, and possessed the faculty of electing the most appropriate methods of procedure—yet it would manifestly be futile to make a personal appeal to what is obviously only physical ; or to present even the most passionate entreaties and exhaust our very existence in an effort to obtain an intelligent utterance from what evidently is not endowed with intelligent will-power and personal sympathy.

But if the physical and material part of Nature is thus altogether impersonal and lifeless as regards its not giving any response to man's craving for intelligent and sympathetic intimations respecting matters which have so keen an interest for him, does it therefore follow that no intelligent and soul-satisfying information is obtainable by scientific inquiry concerning the objects and intents for which matter and physical forces and influences exist, and for which they perform their infinitely diverse functions in a manner which appears to have been omnisciently pre-ordained?

The question, "What is scientific inquiry?" seems to be worth repeated consideration. It may perhaps be deemed to consist of

the tracing of the modes and methods in which Nature's effects are evolved; and of the manner in which natural phenomena are produced; and of the immediate, proximate, and ultimate utilities they subserve.

Judging even from the merest superficial consideration of what any intelligent man sees to be taking place around him, it appears impossible, in reason, to suggest that the unspeakably wondrous universe of cause and effect, whereof he himself is a constituent atom, is but a mechanical and chemical organisation, which, though seemingly boundless as to dimensions, and absolutely perfect in the interaction of its infinitude of details, yet aimlessly and purposelessly exists—that is to say, *only*—that mechanical and chemical effects should be for ever in the course of being evolved.

Does our own solar system, for example, exist only that the sun and the planets should rotate upon their axes, and that planets and satellites should revolve in their orbits, so as aimlessly and purposelessly to constitute a grand piece of toy mechanism altogether unconnected with intelligent and appreciative personality?

Of course, we all know that we are each of us, individually, members—infinitesimal members, no doubt—of something very different from that. At every step we take in our daily lives, we find ourselves surrounded by a multitude of circumstances and subject to numerous incidents, each of which is referable to the regular and constant operation of some of Nature's methods and processes. Who is there who does not perceive that every breath of wind that blows, and every ray of light that manifests itself, and all the grains of matter which hold together and form the greater part of our spherical world, have their utilities among millions of other like means and agencies with special reference to the mysterious origination and development of vegetable and animal life? Between what is seemingly the merest dead matter of the nether rocks and the most intellectual and cultured of human beings, what an unutterably vast range is there of Nature's provisions and operations! The influences stored up in a microscopical seed, the arrangements for its quickening and nurture in the soil, its air-growth, and its continued nutrition through leaves and roots, its maturing and the part of its physiology which displays itself in flowers and fruit, and ensures a superabundant perpetuation of its kind; in that single instance of one of Nature's productions, what a lengthened chain of development is involved! How completely does every phase of the plant's career seem to be provided for! By a profoundly subtle interaction of elements at her disposal, Nature has produced a marvelous physical and material structure, which also contained, in its most incipient stage, another principle or influence—to wit, vitality—without which it would have been but a mere atom of dead matter. And, similarly, through all the phases of locomotive life,

by what an infinitude of simple provisions is the well-being and healthy development of each individual secured! the maturing of the incipient being in the womb, or by other modes; the instinctive solicitude of the parent as a safeguard of offspring-life, are simple illustrations out of millions and millions of instances of Nature's apparently pre-ordained methods.

Whether it be in the formation of suns, as may be conjectured, out of elements existing in universal space, and the maturing of those inconceivably vast collections of gaseous material until they acquire a condition wherein they are fitted to throw off semi-molten masses which immediately acquire a rotary motion on axis, and begin to revolve in orbit about the primary, or the gradual condensation of such a projected mass, and its preparation for the inauguration of living organisms upon and around its surface, such as the geology of our own planet seems to show has taken place; whether it be the seeming ebb and flow of the seas and oceans of our world; whether it be that wonderful influence or supposed influence, to which the name of gravitation has been given; or whether it be the originating and the development of a grass-blade, or of tiny colour-streaks upon a flower, there seems to be and to have been somewhere or somehow in exercise in and among all such operations, an intelligence which we can only regard as omniscient, a power which we can only conceive to be omnipotent; and a character which is necessarily regardable as all-beneficent.

What a proud and magnificent position is it in which an intelligent man attempts to pose when he assumes pessimistic airs and remonstrates with the constitution of Nature on account of its having been so arranged that many things occur in a way which has not his approval! That humble-minded individual would, however, appear justified in not giving a willing acquiescence to some of the inexorable methods in Nature's programme. That weakness and decay should inevitably overtake one; that our mortal structure should be liable to all sorts of maladies; that our mental vision is utterly powerless to penetrate the veil of death; that we should be left in absolute ignorance whether any part of our being survives when the mortal tenement is bereft of the spirit which animated it, are matters about which we may argue and speculate and invent theories, and formulate theological creeds, and as to which some folk are induced to believe that miraculous intimations have been conveyed to mankind by some method which does not appear to be traceable within the range of Nature's illimitable domain.

And yet it is perfectly obvious, withal, that Nature's methods and processes are altogether invisible to mortal vision and imperceptible to mortal touch. The influence, or force, or whatever it is, which in the language of science is spoken of as "gravitation" and which

appears to rule the universe, and that which consists of or occasions chemical action and seems to be equally extensive in operation, are only palpable through the effects evolved by their supposed instrumentality. A cannon-ball may come to us in a very demonstrative form, but the force which sends it on its career is never seen. The life or vitality of an organism is assuredly invisible in whatever way it may be deemed to exist, whether as a material part of a material body, or as something which is immaterial and not a mere physical part of it.

It seems unquestionable, then, that we live in the presence of unseen powers or influences, and that our very existence, including the maintenance of our being for longer or shorter periods, is somehow due to the methods in which they, or some of them, act together, and that everything we behold, or that we can touch or handle, is necessarily attributable to them.

If such a conception of Nature be correct, the universe itself seems to be regardable as of a dual character, the one part consisting of phenomena which the scientific explorer seeks to trace out and to follow through their seemingly interminable and infinitely complicated modes of causation, and the other as comprising powers or influences, which, although affecting and sustaining us at every instant, are nevertheless such that the human faculties are only capable of forming more or less reasonable inferences or conjectures concerning them.

If one's consideration of phenomena be given in a general sort of way, even to what is only mundane, into what an infinitely complicated and infinitely various an array of causation and effect do we seem to enter! Is it to be marvelled at, that the ultra-sentimental and ultra-poetic mind of savage and uncultured man should be utterly overwhelmed with a sense of the sublime magnificence of the wondrous effects he beholds in every direction to which his vision is directed? Can the sun and moon and stars be anything less than divine personalities, seeing how majestically they march from one side to the other of heaven's blue dome? Are they not evidently capable of being displeased, when, as they oftentimes do, they hide their countenances from human sight, and send violent deluges upon the earth, and hurl forth destructive hurricanes upon men and cattle, and upon the crops which are necessary for their sustenance? Can it be otherwise than by divine magic that vast mountain ranges should so often appear along the far-off horizon as the great day-king is completing his ever-watchful march? By what can those sparklings upon lake and river surface be occasioned, as they come and go with such instantaneous activity, if not by tiny water-sprites issuing forth in myriads from their hiding-places to greet the sun upon his first appearance above the eastern hills? How come the leafy slopes to put on such intense autumn colourings if no

unseen spirits steal forth in the cold hours of the night to effect the mystic artistry?

But for the imaginative faculty, the experience of childhood would be deprived of more than half its pleasures; and, in like manner, but for the supposed personality which primitive man attributes to the influences of Nature whence phenomena are evolved, his existence would be dispossessed of a large proportion of its interests.

And are phenomena, so many of which are objects of faith, and of intense concern to children and to a vast number of the simple folk of the earth, by reason of their imagined personality, of less keen regard to the scientific inquirer because he perceives that they are only phenomena or manifestations of a more or less permanent character, and are due to the operation of unseen physical causation? That they, and their immediately producing causes, are not living entities he cannot reasonably doubt; but that they are all somehow ascribable to the exercise of omniscient will-power, his reason compels him to believe. By tracing phenomena or effects to their causes, immediate, proximate, or remote, he discovers that out of exactly similar circumstances exactly similar results ensue, and hence he deduces and formulates what, for scientific convenience, he calls natural "laws," but which so-called "laws" no real scientific inquirer can deem to be anything more than a tentative human conception, and more or less hypothetical.

Is there no evidence of personality trackable, then, in the course of a scientific exploration through any department or region of Nature? Is the universe constituted of nothing but matter and force? Is a human being nothing more than a wondrous piece of mere physical organisation with just a temporary spark of vitality thrown in, which is called its "life"? Is its brain-power and its reasoning capacity an effect only of certain mechanical and chemical combinations? Is any coffinful of black dust which is so ruthlessly disturbed nowadays, the resultant entirety of a thinking, speaking, devising, and right or wrong doing locomotive machine, which, some twenty or thirty centuries ago, was so carefully located in its Egyptian tomb in the belief, on the part of its relatives, that the body would some day be resuscitated and the skeleton resume its garment of flesh? Can science aver its yea or its nay in answer to that question?

As there is no doubt whatever that science cannot positively answer it one way or the other, seeing that upon the death of the body taking place an impenetrable veil is drawn down, yet, on the other hand, it seems certain that those of the provisions and operations of Nature with which we become acquainted, afford evidence of the most absolute kind, of there being a supreme intelligent personality—or what we are justified in reverently regarding as such a personality.

That what is called "intelligence" is one of the invisible and

intangible facts of Nature is perfectly obvious, for the proofs of its existence and of its exercise present themselves in millions upon millions of instances at any spot upon the globe's surface at which man places himself. The evidence is discernible throughout the vast range of ocean life. Whether in the case of the merest diatom or of the biggest leviathan, there is an instinct or a greater or less degree of "intelligence" which is employed in directing the animal's movements in its searches for appropriate food, and for the external conditions requisite for its various functions. And so in every example of the locomotive creatures of the air and of the land, there is unquestionably a greater or a smaller degree of that adaptive characteristic which is obviously a part of the creature's being.

And in coming to the consideration of our own race, there is no need to refer to the evidence it affords of the existence of that faculty, for it is manifested in various degrees in the actions of the hundreds of millions of human beings who people the earth. As one of the realities of Nature it may serve either the pessimist or the optimist for a text, but that it exists as an irrefutable fact is demonstrated in almost every region of the globe.

Such a course of suggestion leads one back to the part of the subject with which the present article was commenced—namely, to the manner in which Nature presumes to deal with the earth's living denizens in general and with the human race in particular, and to the various arrangements which appear to have been ordained in their special behalf.

In the estimate of the pessimistic philosopher there may appear to be a striking incongruity as between the numberless painful circumstances which, on the one hand, are incidental to all animal existence, including the human section of it, and, on the other hand, the superabounding beneficence in virtue whereof the well-being of every living thing is provided for, almost as though the forces and influences of the entire universe were directed to its individual interests according to its functions and its needs.

If true scientific inquiry consists, as it would appear to do, in the tracing of phenomena or effects to their immediate or remoter causes, and in ascertaining the manner in which Nature's processes are evolved, the inquirer will not be perturbed in spirit because in the course of his explorations he discovers so much that is for the time inscrutable and that so utterly passes understanding. From a few simple facts which present themselves to his attention in the humble lowlands where his quest begins, he gradually mounts to higher points whence more extensive views are obtainable. His knowledge of facts increases as zone above zone is reached, and until he is enabled to discern the more general features of the wondrous region which he is traversing.

What summary, then, can be formulated by an intelligent mind out of a general scientific inquiry or philosophical exploration, through the visible and invisible regions of Nature by which we are surrounded, and of which every human being is in fact a denizen?

(1) The first axiom which suggests itself is that Nature is absolutely supreme in the exercise of her functions, and that, pessimistic protests and optimistic laudation notwithstanding, she produces her effects with special reference to the utilities they subserve and according to seemingly established methods, but yet with more or less of variation or deviation from absolutely rigid courses.

(2) All visible phenomena are the outcome of forces or influences which are themselves invisible, and which indicate, in the manner in which they operate together and produce their effects, that they are due to the exercise, apart from themselves, of a supreme omnipresent intelligence and of an omnipotent and universally beneficent will.

(3) The facts of Nature do not afford any absolute intimation whether man's being has or has not a continuing sentient existence after the decease of the body, but, so far as they do afford evidence upon the subject, they show it to be reasonably probable that it has such an existence in some form.

The principles upon which Nature appears to be constituted seem to include the necessity that the question concerning a "here-after" for mortal man, should *not* be capable of solution by us, for if, on the one hand, it were known as a fact that when the body dies we should enter into conditions more acceptable than those of the present life, how many folk would be justified in hastening their departure hence, and so frustrating the very purposes for which the world exists; while, on the other hand, if it were certain that there were no future state for us, it would be but reasonable that man's efforts should be chiefly directed to present enjoyment. But the spirit whereby the educated and enterprising portion of mankind is animated, is in consonance with the higher aims supposedly involved in a progressive destiny. If our mundane existence were assuredly terminated by a mere blank, then, with so hopeless and meaningless a prospect before us, it would perhaps be almost justifiable on the part of every individual and of every community to act upon the aphorism "what does it matter, annihilation is before us, let us eat, drink, and be merry, for to-morrow we die."

Respecting our own special sphere of existence, one part of Nature's methods is plainly discernible—namely, that every living organism has its genesis and its period of growth and development and of decadence, and that the dissolution of the material part of it is the precursor, though not the progenitor, of new life. Even the rocks, of which at least the outer portion of our globe itself is composed, appear to undergo their transformations prior to their ultimate



disintegration, which, in its turn, is a step preliminary to the reconstruction of the materials constituting them; and it may be that the same principle of genesis, development, and decadence extends to the suns, worlds, and other heavenly bodies with which we may suppose infinite space to be tenanted, and that, after performing the functions proper to them, they become ultimately dissolved and dispersed previous to the elements composing them entering into new combinations and being gradually worked up again, so to speak, into new spheres.

Into what region do we find ourselves landed after thus attempting to make a philosophical exploration amid the wondrous facts of Nature with which we are surrounded? Do the innumerable evidences of design, method, order, and beneficent provision, which present themselves at every step we take, lead to a reasonable conclusion that Nature is merely a vast aggregation of material and physical effects which operate, of necessity, according to rigid "laws," and without any other purpose than that of material and physical evolution? and that the universe, after all, is but an inconceivably intricate combination of soulless mechanism? Does such an excursion conduct us into the domain of fancy, and sentiment, and miracle, where credulity, under the head of religion, dominates to a prevailing extent the minds and hearts of men? or do we not rather become more and more conscious at every instant of our being, that we are in a Presence whom we may, for want of a more appropriate expression, deem to be an all-pervading personality, and the Soul and Spirit of the Universe?

There seems to be no ground for the apprehension on the part of man that the beneficence which is so conspicuous a characteristic of Nature's processes will be lacking, whatever it may be that ensues when his body is grasped by the mystic hand of death. That all things are perfectly adapted to the circumstances in and for which they appear to have existence, that the welfare of everything having life is thoroughly provided for at every stage of its being, and that material and physical operations which take place in, upon, and around our globe are effected in the most complete manner conceivable, are matters of actual experience. They are facts which may be seen, and understood of all men who are capable of forming an independent judgment. They are not the imaginary conceptions of credulity, but the reasonable bases upon which an absolutely relying faith may unhesitatingly repose.

R. G. MACKLEY BROWNE.

## CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

### SCIENCE.

THE third volume of Mr. Masee's *Fungus-Flora*<sup>1</sup> has followed promptly after the second, but it bears no evidence of having been unduly hurried in its preparation. In our notice of the second volume it was pointed out that it ended in the middle of the Leucosporous Agarics. This, therefore, is the starting-point of the one before us, which commences with the genus *Lactarius*, and carries the treatment of the *Basidiomycetes* to its conclusion. When this is reached the reader finds himself more than half-way through the volume, so that the description of the members of this large group really covers about five-sixths of the three volumes now published. This being so, we are not surprised at the announcement prefixed to this volume that it has been found necessary to extend the work beyond the limits originally contemplated, and that a supplementary volume will be issued at an early date. There is always some disadvantage in a change of plan, but in this instance, we think, no one will complain so long as the high standard of thorough and exact treatment is maintained. Happily, there is no reason to fear any shortcomings on this point, as the author seems as careful and conscientious in his work as ever, and is evidently aiming at the production of a Flora which, for a generation at least, shall be the text-book of British fungologists.

The *Basidiomycetes* disposed of, the remainder of the volume is given up to the *Hyphomycetes*, under which are included several so-called "moulds" and other microscopic forms. This group is not a very natural one, and is not recognised by those fungologists who classify fungi from the morphological point of view, many of the forms included in it being merely phases in the life-cycle of pleomorphic species. But there is great practical convenience in the plan adopted by Mr. Masee, and, this being so, we are not disposed to criticise it adversely. We think, however, that the references to the pleomorphy of the forms described should have been more numerous than they are. In the case of the genus *Oidium* it is pointed out that some of the forms are merely the conidial phases of species of *Erysipha*, or *Sphaerotheca*, but *Penicillium* and *Asper-*

<sup>1</sup> *British Fungus-Flora.* A Classified Text-Book of Mycology. By George Masee. Vol. III. London and New York: George Bell & Sons. 1898.

*gillus* are not treated so well. Thus there is no mention of the ascigerous phase of the former genus, and of the latter it is only stated generally that "many species are known to be the conidial forms of higher fungi."

As to the descriptions of the genera and species, they are throughout clear, definite, and sufficient, and will not suffer by comparison with those of other writers. As in the previous volumes, there are numerous figures, upwards of one hundred and fifty in all, which, though not very highly finished, are strikingly characteristic, and will be of considerable service to the student in determining the species of the specimens he collects. We trust the concluding sections of the work will be forthcoming at an early date, and then we shall have a text-book of mycology worthy both of the importance of the subject and of the confidence of the student.

M. Bourdeau's *Conquête du Monde Végétal* is a book that may be widely recommended—wherever, indeed, an intelligent interest is taken in the resources of Nature as utilised by man. We know of no work which is in any degree similar to it, other than De Candolle's *Origin of Cultivated Plants*; but even this is not quite the same in aim and scope as the one before us. As a matter of fact, the author takes a most liberal view of the demands of his subject, and gives us a very full history of the conquest that man has gained over the vegetable world. That mankind is largely dependent upon that world for the necessaries, conveniences, and even luxuries of life, is a fact which is more emphasised in these days than it ever was before, and a clear and succinct account of how this has been brought about can hardly fail to be attractive. Such an account the author has given us, and it is to be regretted that we have no work like it in our own language. Those, however, to whom the language is no obstacle will find the contents of the volume very systematically arranged in books and chapters, written in a concise, clear style, and full to overflowing of interesting and carefully verified facts. The historical statements have been brought together from many sources and evidently with great labour, but the result is one on which the author may be complimented. At the beginning it is pointed out that the earliest attempts to utilise vegetable products consisted simply in collecting such as were spontaneously produced, and that it was not until a much later period that attention was turned to their cultivation. The exact time at which this occurred is difficult to fix, and indeed must have varied in different races; but the author is justified in regarding the first efforts at agriculture as marking an important epoch in the history of mankind and heralding the dawn of civilisation. At any rate, to these efforts we owe the beginning of that dominion over the plant-world

<sup>1</sup> "Études, Histoire Générale." *Conquête du Monde Végétal*. Par Louis Bourdeau. Paris: Felix Alcan, Éditeur.

which man has now obtained and the growth and extent of which M. Bourdeau describes so admirably in this volume. This preliminary matter disposed of, the author goes on to consider separately, food plants, economic plants, plants used as forage, officinal plants, plants used in the industrial arts, plants used for their wood, and ornamental plants. In each case he treats of every plant which can fairly claim a place in such a work, and traces in detail the history of the steps by which its position as a plant useful to man has been obtained. Having thus satisfied the claims of the past, he adds a few chapters at the end on the possibility of future conquests, on the methods of culture, and the creation and preservation of improved types. On these subjects the author shows himself as thorough and as competent as in the historical part of the work, and has much to say that even experienced agriculturists and horticulturists might study with advantage.

The new series of Natural Science Manuals to be published at the Cambridge University Press has opened well with the issue of Mr. Henry Woods' Invertebrate *Palæontology*.<sup>1</sup> It is not a large volume, but by judicious arrangement and the adoption of a terse style the author has managed to get more solid matter into it than is to be found in many volumes of greater bulk. The arrangement is zoological rather than geological, but the wants of geologists have been specially studied by giving greater space to those forms which are most useful from the stratigraphical point of view. The plan followed is briefly to describe the zoological features of each group, and especially of the hard parts; then to give the classification and characters of the genera which are important geologically; and lastly to sketch the present and past distribution of the group. The plan is consistently carried out from beginning to end, and in following the author in its execution we have found much to admire and but little to criticise. The treatment accorded to each group is proportionate to its importance, and on all points the author shows himself *au courant* with the latest knowledge. The facts presented are those that are most fundamental and the most necessary to be known, and, as far as possible, all matters which are still in dispute are avoided. The only references, indeed, to controversial matters are in the paragraphs on *Eozoön* and the systematic position of Trilobites; but even here the references are of the briefest, they are eminently judicious, and do not go beyond what every student of elementary palæontology has a right to expect. Where every chapter reaches a high standard of excellence, it may seem invidious, to particularise, but for the information of geologists specially, it may be well to mention, that among the groups in which they are interested which are admirably dealt with, are the *Foraminifera*,

<sup>1</sup> Cambridge Natural Science Manuals. *Elementary Palæontology*. Invertebrate. By Henry Woods, B.A., F.G.S. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1893.

the Sponges, the Graptolites, the Madreporarian Corals, the Starfishes and Sea-Urchins, the *Brachiopoda*, the *Lamellibranchiata*, the *Gastropoda*, and the *Cephalopoda*. Intending his volume for real students who will not attempt the study of palæontology without actual specimens, the author has not introduced many illustrative figures. There are a few, however, which show, more or less diagrammatically, the structure of some of the fossils dealt with, and these will be of great service, for they indicate at a glance the points that it would require many words to describe. Though not elaborate, these figures are clear and bold, and as the type, printing, and binding are of the best, the volume is in every respect worthy of being honestly and strongly recommended. We may mention in conclusion that a short but valuable list of palæontological works is given at the end, for the benefit of those who wish to carry their knowledge further.

This little volume<sup>1</sup> on the Poultry of the Backyard, as we may, perhaps, translate its title, is one that has a useful end in view, and on that account deserves a fair measure of popularity. The author is of opinion that, in France as elsewhere, the claims of poultry-keeping as a branch of agricultural industry have not been as fully recognised as they ought to be, and that, if conducted on right lines, it ought to prove profitable. To be successful, however, it should be conducted with intelligence and with some knowledge of the characteristics, habits, &c., of the birds concerned, and of the methods of breeding, rearing, &c., which experience has shown to be the best. Hence one of the objects of his book is to supply, in a readily assimilable form, information on these matters. It consists of between three and four hundred pages and contains ten chapters on the common fowl, five on the turkey, two on the guinea-fowl, seven on pigeons, five on ducks, and four on geese. From this it will be seen that the chapters are not overweighted, and on perusal it will be found that they are concerned solely with those details which are of interest and importance to practical men. In general terms, the book deals with the natural history of the birds, the hygienic conditions under which they thrive best, and the maladies to which they are subject. These include, however, a tolerably full account of the various breeds or races, with the characters of those best adapted for breeding, the methods of artificial incubation where that is possible, and the points to be attended to in rearing, housing, and feeding the young of the various kinds. Writing in the first instance for French readers, the author naturally dwells on the native breeds, where these exist, and on this account English readers may find it well worth perusal. In going through the various chapters we have come across no defects of a serious kind, and have

<sup>1</sup> *Les Oiseaux de Basse-Cour*. Par Gaston Percheron. Paris : Librairie de Firmin-Didot et Cie. 1894.

found nothing to impair our confidence in the author's reliability. Indeed, as editor-in-chief of two journals devoted to agricultural and veterinary matters, he has had excellent opportunities of becoming fully posted up on the various subjects touched upon, and his volume may be accepted as a very useful and reliable guide to poultry-keeping both on a large and a small scale.

Dr. Cooke is a somewhat prolific writer, and when writing for non-scientific readers usually employs a flowing and attractive style. This is well seen in his latest book, which has just been published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, under the title of *Romance of Low Life amongst Plants*.<sup>1</sup> From the alternative title we learn that it is concerned with the "facts and phenomena of cryptogamic vegetation," which leads one to expect the treatment will be more serious than the principal title would suggest. Dr. Cooke is no doubt right in thinking that an account of these facts and phenomena will prove interesting to young readers, and taking his book as a whole, we think it will not disappoint any such who give it a careful perusal.

Beginning with ferns and their allies, he takes his readers through the mosses, liverworts, lichens, and algæ, and then winds up with his own special group of fungi. From each of these classes he selects certain species which lend themselves, with more or less readiness, to the romantic style of treatment, and deals with such phases of their life-history as are suitable for his purpose. Those who have some previous knowledge of botanical matters will recognise the fact that, very often, the romance is not found in the lives of the plants themselves, but rather in the notions which, in the absence of actual knowledge, the older writers held with regard to them. Hence where actual facts are dealt with there is frequently no romance, and where we get romance, there is usually a conspicuous absence of facts.

As to the educational value of the volume, we doubt whether it will prove so great as some of the author's previous works on popular science. There is, in many parts, a looseness in the style which frequently leads to inaccuracy, and that to an extent which is somewhat surprising coming from so eminent a botanist. Thus the "tetragonidia" of the *Florideæ* are said to be "sexual organs of reproduction"; the egg-cell of a fern is called "a little bud or germ" which "protrudes from its cell" to come in contact with the male element; and the archeogonia of mosses are said to contain "the ovary, enclosing the ovules, to be matured into spores." On the subject of lichens, Dr. Cooke reiterates his objections to Schwendener's hypothesis as to the nature of these plants, but it is signifi-

<sup>1</sup> *Romance of Low Life amongst Plants*. Facts and Phenomena of Cryptogamic Vegetation. By M. C. Cooke, M.A., LL.D., A.L.S. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. New York: E. & J. B. Young & Co. 1893.

cant that he avoids asserting any organic connection 'between the algaoid and fungoid constituents, and nowhere maintains that either of them originates from the other. In dealing with the algæ, *Volvox* naturally occupies a prominent place, but the account given ignores the real differences between the two commoner species, and the figure given of *Volvox globator* is obviously that of *Volvox aureus*. In describing the fungi, he is more successful in avoiding lapses of this kind, and the reader may rely with more confidence on the details which are given in that part of the volume.

Professor Potter's *Agricultural Botany*<sup>1</sup> is the outcome of a series of Extension lectures. Though intended, in its special application to agriculture, for the use of agricultural students, it claims also to be an elementary text-book on general botany, suitable for those who are beginning the study of the subject. Looking at it in the latter character first, we may observe that it opens with a short chapter on the plant cell, and the physiological properties of protoplasm; the various forms of plastids, reserve products, &c.; and the cell-modifications met with in plant-tissues. We doubt whether this is the best way of introducing a beginner to the study of botanical science, but, apart from this, there is a want of precision in dealing with these important matters. The vacuole is spoken of as if it were universally present in adult plant-cells, as is also the phenomenon of rotation or circulation in the protoplasm. It is scarcely correct to say that the exact functions of the nucleus are at present unknown, and that the guard cells of a stoma "are known as *stoma*." With most botanists the plural of stoma is stomata, in agreement with the Greek derivation of the word, but with Mr. Potter, stoma itself is always employed as the plural form. Similarly, the vascular bundles of plants are spoken of throughout as fibro-vascular bundles, in spite of the fact that in many such bundles there are no fibres at all. Cork is spoken of as if it were equivalent to bark, and in describing the increase of thickness in roots by means of a cambium layer no mention is made of the part played by cork in causing the exfoliation of the primary cortex. In describing the structure of the stem, the fascicular cambium and its products are duly considered, but there is no reference to the interfascicular cambium by which the cambium strands of the separated bundles are connected, giving rise to a continuous cambium ring.

In the chapters devoted specially to the root, stem, and leaf, such inaccuracies and ambiguities are, happily, fewer; but even here we come across statements which, in the interests of beginners, are objectionable. In treating of transpiration, for instance, reference is made to its action in producing negative pressure in the wood

<sup>1</sup> *An Elementary Text-Book of Agricultural Botany.* By M. C. Potter, M.A., F.L.S. With 99 illustrations. London: Methuen & Co. 1893.

vessels, but the reader is left quite in the dark as to what it is that is under a diminished pressure. From the context he will infer it is the water, whereas, as the author knows well enough, it is the gases which accompany the water. The presence of gases in the vessels is not mentioned however, hence a greater likelihood of the ambiguity leading to error. Again, the cortex of the stem of a bean plant is said correctly enough to contain two kinds of cells, some with uniformly thin walls and others whose walls are thickened, especially at the angles. But in contrasting the latter, as mechanical cells, with the former, as assimilating cells, the author forgets that the thicker walled cells contain chlorophyll and are assimilating cells also.

Turning now to those parts of the volume which are specially applicable to the needs of agricultural students, they will be found mainly in the chapters on the diseases of plants, the grasses, and the Leguminosæ. In the more general chapters there are many references to matters of great importance to agriculturists, but the three chapters mentioned are almost exclusively occupied with such, and are among the best in the book. In the first we have an account of certain fungi which attack either the cereals or the green crops, and produce diseases which are more or less destructive. In the second is an account of the structure and classification of grasses, and in the third a similar account of the Leguminosæ. The peculiar relationship between the Leguminosæ and the free nitrogen of the atmosphere is considered with some detail, and a summary of the recent researches into the part played by bacteria in enabling leguminous plants to become "nitrogen collectors" is put clearly before the student. The book is profusely illustrated throughout, by figures taken from the publications of the best authorities, some of which add largely to its value. Among these are Wagner's figures showing the results of experiments with vetches in relation to nitrogen, and of the experiments on "green manuring" with oats.

---

#### PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

It will, no doubt, be with some little surprise that the readers of this REVIEW are introduced to a thinker who has the courage to challenge Mr. Herbert Spencer, and this, not on the ground of his conclusions, but of his first principles. Yet this is what Mr. D. J. Hill does in his *Genetic Philosophy*.<sup>1</sup> He charges Mr. Spencer with adopting a discredited method in commencing his philosophy with *a priori* assumptions, in determining beforehand what is knowable and what is unknowable, in laying down a fixed formula of evolution, and then accumulating from science an immense body of

<sup>1</sup> *Genetic Philosophy*. By David Jayne Hill. New York and London: Macmillan & Co. 1893.



facts to illustrate and support his theory. This, Mr. Hill declares, is to invert the order of inquiry by professing to find the limits of knowledge first and its contents afterwards. This fairly correctly describes the method of the Synthetic Philosophy, and indeed of all systems of philosophy. Mr. Hill contends that philosophy must change its methods and follow the methods of science. That is, it must start with the assumption that truth has to be *discovered*, not *made*; and that we are to discover it at the *end*, not at the *beginning* of an examination. The genetic method which he adopts, or professes to adopt—for one is not without suspicion that he has an hypothesis lurking behind his examination—“consists in referring every fact to its place in the series to which it belongs.”

The *a priori* philosopher traces facts so far till they fit into his system and no further; the genetic philosopher will trace them until they can be followed no further, without any desire to make them fit any foregone conclusion. It will be seen then that Mr. Hill pursues a scientific method and reserves his conclusions until he has surveyed all the facts; and, considering the compass of the book, we must congratulate him on the admirable way in which he has fulfilled his task. Necessarily many of his conclusions are not new, but they are reached by a valid process of investigation. The work consists largely of a lucid summary of the results of scientific investigation in all the great departments of knowledge. After a preliminary chapter on the “Genetic Method,” the author treats of the Genesis of Matter, of Life, of Consciousness, Feeling, Thought, Will, Art, Morality, Religion, and Science. It is manifestly impossible to follow the writer over the whole field thus surveyed; it is sufficient to say that it ends in the presentation of Monistic Realism as the final result of his investigation; that consciousness, which we call “mind,” and objects-of-consciousness, which we call “matter,” are both manifestations of one Reality or Being whose earliest stages elude our thought. We have as much right to predicate eternity and universality of the psychical as of the material elements. By the genetic method we trace back “matter” in its evolution until we can no longer subject it to experiment, but we feel none the less assured that in some form it persists; so we can also trace back the psychical element until it is apparently lost, but we are justified in assuming that it is not dissolved into nothing. The theory is not new, but the body of facts upon which the theory rests are, thanks to science, greater than formerly were at the service of the philosopher. The method at least is sound, and the reasoning is temperate and fair.

A bulky volume of nearly five hundred pages in the *Bibliothèque de Philosophie Contemporaine*, entitled *L'Action*,<sup>1</sup> by Maurice Blondel, arouses our curiosity, and we feel anxious to know what it is all

<sup>1</sup> *L'Action. Essai d'une Critique de la Vie et d'une Science de la Pratique.* Par Maurice Blondel. Paris: Felix Alcan. 1893.

about. The opening chapters are interesting, and even entertaining; there is a good description and criticism of "aesthetic asceticism," a psychological development we fancy peculiarly French. Pessimism, Materialism, Freethought, are criticised in succession, and we gradually begin to see daylight. And finally we find we are being led by a clever writer to consider the supreme claims of dogmatic religion under the veil of a philosophical treatise.

The problem of life, the writer says, in substance, can only be solved by action. Aesthetic, Pessimist, Materialist, cannot refuse to act, to put their theories to the test of experience. The Church asks no more. Why should the course of action prescribed by it be the only one which men refuse to put to the test. "Try it," he says—almost in the words of Coleridge—when asked if Christianity were true. It is clever but not convincing, for the same prescription may be offered by various theories of life, and the results will not differ widely.

Another volume in the same library differs from the one just noticed in every respect. *Le Droit des Femmes et la Mariage*,<sup>1</sup> *Etudes Critiques de Législation Comparée*, is short, practical, and clear as daylight. The bulk of it consists of a comparative view of the position of women in the great civilised countries. This is displayed from several points of view, as conjugal fidelity and adultery; the incapacity of the married woman; the legal rule as to goods, &c. Many curious diversities are exhibited as to the relative legal position of men and women under different systems. The author apparently has especially in view the desirability of reforms in France, which should place the woman on an equality with the man. A strange instance of the favoured position of the husband is to be found in the unmodified clauses of the French Penal Code of 1810. "The wife convicted of adultery shall be subject to the penalty of imprisonment for not less than three months nor more than two years." "The husband who shall keep a mistress in 'la maison conjugale,' and who shall have been convicted on the complaint of his wife, shall be punished by a fine of 100 to 2000 francs."

The writer concludes with twelve propositions by which the legal disabilities of women may be abolished and their equality with men be established before the law. It is an instructive and useful work, and would be of invaluable assistance to every advocate of "woman's rights."

*The Spiritual Life*<sup>2</sup> is a delightful book of its kind, consisting of six essays by American writers. The subjects of the spiritual life treated by the authors are drawn from the most diverse forms of Christianity, in which have been found men and women possessed by that intensity of religious emotion which is usually and properly understood by the term. It is not peculiar to any age or any

<sup>1</sup> *Le Droit des Femmes et la Mariage*. Par Louis Bridel. Paris: Felix Alcan. 1893.

<sup>2</sup> *The Spiritual Life*. Studies of Devotion and Worship. Boston: Geo. H. Ellis. 1893.

particular Church, and much more than any profession of faith unites those who experience it. In some it is an overmastering sense of God, or the divine life in man; in others it is a sense of sin and shame of everything which in the human heart opposes the touch of this divine life; and in others again, a passionate longing by means of self-sacrifice. This is how it is described by Howard N. Brown, the writer of the first essay on the *Spiritual Life in the Early Church*. Other writers deal with German Mysticism, Spanish Mysticism, the Modern Church, &c. Mr. George Willis Cooke describes some American phases, which are chiefly expressed in lyrical form by well-known poets and hymn-writers. The book shows that even in this material age transcendentalism still survives in a religious form.

A more intellectual and less emotional side of modern religious development is discussed in the *Church of England and Recent Religious Thought*,<sup>1</sup> by the Rev. Charles A. Whittuck. It is a serious attempt to realise the present position of the Church in the nation. The author appears to favour what may be called the national tendency in Church matters rather than the sacerdotal tendency, though its success may depend upon a just combination of the two. It does not seem likely to us that the Church will ever regain its former supremacy. The sacerdotal tendency is a narrowing and exclusive one, and, on the other hand, the nation is less in favour than ever of allowing the Church to interfere with matters which are not expressly ecclesiastical. Mr. Whittuck looks at the matter from the point of view of an intelligent churchman, but is evidently not without some misgivings. The relations of the Church to Nonconformity, the question of reunion, the alienated classes, and other related topics are discussed in a liberal spirit, but not very hopefully. Some chapters treat of the theology of the teachers of the Church in recent years; but this is not a very exhilarating topic, for it has been directed to minutiae rather than to the great problems which exercise men's minds outside ecclesiastical boundaries.

*Religion and Modern Thought*<sup>2</sup> approaches the subject from still another point of view, as this is a collection of theological papers written by well-known liberal preachers. The first, which gives the title to the book, is by T. W. Freckelton, who contends that a consistent Evolutionist should be an Intuitionist as well. The writer eloquently urges that religion is consistent with science and philosophy, though it must be understood that the religion spoken of is Theism and not Orthodoxy. Mr. J. Frederick Smith describes some of the results of Biblical criticism, and Mr. Walter Lloyd gives a condensed summary of the arguments, principally critical and historical, against the credibility of the miracles of the Old Testament, at the

<sup>1</sup> *The Church of England and Recent Religious Thought*. By Charles A. Whittuck, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1893.

<sup>2</sup> *Religion and Modern Thought, and other Essays*. London: Philip Green, 1893.

same time maintaining that religion and morality are independent of the miraculous element commonly associated with them. Mr. George St. Clair suggests a solution to the Problem of Evil, and discusses the difficulties attending it in a thoughtful way. Mr. H. Shaen Solly disposes of "Eternal Punishment," and Mr. Lawrence P. Jacks has an admirable essay on "Authority in Religious Belief." Two short biographical sketches, "Channing," by Dr. Brooke Herford, and "Theodore Parker," by Mr. Silas Farrington, will help to an understanding of the general theological position of the writers of these essays.

Another *modern* book comes next upon our list, *Jesus and Modern Life*,<sup>1</sup> by M. J. Savage, a well-known liberal American preacher. The aim of the book is not merely, if at all, to present a new life of Jesus, but to consider the relation of His teaching to our present circumstances. Mr. Savage is evidently not bound by any theological prepossessions, and treats the Gospels and their contents without reserve; applying not only the results of historical and literary criticism, but also testing them by the requirements of our ethical standards and social relations. The task is performed in a manner calculated to offend none but the extremely orthodox, and the book will be of interest and probably afford assistance to such as have abandoned the dogmas of the Church concerning Christ and yet retain some veneration for the man who initiated that religious movement in humanity known as Christianity.

In Mr. Whittuck's book noticed above we came across the phrase "Cambridge School," and though strictly speaking there is no distinct theological teaching which merits that title, we presume there is unavoidably a general drift which characterises religious teaching in that university. What it is like may be gathered from the *Cambridge Sermons*,<sup>2</sup> selected and edited by Mr. C. H. Prior. As these are only occasional discourses, delivered without any continuity or common aim, we can look for no more in them than a general consistency. When we say that amongst the authors of these discourses we find such teachers as Dr. Westcott, Archdeacons Wilson and Farrar, Professors Swete, Kirkpatrick, and Ryle, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, it will be seen that we have the best the university can show. Generally speaking the tone of these discourses is lofty and liberal, and the preachers are not so much dominated by the idea of the "Church" as their brethren at Oxford. They have their limitations, however, strongly marked, and their conclusions often seem to us lame. Still there appears an effort to break away from tradition, which is not only the sign of the times, but is curiously exemplified in one way or another in this and the four preceding books noticed in this present article.

<sup>1</sup> *Jesus and Modern Life*. By M. J. Savage. With an Introduction by Professor Crawford H. Toy. Boston: George. H. Ellis. 1893.

<sup>2</sup> *Cambridge Sermons*. Preached before the University in St. Mary's Church. Selected and Edited by C. H. Prior, M.A. London: Methuen & Co. 1893.

*The Pilgrim in Old England*<sup>1</sup> is a rather fanciful title for a review of the history, present condition, and outlook of the Independent (Congregational) Churches in England. The author, who is an American, justifies his use of the term "Pilgrim" in this connection by saying that the name not only belongs to those who left England and afterward went to America in search of religious liberty, but also "to an intellectual and spiritual movement of which the migration to the New World in the *Mayflower* was but a small part." The book, though not displaying any original research, gives a fairly good account of English Nonconformity, the author's views upon the present position and tendency of Dissent depending chiefly upon information and opinions received from Nonconformists in England. It is a picture of Nonconformity painted by Nonconformists, and if naturally a little one-sided, it is not at all unfair. The work has been better done before by Nonconformist historians at home.

---

#### SOCIOLOGY, POLITICS, VOYAGES AND TRAVELS.

It is not unnatural that we should stop to inquire exactly what place on the shelves of economic libraries a new treatise on political economy may expect to fill. There are several comprehensive treatises of the first authority; we are inclined to demand of any new competitor that it shall satisfy us as possessing some considerable originality of treatment, or as embodying some new theory.

Professor Shield Nicholson's new book<sup>2</sup> is not one which we shall praise without hesitation. It does not immediately answer to the test above suggested, although it has an arrangement of its own, and it takes exception to some of the opinions of Professor Marshall, who may be considered the leading British economist. It seems to us that Professor Nicholson's language is too often involved. In our opinion the danger of modern economists is that of getting lost in the vague verbiage of sociological and metaphysical generalisations. Now Professor Nicholson steers his way clearly enough through these difficulties for himself, but he does not mark the path clearly for his readers. His language often tends to confuse, and it is a matter of prime importance in economics that all exposition should be as clear and incisive as possible; this is hard to acquire, for it means intense labour of thought and analysis.

There is one point in which the work is fundamentally different from other recent works, such as Professor Marshall's *Principles of Economics*. These for the most part have been written as fresh expositions of the truth in contrast to the errors of Mill, Ricardo,

<sup>1</sup> *The Pilgrim in Old England*. By Amory H. Bradford. London: James Clarke & Co.; and Congregational Union of England and Wales. 1898.

<sup>2</sup> *Principles of Political Economy*. By J. Shield Nicholson, M.A., &c. &c. Vol I. London: Adam and Charles Black. 1898.

and others. Mr. Nicholson has founded his work on those of Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill, endeavouring rather to reproduce all that is good in both : he aims at adopting the historical method of the former, while he adheres to the lucid exposition which marks the latter. Whether he fully succeeds we are not quite sure.

The volume is divided into two books—the first deals with production, the second with distribution. The former starts with an examination of “economic utility”; it examines the functions of nature, labour, and capital in the work of production; it includes a chapter on large and small farming; and a very good discussion of the principle of population. The second book has a good chapter on the distribution of private property—a subject which lends itself to fresh handling at the present day, when general dissatisfaction with the “abuse” of the privilege (to use the phraseology of Plato) has produced a number of crude and erratic attacks on the “use.” Wages and theories of wages have three chapters to themselves, and one is devoted to economic rent. One of the most generally interesting chapters is the final chapter, on economic history and economic utopias, with a criticism of modern socialism.

We think that Professor Nicholson has treated the subject of capital better than it has usually been treated; we observe that it was he who wrote the article on capital in the *Dictionary of Political Economy*, and his present chapters are in a manner a development of that article. There is a point here which it may be worth while to cite :

“Mill calls attention . . . to the erroneous idea that most people entertain regarding the transmission and inheritance of capital. They imagine that the greater part of a national capital was accumulated in the past, and that any given year only produces what is added to the previous amount.

“The fact, he asserts, is far otherwise. The great part in value of the wealth now existing in England has been produced by human hands within the last twelve months; a very small proportion was in existence ten years ago; and scarcely anything in the nature of productive capital has come down to us from a remote period. The land subsists, and the land is almost the only thing that subsists. . . . The perishable nature of capital, and the need for continuous reproduction has been well brought out . . . by Mr. Atkinson.”

It is obvious that here is contained a lesson which is very new to the majority of ordinary commercial men, and a little reflection will show that some important consequences may flow from it.

The chapter on large and small farming is one to which we may call special attention, for some of our readers may remember that in August last we noticed Mr. Moore's very practical little work on this subject. Though Mr. Nicholson's work is not exhaustive on this point, much of his chapter is worth attention, and we may cite some words in which he arrives at a conclusion more cautious even than that of Mr. Moore :

“Until recently it was a favourite contention of economists in this country that if the laws of entail and primogeniture were abolished, and a simple and inexpensive system of transfer adopted, at once a stimulus would be given to the creation of small properties and small farms. It is, however, very doubtful if the greatest simplification of the law in this direction . . . would have much effect. . . . But in Great Britain an agricultural labourer who had saved enough money to purchase a small farm would certainly be better advised to rent a larger one, or to emigrate with his capital.”

We are the more ready to call attention to the doubt, because we have in past years more or less strongly urged the breaking up of agricultural holdings, and we still have some remnant of faith in that idea.

Somewhat later on the question of population is suggestively treated, but without much new light. This is after all the crux of economics. To this all practical difficulties are finally traceable. We crave something more than the following :

“If the conclusions of Malthus were ever true they are still true, if ever applicable they are still applicable.

“It may be thought that I am emphasising a truism, but the following sentence from the most popular authority of the day upon the subject of pauperism, a writer who claims to be guided only by facts, shows that Malthus requires either refutation or confirmation : ‘I have not sufficient evidence to show whether, as a rule, early marriages and large families hang together, but there are instances of it in the stories that have been told. On the whole, neither of these causes seems to have as much effect on pauperism and poverty as is sometimes supposed.’”

We take one more quotation on a subject which is just now occupying much public attention :

“It is a fundamental maxim of political society that the State has a right, in the interests of the public, to undertake any expropriation whatever. On this there can be no dispute. But in estimating the interests of the public, the question of compensation is always present. The State cannot set the example of robbery and plunder without affecting industrial security, and the greater the development of industry and credit so much the more important is security. Still, as already pointed out, security is only a means to an end.”

And thereafter the writer goes on to discuss the cases of abolishing liquor traffic, horse racing, &c., and to state the “economic principle of compensation in its most general form.”

We have already referred to chap. xv. of the second book. Professor Nicholson gives a brief but fair summary of what we have sometimes in these pages called “scientific socialism”—the socialism of the *Fabian Essays*—and commences his criticism of it in the following terms :

“The reader of the preceding pages will readily understand that in my view socialism of this kind is based on a total misconception of history, and sets up an ideal with which I can have no sympathy. The doctrine which Mill regarded as his most important contribution to political economy, namely, that the distribution of wealth depends ultimately on popular opinion, and that the various schemes of communism and socialism cannot be truly said to be impracticable, has, in my opinion, been mischievous both in theory and practice.”

And the subsequent observations will be found sound and helpful. They are summed up with the statement that has been made over and over again in the pages of the WESTMINSTER—a statement which must be repeated *le plus haut*—“Above all, the liberty of the individual would be stilled, and with it self-reliance, independence, and enterprise.” It is the point at which we have always broken with the Socialists. We sympathise with their aims, we cannot adopt their conclusions. Yet we cannot afford to neglect their existence, or refuse to recognise that they have of late years made some headway. People forget that similar movements have been in operation in past years, have for a time run a promising course, and have sunk into oblivion after practical failure.

Mr. Morris and Mr. Bax are two well-known names amongst modern Socialists, though they are not, in our opinion, entitled to the first place as the scientific expositors of socialism. Their joint book<sup>1</sup> comes in remarkably well as a counter to Professor Nicholson’s remarks, for it claims to deal with its subject from the historical point of view—the very point of view in which the Edinburgh Professor finds socialism hopelessly weak.

There is no question that the work will be read with interest, and we are glad to recommend that it should be read. There is nothing like discussion for a subject which is permeated by fallacies: it is only by discussion that the strong common sense of the British public will be able to get its grasp of the weak points of socialism, for *prima facie* the exposition is attractive to every one: and this appears to be admitted by the writers of the book before us when they say, “Nowadays the Socialist lecturer rather finds a difficulty in drawing out opposition to his views until he begins to deal with details.”

Time and space confine us to a notice of the two closing chapters—“Socialism Militant” and “Socialism Triumphant.” Under the former little help will be found for the inquirer: it states in effect that modern legislation is deeply tinged by the desire to use the power of the State in all relations of life—which we know; that there is a growing tendency to work by means of local organisations—which we can certainly see; that all this is the result of socialism, and is reacting for the benefit of socialism—which is only partly true. The other chapter contains some clear suggestions as to the

<sup>1</sup> *Socialism: its Growth and Outcome.* By William Morris and E. Belfort Bax. London; Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1893.



conditions of social life towards which the Socialists desire to work,—complete freedom in regard to the marriage-contract; the relish for all labour for its own sake by every labourer; an abandonment of fashion in dress, and of any extreme difference between the sexes; a regularity of building in all towns, so that the present unhealthy massing of population should be known no more. In all this chapter we see before us Morris the artist (and, like many artists, Mr. Morris is rather a man of idea than a man of practice).

*Le Monde des jeux*<sup>1</sup> is an original little book twice as long as it is broad, dealing with a subject with which the ordinary Englishman is not really in sympathy. Roulette and baccarat exist in England as exotics, and the proportion of persons who think about them is very small. On the Continent, M. Leroy addresses a large circle; and he endeavours to put his readers on their guard against many tricks of play. Our advice to those readers would be not to play at all. We can imagine that some day in future ages this little book may be a valuable curiosity.

M. de Lano has made a study of the French and German Courts in recent times, and his new book<sup>2</sup> on the Court of Berlin is a contribution rather to the personal memoirs of European Sovereigns than to the history of one age: but, like other political memoirs, it contains much that may help a historian.

“Portraits, observations on the private life of the Sovereigns of Germany, and on that of their courtiers, criticisms of the manners of the upper circles of Berlin, revelations, spicy and unexpected, about the loves of the *beaux* and *belles* of the Prussian Court—these are materials which have been massed into the following pages.”

Doubtless this little advertisement will draw a good many readers. The chapter on Prince Bismarck is one to which they may give special attention.

Mr. Fraser Macdonald has sent us a book<sup>3</sup> which fills a distinct niche on the library shelf. Only why he should go out of his way to talk of ocean railways we cannot imagine. Neither by history nor by analogy of nature is there any value in the figure, though it recalls to us the argument of a high official respecting the propriety of charging the cost of steamers to a vote for roads. “What are steamers but the locomotive of the sea? what is an engine but a steamer on land?”

That, however, is a small point. We are all proud of our mercantile marine, and we do not hesitate to counsel every one to get a book which traces from small beginnings the history of those great ‘steamers which are England’s pride.

A small *brochure*<sup>4</sup> on the official management of the Dutch colonies in the East Indies will be useful to English politicians as well as to

<sup>1</sup> *Le Monde des jeux*. Par X. Leroy. Paris: E. Dentu. 1893.

<sup>2</sup> *La Cour de Berlin*. Par Pierre de Lano. Paris: H. Simonis Empis. 1894.

<sup>3</sup> *Our Ocean Railways*. By A. Fraser Macdonald. London: Chapman & Hall. 1893.

<sup>4</sup> *La Hollande et les fonctionnaires des indes néerlandaises*. Par J. Chailley-Bert. Paris: Armand Colin et Cie. 1894.

the French colonial party. It is the result of an official mission. Mr. Bert has had other experience in the East, and we think that he puts concisely and clearly the descriptions which he has to give.

An *Historical Summary of French Colonisation*<sup>1</sup> is a book of somewhat similar stamp. It aims at giving a general view of the French methods of colonisation—rather, we might say with M. Foncin, whose letter is printed as a preface, the want of methods. We do not direct this as a reproach against the French. We are not sure that it is not true of all nations; only popular ignorance, going by results, has simplified its analysis of these results by assigning “method” to one nation, “want of method” to another.

Dr. Taylor’s book on the *Canary Islands*<sup>2</sup> is an essay on the “climatological and medical” aspects of islands which have been a good deal sought after of late years. Beyond the first chapter and the appendix, which contains a brief account of the history of the islands, the book is simply statistical, presenting them in the view above mentioned. To the general reader it will not be so interesting as to “the profession.”

M. Victor Tissot<sup>3</sup> takes his holidays with a good healthy spirit, and writes that bright vivacious prose which seems to be an heritage of so many Frenchmen. He has not only climbs and scenery to tell of; in a small way his book is one of adventure, and he enlivens it with more than one story which will captivate the heart of youth. It is a pity that the English schoolboy is usually so slow in reading French, for here is a book much of which would please him. Moreover, M. Tissot’s knowledge of the places he has visited is made as available as if in a guide-book, without losing its chattiness and pleasant associations.

We finish this month, as last, with a book<sup>4</sup> of African travel—this time from Messrs. Blackwood & Sons. The first point that strikes us about Mr. Rankin’s presentation of African travel is his half-humorous dilation on its petty discomforts. We are wrong in using the word “petty,” but mosquitoes and cockroaches and night-alarms are, after all, minor troubles in a land where men go by land and water in peril of their life. But Mr. Rankin has also some thrilling tales and anxious situations to recount; more particularly on the expedition of which he took charge in May 1890. The book deals with some places, Blantyre in particular, of which we know little; of Mombasa more has been heard of late years, but Mr. Rankin’s pages about it will repay perusal. His observations on the Portuguese in Africa are an addition to the literature of travel.

<sup>1</sup> *Histoire Sommaire de la colonisation Française.* Par Léon Deschamps. Paris: Librairie Classique. 1894.

<sup>2</sup> *The Health Resorts of the Canary Islands.* By I. Cleasby Taylor, M.D. London: J. and A. Churchill. 1893.

<sup>3</sup> *Au pays des glaciers—vârances en Suisse.* Par Victor Tissot. Paris: Charles Delagrave. 1893.

<sup>4</sup> *The Zambesi Basin and Nyassaland.* By Daniel J. Rankin. William Blackwood & Sons. Edinburgh: 1893.

## .HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

DR. KINGSFORD'S voluminous *History of Canada* makes but slow progress. Whereas his fifth volume, which was published a year ago, dealt with a period of twelve years (1763-1775), the sixth volume, now just published,<sup>1</sup> is occupied only with a detailed narrative of events that happened in the brief space of the four years from 1776 to 1779. At this rate of progress we cannot expect Dr. Kingsford to reach the year 1841, at which date he has announced his intention to lay aside his pen, in less than another batch of six bulky volumes.

In the sixth volume the first and fourth books are both comparatively short ones, and they deal strictly with the history of Canada. In the second book of some 200 pages there is given an interesting and exhaustive account of the arrangements between George III. and his German allies, by which some 29,000 German troops were landed in America between the years 1776 and 1782, but the bulk of the book is occupied in an unnecessarily detailed account of the campaign undertaken by General Burgoyne, which resulted in his inglorious surrender of his army of over 4700 troops to General Gates at Saratoga on 17th October, 1777. The third book is entitled "The American War of Independence," 1777-1782, and in the course of 130 pages the story of this most instructive and painful period of English history is fully and fairly set forth. Dr. Kingsford puts the blame on the right shoulders in roundly condemning the vain and incapable Lord George Germain as the prime author of the disastrous campaigns that eventually resulted in the loss of the thirteen colonies. But he also exposes mercilessly the miserable failure as a general of Sir William Howe (afterwards the fifth viscount). Howe began badly by leaving a most valuable collection of stores, guns, food, and clothing when he evacuated Boston; and to make matters worse, Washington was in the utmost need of the articles which were so foolishly left for him to make use of. All through his career as commander-in-chief in America, Howe showed his incapacity for his post. He failed to follow up his victory at Long Island; he was dilatory in his occupation of New York and in his march across New Jersey, preferring to enjoy the society of women in New York to briskly pursuing Washington, who was almost at his last resource. But Howe's worst exhibition was given while he was in winter quarters in Philadelphia. His conduct was so loose that his whole army followed his lead in respect of immorality. Gambling became so prevalent that many young officers had to sell their commissions in order to pay their debts. In

<sup>1</sup> *The History of Canada*. By William Kingsford, LL.D., F.R.S., Canada. Vol. VI. (1776-1779). With Maps. Toronto, Dominion of Canada: Rowsell & Hutchinson. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. 1893.

short, the few months' occupation of Philadelphia alienated the loyalists and embittered the partisans of Congress to such an extent that it did more damage to the cause of Great Britain than the loss of many battles. The only bright feature that stands out in the story of the struggle is the unflinching bravery of the troops in the numerous engagements, and Dr. Kingsford gives us many graphic pictures of hard-fought fights.

The fourth and closing book of this volume narrates the events that centred round the quarrel between Sir Guy Carleton and Lord G. Germain, ending in the recall of the Governor and of the appointment of General Haldimand as his successor. The sketches of Sir Guy Carleton and General Clinton are as pleasing to read as the portrayal of Germain's incapacity, Howe's sloth and luxurious living, and Burgoyne's vanity are mortifying to the pride of Englishmen. The maps included in the volume are excellent.

We take next two volumes from the *Story of the Nations* Series, which in order of publication preceded the history of Spain which we noticed last month. Good histories are few and far between, and this series does not profess to give us critical histories. We therefore do not review the books from any but their own standpoint; and taking them thus, our verdict on both the volumes before us is favourable.

Considering that the Parthians have enriched our ordinary conversation with one of its most hackneyed figures, it is a little hard on them that so few of us know anything about them. We imagine indeed that very few are competent even to undertake the writing of Parthia's story. Mr. Rawlinson's name and antecedents are some guarantee of the knowledge necessary to the task; and they are not belied when the book is examined. We really did not know that so much was to be said about Parthia. But besides this, the story is made interesting; we see the people represented from their own point of view, not merely from the Roman side. The narrative of the Mithridatic wars of Roman history obtains a much more vivid light and illustration under Professor Rawlinson's touch. Not that our general admiration for the Parthians is exalted thereby; indeed they have in a manner sunk in our estimation. We used to imagine them the bold and fearless mountaineers; now we find them a rather misshapen, lazy race, capable only of being roused by emergencies.

The *Australian Commonwealth*<sup>2</sup> is a bold title, but not a bad one after all; for a moment we are startled at the idea of Australian history being written apart from that of England. As the author suggests, it is difficult in a book dealing with many facts so modern to draw the line between history and political discussion. On the

<sup>1</sup> *Parthia*. By George Rawlinson, M.A., &c. &c. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1893.

<sup>2</sup> *Australian Commonwealth*. By Greville Tregarthen. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1893.

whole, Mr. Tregarthen does this fairly; and parts of the book are well written. But his work strikes us generally as uneven, and we can quite understand that he has found his official work a bar to regular progress.

Mr. Salisbury's book<sup>1</sup> on *Portugal* has very much the same character as the last two. It is not a history so much as a narrative of events. But it displays one quality—impartiality—a great qualification for writing history. The author is not blinded to the value of the Portuguese soldiery in the Peninsular wars. Nor again does he leave unrebuked the recent unreasoning vexation with England over African affairs. A part of the book also deals with Brazil, the greatest of Portuguese colonies, and comes pretty well down to the present time. Mr. Salisbury has filled a gap—the want of a short and readable account of the Portuguese people, about whom we English are unduly ignorant.

---

#### BELLES LETTRES.

THE opening chapters of *Marion Darche*<sup>2</sup> contain much admirable work, the figures gathered round Mrs. Darche's luncheon-table being sketched with Mr. Crawford's usual flowing line. But presently the book falls off. The plot hesitates, and ceases to hold the interest, the action sinks towards the commonplace, and the story becomes thin and unsubstantial. It is given, as we are warned, "without comment," and Mr. Crawford's commentary is what his readers love. His method is expository, and not impressionist; he cannot write the *romance sans paroles*. Further, the rich suggestiveness of an old civilisation suits him better than the hard modern definition of New York Society. In this, and his other American novels, he is an echo of greater men; in *Saracinesca*, or *The Cigarette Maker's Romance*, he walks with head erect.

The author of *Hartmann, the Anarchist*,<sup>3</sup> inspired by M. Jules Verne, constructs an ingenious "aeronef" or aërial man-of-war, and shows how it could be utilised as an Anarchist engine of destruction. The book is clever and vivid, especially as regards this ship and its navigation, but the later scenes must prove unpleasant reading. Descriptions of wholesale and fiendish massacres, taking place in our daily haunts—in Westminster, in Kensington, in Bayswater—can only be distressing, and though the conclusion is intended to reassure, and to point to the ultimate triumph of civilisa-

<sup>1</sup> *Portugal and its People. A History.* By W. A. Salisbury. London, &c. : T. Nelson & Sons. 1893.

<sup>2</sup> *Marion Darche. A Story without Comment.* By F. Marion Crawford. London : Macmillan & Co.

<sup>3</sup> *Hartmann, the Anarchist; or, the Doom of the Great City.* By E. Douglas Fawcett. London : Edward Arnold.

tion, it does not do away with the effect of so much terror and destruction.

*For One Season Only*<sup>1</sup> is an amusing book of an always popular type. A well-known writer of "sporting novels," Mrs. Robert Jocelyn, in her sketch of Macfluster Hall and its inhabitants, is particularly bright and vivacious. It is true that, on the first page, we were terribly prejudiced against the heroine, through being told that "there was a strong individuality of her very own about her," and it is to her credit that she contrives to live this down. Mrs. Jocelyn is disposed, at times, to overdo her effects, but her main situation is novel, and her characters entertaining.

*The Sin and the Woman*<sup>2</sup> has an undercurrent of feeling which gives interest to the soul's tragedy of Eleanor Monroe. This, however, is at all times but faint, and in its later developments the plot is unworthy of a not unpromising commencement.

In *The Bridal March*,<sup>3</sup> a translation of a story by Björnson, the two dominant notes of this writer's genius, passion and mysticism, are clearly sounded. The mysterious Bridal March, composed by the poor musician Ole Haugen, is interwoven strangely with the destinies of the Tingvold family, and gives a supernatural tinge to the story, while the sudden and overmastering entrance of love into a maiden's heart is described with many strong and well-felt touches. *The Watch*, a tale by Ivan Turgenieff, is included in the volume, and seasons its study of simple lives with a strain of quaint *diablerie*.

*The Tragedy of the Norse Gods*,<sup>4</sup> by Ruth J. Pitt, is a well-conceived volume, sure to find many readers. In a series of simple prose tales, grouped so as to form one narrative, we find a clear and readable account of the chief episodes of the Poetic and Prose Eddas, of the attributes and achievements of the Norse deities, and of the portents which preceded the dawning of Ragnarök, and the fall of the Immortals from Asgard. The cycle is pleasantly and sympathetically related, and the book will help to familiarise the public with many beautiful and comparatively little-known legends of Northern mythology.

*The Madame Chrysanthème*,<sup>5</sup> of M. Paul Viaud, is, in some sort, the "*magot d'ivoire*" of this fine artist's production, peopled as it is by *potiches drôles*, such as M. Sucre and Madame Prune, "*deux impayables échappés de paravent*." This Japanese "experiment" is without the conviction of "*Aziyadé*," for Pierre Loti regards his Chrysanthème purely *en poupée*, and the Japanese people generally

<sup>1</sup> *For One Season Only*. A Sporting Novel. By Mrs. Robert Jocelyn. London: F. V. White & Co.

<sup>2</sup> *The Sin and the Woman*. A Study from Life. By Derek Vane. London: Remington & Co., Limited.

<sup>3</sup> *The Bridal March*, from the Norwegian of Björnson, and *The Watch*, from the Russian of Ivan Turgenieff. Translated by J. Evan Williams. London: Digby, Long & Co.

<sup>4</sup> *The Tragedy of the Norse Gods*. By Ruth J. Pitt. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

<sup>5</sup> *Madame Chrysanthème*. Par Pierre Loti. Quatorzième Edition. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, Editeur.

"*en petits chiens savants.*" But the book is exquisitely amusing, with its delicate perception of *saugrennités*, its quaint impatience "*de ce milieu qui atténue, rapetisse, drôlatise,*" where words, however carefully chosen, are always too weighty and sonorous, where even a funeral is lacking in seriousness, and "le principal personnage du défilé, le mort, vient par derrière, assis dans une sorte de petit palanquin fermé, tout à fait gentil."

The *Sans Entraves*<sup>1</sup> of M. Henry Rabusson is one of those dry and charmless studies of moral monstrosity in which a certain class of French novelist finds a strange delight. The hero regards all human ties and affections as so many fetters on his liberty, and tramples them underfoot, until one day, at the height of a successful career, he suddenly awakes to find that they make all that can attach us to life, or render it worth the living. His dreary suicide concludes a depressing book (though one by no means without ability), and closes it with something like a moral—"Mon fils, il faut aimer. On en meurt quelquefois, dit-on. On meurt bien du contraire. . . ."

M. Henry de Chennevière's *Estelle*<sup>2</sup> is a volume of stories of a rather old-fashioned type, the most important being the history of the beautiful and virtuous daughter of a *danseuse*, and of her sufferings under a trial imposed upon her by her husband as a test of freedom from the taint of her parentage. *Khotta*, perhaps the second in merit, treats of that familiar figure in French fiction, the abandoned *protégée*.

*Mademoiselle Sous-Pliocène*<sup>3</sup> concerns itself with the animosities of "Atheists" and "Christians," and takes for heroine a young geological *savante*, emancipated from all prejudices, and borrowed perhaps from the similar conception in M. Octave Feuillet's *La Morte*. Although full of absurdities and inflated in style, the book is not without some merit of originality.

A little story-book, *Les Deux Côtés du Mur*,<sup>4</sup> contains a pretty piece of child's-play in the description of the nest of the *Robinsons* in the mulberry-tree, an idea for a game which might have occurred to Mr. R. L. Stevenson himself. The tale is to be recommended as a pleasing gift-book for children.

Miss Betham-Edwards has chosen an interesting situation,<sup>5</sup> but her handling is too sketchy, her characters slightly modelled, and often overdrawn. Their talk also is stilted and unreal, and altogether there are quite too many abatements to be made before we

<sup>1</sup> *Sans Entraves*. Roman d'un Français de la Fin du XIX<sup>e</sup> Siècle. Par Henry Rabusson. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, Éditeur.

<sup>2</sup> *Estelle*. Par Henry de Chennevières. Paris: Librairie Marpon et Flammarion.

<sup>3</sup> *Mademoiselle Sous-Pliocène*. Par Charles d'Héricault. Paris et Lyon: Delhomme et Bruguet.

<sup>4</sup> *Les deux Côtés du Mur*. Par M. Bertin ("Petit Bibliothèque Blanche"). Paris: J. Hetzel et Cie.

<sup>5</sup> *The Curb of Honour*. By M. Betham-Edwards. London: Adam & Charles Black.

can abandon ourselves to our sympathy with the unhappy invalid, Rollo Rugden, in his conscientious struggle against the love which he feels Providence has forbidden him to enjoy.

A story for girls, *For Marjory's Sake*,<sup>1</sup> has the advantage for English readers of the comparative novelty of an Australian setting. It is on the whole a readable tale, dealing pleasantly with a hoydenish maiden, her flirtations, and the transformation worked in her by a serious love; and concluding with a general and satisfactory pairing off of the characters, which cannot fail to leave the reader in a contented frame of mind.

*From Prison to Power*<sup>2</sup> treats of life on a Queensland station, and shows some inventive power in the incidents of struggle with hostile blacks and greedy squatters, but unfortunately the style is wordy and conventional. Another Australian romance, *Milliara*,<sup>3</sup> is of a more sentimental type, and though not quite without interesting passages, is on the whole a dull and twaddly production.

It is a surprise to find that the forbear alluded to in the title *An Ancient Ancestor*<sup>4</sup> is none other than the renowned poet Ossian himself, the heroine, Malvina Fergusson, being able to trace her descent from Fergus, or Fingal, the brother of the bard. The book gives an account of three weeks spent by the fair Malvina and her friend in the Isle of Arran. During their holiday they set about the excavation of Ossian's supposed tomb and discover a chest of MSS., which of course prove to be the originals of Macpherson's translations. The descriptive portions are not badly done, but the book is by no means strong, and we fear that our interest either in Malvina's love affairs, or in the Ossianic controversy as here discussed, continues tepid throughout.

Mr. Levett-Yeats is one of the most obvious and unmistakable, but also one of the cleverest of the many imitators of Mr. Rudyard Kipling. *The Romance of Guard Mulligan*<sup>5</sup> contains stories after several of Mr. Kipling's various types—an elephant story, a story of Simla society, railway construction stories, and native stories, all sufficiently graphic and telling, but with a comparative baldness, a want of fulness of detail and firmness of handling, which distinguish them broadly from the work of the master.

<sup>1</sup> *For Marjory's Sake*. A Story of South Australian Country Life. By Mrs. John Waterhouse. London: Digby, Long & Co.

<sup>2</sup> *From Prison to Power*. A Tale of Queensland. By A. H. Lambton. London: Eden, Remington & Co.

<sup>3</sup> *Milliara*. An Australian Romance. By Noel Hope. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

<sup>4</sup> *An Ancient Ancestor*. A Tale of Three Weeks. By Charles E. Hall. London: Skeffington & Son.

<sup>5</sup> *The Romance of Guard Mulligan, and other Stories*. By S. Levett-Yeats. London: Walter Scott, Limited.



## THE DRAMA.

As we approach Christmas we find every year the same symptoms. New productions become scarce, theatres live on their old successes or revivals, and only on Boxing-day one or two houses lead off with something new, mostly in the shape of that time-honoured toy thing—the Pantomime.

Of all the productions of last month none were more important than the revival of *Captain Swift* at the Haymarket, which remains Mr. Haddon Chambers' little *chef d'œuvre*. We went to see this play again, and although several years have elapsed since its first production, time has done no harm to it so far. It remains an uncommonly fascinating play: a play with very great qualities and glaring faults—faults that become more intense as one renews acquaintance with the drama. It is not yet the moment to submit *Captain Swift* to a new and searching criticism, for all that has been said before may be endorsed now. Yet, as a point of interest, we should like to point out the two prominent and, in their way, somewhat amusing improbabilities, which in a less well-written and interesting play might have acted as wreckers. It is almost comic to remain serious when we are called upon to believe that the staunch British gentleman—very British in his ideas indeed—should almost immediately make an intimate friend of the family of a gentleman like Captain Swift, about whom he knows nothing, except that he has assisted him in a small cab accident. True, the author tells us that Mr. Seabrook is somewhat unsophisticated and apt to form easy acquaintances, but, after all, in the case of Captain Swift, the worthy gentleman has gone a little bit far, and when we add to that the long arm of coincidence, which makes Captain Swift the antedated son of Mrs. Seabrook—well, then we can no less suppress a smile than when, in the last act, as Mr. Gardiner's chambers are surrounded by detectives eager to catch Captain Swift, the latter walks into the rooms unseen and yet a free man. Of course these youthful errors of the author may be easily forgiven. *Captain Swift* was his first play, and for a firstling it was an exceedingly felicitous attempt, and that this opinion is shared by all playgoers can be best proven by the fact that, night after night, the Haymarket is filled by an enthusiastic crowd.

The acting in the main remains excellent. Some call Captain

## INDEX.

- AITKEN, G. A., John Gay, 386  
 Erling, N., The Future of "Society," 229  
 Art, Contemporary Literature of, 101, 222, 347, 465, 580, 699
- BELLES LETTRES, Contemporary Literature of, 97, 216, 346, 460, 578, 692  
 Bellot, Hugh H. L., Canadian Finance and the Home Rule Bill, 1  
 \_\_\_\_\_, Local Self-Government : A Canadian Village, 279  
 \_\_\_\_\_, The Origin and Evolution of Property in Land, 644  
 Blatch, H. Stanton, Another View of Village Life, 318  
 Browne, R. G. M., The Origin, Perpetuation, and Decadence of Super-  
 naturalism, 115
- CARTRIGHT, A., See African Labour Questions, 47  
 Cook, Lady, Habits and Customs of Savage Life, 514  
 Cunliffe, J. W., Modern Industrial Warfare, 109
- DAVIES, HARRY, The Future of Wales, 369  
 Dewey, Stoddard, A Dutchman in Paris, 446  
 Dix, Gertrude, Hard Labour in the Hospitals, 627  
 Drama, Contemporary Literature of the, 104, 226, 585, 703
- FARQUHAR, GEORGE, The Scotsman as a Householder, 635  
 Fish, A New Plan of Distributing, to Consumers, 413  
 Fisher, F. V., Party Government, 425  
 FitzGerald, J., The Novels of Ossip Schubin, 653  
 \_\_\_\_\_, Some Aspects of the Work of Pierre Loti, 30
- GLEADELL, W. H., Zola and his Work, 614  
 Gray, F. W., The Theory and Practice of American Popular Government, 175-
- HANKIN, ST. JOHN E. C., The Criminal, 24  
 Hannigan, D. F., Prospective Transformation of the Novel, 256  
 Hereward, L., A Famous Night Mission in New York, 272  
 History and Biography, Contemporary Literature of, 92, 207, 456, 570, 684  
 Hopkins, J. Castell, Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway, 154  
 Howlett, England, F.S.A., Burial Customs, 166  
 \_\_\_\_\_, Marriage Customs, 602
- IRELAND, THE REBEL SOUTH, 241  
 Isaacs, I. H., The Jew and Modern Thought, 261  
 Ivens, A. H., The Inter-Relations of Natural Forces, 50
- JACOBSEN, E. P., Italian Women of the Sixteenth Century, 17  
 Joseph Zalmonah, 312
- KEENE, H. G., Home Rule in Operation, 138
- LONGHURST, ARTHUR E. T., M.D., Scientific Aspects of the Temperance  
 Question, 8  
 Love and Marriage, 349
- OWEN, DOUGLAS, The Sea : Wrecks and Salvage, 483
- P. C. R., The Alleged Danger of the Indian Civil Service "Resolution," 495  
 Peacock, Florence, Human Armour : A Retrospect, 433

- Philosophy and Theology, Contemporary Literature of, 78, 193, 333, 453, 560,  
670
- Poetry, Contemporary Literature of, 219, 697
- RAE, W. FRASER, *The Colony of Gibraltar*, 126
- Robinson, Mrs. Newton, *The Life of Sir Richard Burton*, 469
- Roper, Charles, *How the Game Laws Work*, 357
- Rose-Soley, A. J., "New Australia": *Communitistic Work at the Antipodes*,  
523
- SALT, H. S., *Cruel Sports*, 545
- Sarel, C. W., *Alaska and its People (Part II.)*, 56
- Science, Contemporary Literature of, 72, 187, 325, 450, 554, 662
- Simons, L., *Ibsen as an Artist*, 506
- Socialism, the Tyranny of, 404
- Sociology, Politics, Voyages, and Travels, Contemporary Literature of, 84, 199,  
339, 564, 678
- Stanton, Mrs. Elizabeth Cady, *Emma Willard, the Pioneer in the Higher  
Education of Women*, 540
- Sullivan, W. R., *The Holy Office and Liberal Catholicism*, 589
- THIRLMERE, ROWLAND, *The Poetry of Madame Negreponte*, 62
- UNITY OF THOUGHT AND ACTION: THEIR EVOLUTION 407
- W. F. G., *A Plea for the Farmer*, 440
- Wilkes, 291

THE  
WESTMINSTER  
REVIEW.

*JULY TO DECEMBER*  
(*INCLUSIVE*)  
1893.

---

“Truth can never be confirmed enough,  
Though doubts did ever sleep.”

SHAKSPEARE.

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

GÖTTE.

---

VOL. CXL.

LONDON:  
HENRY AND COMPANY,  
6 BOUVERIE STREET, FLEET STREET, E.C.  
MDCCCXCIII.

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

Swift Mr. Tree's best part, and we should feel inclined to endorse it, but for the great versatility of Mr. Tree, who has done so many good things and will do so many more, that it would be premature to say which is really his best part. One thing is certain: Captain Swift is the one conception of Mr. Tree with which it would be extremely difficult to find any fault, and so firmly has this reputation been established, that every actor one sees, after Mr. Tree, must needs seem a pale copy of the prototype.

Since the play first saw the light Mrs. Tree has made enormous strides, and now we should feel inclined to say there are very few actresses on our stage who can handle a part, in which tenderness and grace is required, with so much delicacy as the accomplished wife of the talented manager.

Among the new-comers are Miss Carlotta Addison, sweet and winning, somewhat too youthful and not powerful enough in the part of the mother. There is Miss Fanny Coleman, a dashing, vigorous English matron full of common sense. There is Miss Irene Vanbrugh, a distinct gain for the Haymarket Company for light comedy parts and impersonation of that charming type—"a sweet English girl." Last not least we should like to pay a tribute to Mr. Holman Clark in the character of the servant Marshall. He is a most conscientious actor, and although he has only recently come to the front, we already recognise in him one of those artists who, like Mr. Cyril Maude and Mr. H. de Lange, will earn a reputation of his own for endowing every part, however small, with a peculiar stamp, showing that they are ardent students of life and most painstaking actors into the bargain. Prophecies do not lie within our province, but we believe that we are justified in predicting that in days to come Mr. Holman Clark will occupy a prominent place among our *Charakter Spieler*, as the Germans call them significantly.

Mr. Augustin Daly has at last struck oil with the revival of the *School for Scandal*. We have seen this revival with some pleasure and not without some dismay. We agree with all our fellow-critics that the performance is good in parts, but as a whole wanting in something, which we for ourselves would describe with the one word—dignity. Sheridan's text has been much hacked about and pruned, and although, as extenuating circumstances, it is brought forward that Mr. Daly has not created, but simply followed a precedent in this case, established by an English manager of days gone by, we can only say that it is no excuse at all. We claim that our classics should be treated with respect; if an Englishman is wanting in that respect, we may deplore it, but when a foreigner does so we feel justified to condemn. Germans and Dutchmen, who gave some of the best Shakespeare performances on record, never dared to rearrange an English masterpiece; they simply adhered to the

"cuts" sanctioned in England, but as to modify the sanario they would never attempt it. It is to be hoped that the strictures, which in other quarters have been inflicted on Mr. Daly's policy, may not pass unheeded by him, and that when presently he produces *The Country Girl* he will allow a venerable tradition to supersede his own desire for innovation.

Some of the acting is very good indeed: Miss Ada Rehan's Lady Teazle is bright, dignified and elegant. From time to time she takes the part somewhat too farcical, but that has already recently worn off. The portrayal will not rank among her great achievements, but it is creditable.

Mr. Arthur Bouchier's Charles Surface is interesting, but not a very mature creation. Mr. George Clarke's Joseph Surface was wanting in that smooth-faced hypocrisy which has been so well delineated by predecessors in the part. The Sir Peter Teazle of William Farren remains what it has ever been—a masterpiece; and when we witness this great old actor, with his refinement, his delicate humour, his charm of manner and his adroitness of diction—qualities which altogether constitute something more than talent—we often are at a loss to understand why William Farren should so rarely have an opportunity to shine in the one rank to which he belongs—the very front.

About *The Venetian Night*, an operetta by Mr. Stephenson, with music by Mr. Sidney Jones, we only need say that the text has killed it. The music is pleasing, but the libretto is too feeble to waste another word over it.

The last item in the programme—*Under the Clock*—is distinctly the best and most amusing, although, in consequence of the withdrawal of the *Tempter* at the Haymarket, it has lost much of its *raison d'être*. *Under the Clock* is a not unskilful but somewhat timid attempt to import into England that delightful *article de Paris* the *Revue*. But somehow the authors have not dared to try their hand at the whole thing at once, they have simply copied the *Acte du Théâtre*, and done the best they could with it. What there is of satire, of parody, and burlesque has been cleverly devised by Messrs. Seymour Hicks and Brookfield. The skit on the *Tempter* and the imitations of Mr. Beerbohm Tree are vastly diverting, and as all the actors seem to enter heart and soul into the fun of the thing, it creates so much merriment that one should encourage the authors not to stop at this first essay, but to write, in the course of next year, a thorough English *Revue* with John Bull as *compère* and Dame Grundy as *commère*. If properly handled, there is a rich load of fun in this new sort of adaptation from the French.

February 1894

## THE COAL QUESTION AND THE NATIONALISATION OF MINES.

BEFORE proceeding to the discussion of this difficult and thorny subject, it may perhaps be considered desirable to describe shortly the various systems under which mines are worked in this and other countries. The principles which determine the ownership of mines and minerals are two—viz., the principle of exclusive individual ownership and collective or State ownership. The United Kingdom, the United States of America, and the Dominion of Canada are the most important instances of the application of the former principle; and France, Germany, Spain, Belgium, and Italy in the Old World, and the Australasian groups in the New, the most important instances of the application of the latter.

State ownership may further be subdivided. In Italy the “domanial” system is in force. Under this the State is at liberty to work the mines itself, or to dispose of them to individual proprietors, as it may deem expedient. In France, Belgium, and Germany, on the contrary, the State does not work the mines itself, but, under what is called the “regalien” system, the property in the mines is conferred upon concessionaires, with the right to work them under regulations established by law, and with the liability to pay as a tax some part of the profits to the State. In the United Kingdom, important exceptions exist to the principle of exclusive ownership. The ownership in precious metals resides in the Crown, and there can be no question that, but for the feudal system and the subsequent action of the landowners described in a former article, the definition of “land” as comprising an indefinite extent upwards as well as downwards expressed in the maxim, *cujus est solum, ejus est ad cælum usque ad inferos*, would never have been engrafted upon the common law of this country, and that State ownership in all minerals would have followed the same course as on the Continent. Another apparent exception occurs in the case of copyholds and lands enclosed under the Inclosure Acts. Under the law as it stands, the lord of the manor is entitled to the underlying minerals. I have already dealt in a former article in this REVIEW with the origin of his claim and the infamous character of these Acts.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> December 1893.



Comparatively few mines, however, in this country are worked by the owners themselves. The almost universal practice is for the owners to grant leases for a term of years at an annual fixed rent, called a "dead-rent," to be paid in any event, and with a charge of so much a ton on the minerals raised, called a "royalty," to individuals or companies technically known as masters. The necessity of this system is twofold: but for the royalty, the masters might work out all the minerals in a few years, and subsequently fail to pay the rent for the remainder of the term, and, on the other hand, it enables the master, if he finds the mine unremunerative, to retire with only the liability for the dead-rent. I shall show presently that royalties are only part of the rent. It may be mentioned that this system is in some respects one of purchase and sale, since it is for something more than the mere use and occupation of the land; something is carried away and consumed whereby the land deteriorates in value, and this has an important bearing with which I will subsequently deal in its place.

In addition to the dead-rent and the royalty, there are the way-leaves, surface and underground, exacted by the surrounding land-owners. The first mention of way-leaves occurs in the year 1354. In a lease of certain coal-mines in Durham to the Prior of Durham, there appears a covenant for *sufficiens chimium*. In 1676, the Lord-keeper Guilford, speaking of the Newcastle collieries says, "Another remarkable thing is their way-leaves, for when men have pieces of ground between the colliery and the river, they sell leave to lead coals over their grounds, and so dear that the owner of a rood of ground will expect £20 per annum for this leave."

From the evidence given before the Royal Commission on Mining Royalties it appears—and this evidence was not disputed—that the way-leaves in the county of Durham amount to  $\frac{1}{2}d.$  per ton per mile, which is at the rate of £90 per acre per annum. It is clear that £90 per acre is something very much more than an agricultural rent. It is obvious, then, that if these way-leaves did not exist the owner would be able to obtain a higher royalty; therefore way-leaves must be also considered as part of the rent. Prior to the publication of the evidence taken before the Royal Commission on Mining Royalties, and the report thereon, the popular demand was for the abolition of royalties, which were regarded by master and men alike as a heavy tax upon the principal industry in the country.

Now royalties vary from *2d.* per ton up to *1s. 6d.*, according to the situation of the mine and the quality of the coal. Twopence is, therefore, the minimum royalty. If royalties were abolished, what would be the result? A., paying *2d.*, would only be able to reduce his price per ton by *2d.*, but B., paying *1s. 6d.*, by only reducing his price *1s. 3d.*, would be able to undersell A., and by a still further reduction, to drive him out of the market altogether; and the *1s. 3d.*,

or less sum as the case might be, would only benefit B.; and the State, if it bought out the royalty-holders, would have to compensate the owner to the extent of 1s. 6d. per ton which he had lost by the abolition of royalties.

And the effect of such abolition would not be permanent, since, when the leases fell in, the lessors would be able to raise the rent to the extent to which the masters had benefited by the abolition of the royalties and by the diminished competition caused by the stopping of the inferior mines.

The 2d. may, therefore, be regarded as a tax, but anything above this minimum is clearly equivalent to rent. It is said that this minimum royalty of 2d. is, in theory, the only part which is an appreciable factor in determining the selling price of coal, and that, as a matter of fact, it is entirely inappreciable. This may be true in one case only—viz., in the export trade, where the variations in freightage are so enormous; but when we find that the aggregate sum paid in royalties and way-leaves on coal in 1889 was £4,210,269 on £56,175,426, the estimated value at the place of production, or more than 7 per cent. of the masters' selling price, it is incredible that the masters could possibly afford to ignore this 7 per cent. in fixing the selling price.

And, moreover, since these royalties and way-leaves really form part of the rent, and since it is indisputable that rent is the most important factor in determining the selling price, the whole question is simply reduced to a mere question of rent. And, further, it is not so self-evident that the minimum royalty of 2d. is an inappreciable factor in determining the price, since it is a fact that strikes have taken place over as small a sum as 1½d. per ton.

The aggregate gross rental of the coal-mines in England and Wales *only*<sup>1</sup> amounts to £3,601,836 for the year 1889, or about 8 per cent. of the selling price at the place of production. It has been asserted that these rentals are grossly undervalued in certain of the North-country mines; but, accepting the Government returns as approximately correct, the amount which goes to the landowners in the shape of dead-rent, royalties, and way-leaves is, at the lowest computation, 15 per cent. of the selling price at the place of production. In his evidence before the Royal Commission, Sir Lowthian Bell stated that the royalty alone on iron ore amounts to 10 per cent. of the gross price of the manufactured article, and he added that, in the present depressed state of the iron trade, it was entirely impossible, not only to make any profits, but even to pay working expenses. Numerous proofs of this statement might be given, but I will content myself with one instance only, that of the Barrow Hematite Steel Company. "It has a share capital," writes Mr. Morrison Davidson, "of £2,000,000. For years not a penny was

<sup>1</sup> I have not the Scotch and Irish Returns before me.

paid in dividends. Three noble lords—Devonshire, Buccleuch, and Muncaster—divide between them both the site of the town and the minerals under and around it. They receive from the company, as their dues, £126,000 per annum, whilst the numerous 'hands' who swelter at the furnaces have to content themselves with an aggregate of £63,000 a year. In addition to this, the 'hands' pay the rates, while the three aristocratic Brahmins get off scot-free."<sup>1</sup>

The comparisons which have been made between English royalties and those in foreign countries are so misleading, and so much stress has been laid upon the conclusions thus erroneously drawn, that it is desirable to clear up this branch of the subject.

The so-called foreign royalty is really a tax. In Germany this is 2 per cent. upon the profits which, when the selling price is 6s., amounts to 1½*d.* per ton. There is no tax upon iron ore. "No objection," says Sir Lowthian Bell, "on the part of the owner of the soil is allowed to prevent the minerals on his property being worked, such prohibition being considered as inconsistent with the interests of the nation." Here we have the key-note to the whole question: minerals are the property of the whole community, and no right of exclusive individual ownership is tolerated. In France concessions are granted to individuals of coal and iron ore at 8s. per square kilometre (245 acres), together with 5 per cent. upon the profits. This is equivalent to a tax of 1¼*d.* per ton.

In Belgium the tax on coal is 1*d.* per annum per hectare (2½ acres), together with 2½ per cent. upon the profits, which amounts to a tax of ¾*d.* per ton.

But since the concessionaire is merely a middleman, who generally sub-leases, rent in the form of dead-rent and royalties, either one or the other, or both, are much the same as in this country, and since England is the largest producer of coal, it is more probable that foreign prices are ruled by English prices than English prices by foreign. The only advantage of the foreign system is that a small fraction of the profits goes to the nation in relief of taxation, and that the landowners have no monopoly in the minerals.

I do not propose to enter into a discussion of the merits or demerits of the recent lamentable coal strike or lock-out with its attendant suffering and loss of trade. My own impression is that both parties to the dispute are more or less in the right. I am led to this conclusion, apart from the facts just adduced, by the prolonged nature of the struggle, by the hardships endured on the one side and by the necessary loss of trade on the other; and this conclusion is further strengthened by the reasonable supposition that competition has reduced the profits of the masters to the ordinary trade profits, and that they are, in fact, unable to pay high rates of wages.

<sup>1</sup> *The Old Order and the New.*

It is true that the late Sir George Elliott in suggesting a coal syndicate stated the probable profits at 15 per cent., but we must take this *cum grano* as the sanguine anticipation of a company promoter. It is also true that it has been widely asserted that the masters have been accepting contracts from the great railway companies at such low rates as to render the ordinary trade profits impossible of realisation. This is denied by the masters, and it is not improbable that the accusation is almost, if not entirely, unfounded. The Board of Conciliation which has, happily, been established will at all events solve these disputed points, but if I am right in my impression the present settlement is only temporary, and it is not within the powers of this Board to effect a permanent one. If I am right in my assumption that both parties are more or less in the right, the Board will find that the 1888 wages, plus, say, 15 or 20 per cent., are the minimum wages—*i.e.* the living wage; they will also find that at the ordinary prices the masters cannot pay these wages and make the ordinary trade profits, and they will further find that if the consumer is asked to pay the difference in increased prices that foreign competition will prevent any very appreciable increase in the price. So, then, accrues another deadlock. If the miner will not take less than the living wage, if the masters cannot afford to pay the living wage, and if the consumer cannot be induced to reject foreign coal and pay more for English, the Board must necessarily find itself powerless to solve the problem. Why not, then, go to the root of the question straight away? There is yet another alternative. There is yet another factor in the price of coal. There is the rent which I have already defined as consisting of dead-rent, royalties, and way-leaves. It is not impossible for the landowners to reduce their rents, their royalties, or their way-leaves. But will they? They are monopolists, and monopolists never voluntarily relinquish their pound of flesh. But it may be objected that the ordinary laws of supply and demand will compel them to do so. But these laws do not apply to monopolies, otherwise the recent strike would never have happened. There has been abundance of time for the monopoly-holders to reduce their claims, and there are numerous mines now closed, and which have been closed for years, simply because their owners insisted upon their pound of flesh; and, moreover, mines are held on long leases, and it would take years for these laws of supply and demand to operate, and then, if at all, only partially. And one must further remember that even if a mine is closed, rent must be paid just the same. The landowner cannot lose, and may make a fortune beyond the dreams of avarice. The lessee may lose a fortune and can only make ordinary trade profits. It may be objected that the lessee bargains with his eyes open, that as a rule he is an expert, and if he makes a bad bargain he must take the consequences. This is true with

a qualification, and this qualification makes all the difference in the world. It is this: the lessor is a monopolist, and the lessee is driven by competition to give just so much as will leave him the ordinary trade profits. If he does not give the price, some one else will.

The case is identically parallel with that of the position of tenant and landlord in a district where there is a land hunger. Whenever there is a monopoly, there the whole of the unearned increment goes to the holder of that monopoly. And it is well known that the landowners make, and have made in the past, enormous sums.

It would appear, then, that the miners are underpaid, that the masters are only making the ordinary trade profits, that the consumer is paying as much as he can be induced to pay, and that enormous surplus profits go into the pockets of the landowners in the way of dead-rents, royalties, underground and surface way-leaves. It is absolutely clear that some one must give way, and the some one who can best afford to do so is the land monopolist. The coal monopoly is only one portion of the mining question, and this again is only a small portion of the great and important land question. If the recent coal strike has no other effect than this—viz., to have forced the public attention to the real points at issue—it will be well worth all the loss and suffering entailed. In addition to the popular outcry for the abolition of royalties is one for the regulation of way-leaves. A Bill has been read a first time, the object of which is to enable the masters to acquire way-leaves and other mining easements over or under lands adjoining their mines by compulsory hiring at a reasonable rent from the adjoining owners. This would no doubt redress some existing cases of hardship; but, as I have already shown, the effect would not be permanent: whatever reduction took place of the way-leaves would go to the landowner in the shape of increased royalties.<sup>1</sup>

Another Bill, which also has been read a first time, has for its object the institution of mining boards for mining districts, with powers to make bye-laws regulating the hours of labour in mines, to enforce penalties for breach of such bye-laws, and to provide insurance funds for injuries received in mining operations.<sup>2</sup> This Bill does not affect the real point at issue. It only deals with the relations of master and miner. Now, although the nationalisation of mines is no new idea among the mining population, owing to the wide ramifications of the coal trade, the immediate effect of the coal strike has been to bring this side of the question within the range of practical politics. I have already, in my former articles, dealt with the origin and the comparatively late conception of the principle of exclusive individual ownership in land, and I have shown the injustice and inexpediency of such ownership.<sup>3</sup> It is unnecessary to go over the same ground

<sup>1</sup> Mining Easements Bill, 1893.

<sup>2</sup> Mining Boards Bill, 1893.

<sup>3</sup> WESTMINSTER REVIEW, December 1893 and January 1894.

again. Whatever I have said as to the ownership of land applies equally to the ownership of mines and minerals, since the greater includes the lesser. But the coal question has been forced upon us all alike in such a practical manner, that it seems to me we have before us one portion of the land question peculiarly suitable for an experiment, in some form or another, of collective ownership. Some people may seek to cast ridicule upon Mr. Keir Hardie's Mines Nationalisation Bill, 1893, but there can be no doubt that the only practical solution of this question lies in the direction of collective ownership. Few, I take it, at this time of day would seriously maintain that the mines belong to individuals, and not to the whole community.

The principle of collective ownership in minerals is recognised and applied to some extent in nearly every country of the Old World and New alike. And the fact that this principle is not carried to its logical conclusion is the fault of the various systems at work, and not to any defect in this principle. The fact that this principle is not consistently carried out in other countries, and that, with the exception of a small tax to the State, the result to the public is much the same as in this country, is no argument against the adoption in this country of State ownership in mines. These remarks, however, do not apply to the "domanial" system in Italy. "Permits" are granted to any one applying for the same to search for minerals. And this in spite of the owner's refusal. The latter, however, has the option of making the search himself, but he loses this preferential right for good unless he at once carries out the work in conformity with the terms of the "permit."

One argument urged in favour of the present system is that, as a matter of fact, the coal trade has developed to an enormous extent, and that the present system has not checked, but has greatly accelerated the trade. This is true, but the fact cuts both ways. The greatest part of this development has taken place in the export trade, and it is open to serious question whether a development of this nature is not rather an evil. It is rather a question of how far we are justified in satisfying our present requirements at the expense of our posterity, and since, as I have endeavoured to show, it is the few who reap the harvest, the question is still more serious. Is this small class, in addition to inflicting present injuries upon the rest of the community, to deprive future generations of actual necessities in order that it may minister to its own luxurious standard of life? But granting for the moment that the present system does foster trade beneficially, it is possible for the general public to pay too dearly even for coal. The following account given by Sir Lowthian Bell of the results of the system in the United States of America, is a good example of the way in which the unearned increment goes to the individual. "One enterprising speculator," he says, "purchased

from the State a property of forty acres for a few thousand dollars. By him it was let to a second, who agreed to pay a royalty of 2s. per ton on the ore to the original purchaser, and the new owner, after an expenditure of £3000 to £4000, passed the property on to a third, who paid for the privilege of working the ore, in addition to the royalty of 2s. per ton, the sum of £75,000, leaving thus a profit to the second holder of £71,000 or thereabouts." That a democratic people like the Americans should be guilty of such unpardonable folly seems incredible.

Fortunately, in this country the people are waking up to the fact that our system is radically wrong, and that immediate remedies must be applied. Steps are even now being taken to work collieries on the co-operative system. But it seems clear that co-operative societies will have the same evils to contend against as the masters. As an outcome of this feeling, a Bill has been prepared and brought in by Mr. Keir Hardie, Mr. John Burns, and others, for the nationalisation of the mines and minerals in this country.

The preamble is worth quoting: "Whereas," it runs, "coal having become an essential factor in the manufacturing industries and transport service of the nation, any interference with a regular and continuous supply is fraught with gravest dangers to our commercial supremacy; and whereas the supply of coal is limited, and when exhausted can never be replaced; and whereas the present system of working mines as private concerns leads to great waste of our mineral supplies and to strikes and lock-outs, thereby imposing great hardship on the mining community and trades dependent on a mineral supply for their continuance:

"And whereas the nationalisation of the minerals and the mines would secure the economical working of the same, the just treatment and consequent contentment of the mining population, and a continuous and cheap supply of coal and other minerals. Be it enacted," &c.

The provisions of the Bill are few and concise, but are only valuable as suggestions. The owners are to make a complete return of their interests; the fee simple in all mines and mineral rights is to be transferred to the State; compensation is to be made to the owners for the amount of their interests at the date of the transfer, in the shape of bonds, bearing interest at the current rates plus 3 per cent. on the capital amount, to form a sinking fund; a special Mining Department, whose President must be a member of the House of Commons, is to be created, with full powers for the direct working and conducting of the mining industry without the intervention of contractor or lessee, and "such wages as will ensure a healthy and comfortable existence" are to be paid by the Department. The question of compensation is too involved to be discussed at length. Speaking generally, where land has been purchased with a

knowledge of the minerals, then, upon the grounds of expediency if not of justice, compensation must be given on the basis of a fair return for the capital actually invested. But where this knowledge is absent, any compensation at all so far as the minerals are concerned is out of the question; and where compensation is given, it must be based upon the capital already invested and its present actual value, and not upon the anticipated profits of future workings. A favourite plea of the individualists is the superiority of private over collective enterprise. But the facts are against them. The majority of mines are worked by companies and managed by directors. And throughout the industrial world, if there is one tendency more apparent than another, it is the development of the private concern into a joint-stock company and of a joint-stock company into a huge syndicate.

And, moreover, it is a well-known economical fact that the chief result of the individual competitive system is enormous waste of labour and capital.

Gas-works, water-works, trams, and other undertakings, are successfully conducted by our municipalities. Why should not London, Manchester, or Birmingham own their own mines and work them as profitably as the undertakings I have mentioned are worked where they exist?

To conclude, the ownership of all mines and minerals should reside in the State, or in its delegates, such as county councils, district councils, and municipalities; the title of the present owners should be reduced to that of possession only, and this possession should be individual or collective. The possessor should be bound to work the minerals direct himself. There should be no subcontractor or sub-lessee. For this, for those who stickle for precedents, there is the precedent of the "domanial" system in Italy already quoted. Thus, for the future at any rate, whatever unearned increment accrued would exist for the benefit of the entire nation, and not for that of a few individuals who have done absolutely nothing to create it.

HUGH H. L. BELLOT.



## CARDINAL VAUGHAN AND THE SOCIAL QUESTION.

ALTHOUGH it may not be literal truth to say that "we are all Socialists now," no one doubts that we are every one of us deeply interested in the social question. With strikes and rumours of strikes, and the commercial and domestic distress they entail, the numbers of unemployed, the depletion of agricultural districts, and the wretchedness prevalent in the lower quarters of our cities, the most heedless must perforce ask himself what it all means, and what is to be the upshot of it? When an ecclesiastical organisation like the Church of Rome in this country assembles for deliberation, it would be strangely blind to the signs of the times if it did not turn its attention to a question of such paramount importance. True to its best traditions, and the example set by that devoted servant of humanity, the late Cardinal Manning, the Catholic Truth Society assembled, under the presidency of Cardinal Vaughan, at Portsmouth, inaugurated its session last autumn with a discussion on "The Key to the Social Problem."<sup>1</sup> A Church which represents the majority of orthodox Christians, which has an unequalled record of philanthropic service, which, at this day, may be said to be equipped, in an unique sense, for further humanitarian enterprise in the possession of large bodies of men, and particularly of women, whose lives are exclusively devoted to the service of man, may certainly claim a hearing on a matter which every religious body is disposed to take up. Orders of men and women, especially dedicated to philanthropy, are the creation of Roman Catholicism. Prior to the Reformation, very few such institutes existed, and when the monastic system, which, in its best days, had been a centre of charitable relief, fell into general disrepute, the Church, seeking to adapt herself to the changing times, encouraged a novel experiment, which brought the monastery and nunnery into the world by charging their inmates exclusively with charitable employment. Vincent de Paul, in the seventeenth century, may be said to be the author of the new departure, and his congregation of the "Sœurs de la Charité" has been the model after which communities of women without number, and of every conceivable titular denomination, have been founded. The more ascetic orders are falling into disfavour,

<sup>1</sup> Cardinal Vaughan has since then published the substance of his discourse in the *Humanitarian* of December, 1893.

both amongst men and women. They have not secured a footing in America, where people believe in progressiveness in religion as in every other department of life. In England, vocations to the Carthusians, or La Trappe, or to the Poor Clares or Carmelites, are extremely rare; and the same is true of typically Catholic countries. The desert gave way to the cloister, which is, in turn, making way for the community of philanthropists. Adaptation to environment is the condition of existence, and the world has no further use for the anchorite or the cenobite.

The best energies, then, of the Catholic Church are given to the service of the destitute and helpless, and, when we remember the Little Sisters of the Poor, and the Houses of Nazareth scattered all over England, Wales and Scotland, which receive, in their hundreds, aged men and women, deformed and crippled children, quite irrespective of creed, it cannot be said that the Church has not been compensated for the extinction of the primitive type of asceticism, or that the wells of her charity have run dry.

What then does Cardinal Vaughan propose to do in the present crisis? He recognises that the social problem, in its widest sense, concerns the well-being of all classes of the community, though the term is generally used in reference to that section which is employed in manual labour. He notices the temptations which beset the working classes in the subversive teachings of "Socialists, Communists, and Atheists," and, as an antidote, suggests that the Catholic laity, with time and ability at its disposal, should organise itself in such a way as to come in contact with the suffering poor. The methods of carrying out this sympathetic suggestion he promised to indicate on some future occasion. The present generation he seems to consider past praying for, and tells his hearers that all their energies must be devoted to "religiously instructing" those between fourteen and twenty-one, for in them lies the hope of the future. Finally, he lays down five principles, which he pronounces the fundamental tenets of Christianity. These are:

1. The sanctity and indissolubility of marriage and of the home.
2. The existence of two great orders of authority, religious and civil.
3. The nobility of labour.
4. The Christian brotherhood, whereby there could be no slaves.
5. The realisation of the dream of Plato and Cicero in the existence of a perfect model of human conduct in the person of Christ.

These principles were discarded at the French Revolution, and, in consequence, society has been suffering ever since. Christianity alone, he affirmed, could save it, and since this was so, it was obvious that the Catholic Church had a mission in this country.<sup>1</sup>

Now, if we except the dogmas of the indissolubility of marriage and

<sup>1</sup> I quote from *The Times* and *Morning Post* reports of September 23, and the *Humanitarian* for December.

the Pope's supreme authority, no one outside those "Communists and Atheists"—all of them of the lowest strata of society, intellectually and socially—would hesitate to adopt these propositions. As to the former portion of the address, we need not concern ourselves with it, for, with unimportant differences, it is very much what has been, and will be, heard on the religious platforms of all denominations. It deals in generalities at which no man can take offence, and proposes nothing that has not been already adopted by men of every persuasion. Guilds and brotherhoods for the promotion of sympathetic intercourse with the poor are the monopoly of no Church, and those who know the East End merely through the papers are well aware that ladies of every shade of belief, and of no belief, habitually visit and spend hours, and in some cases their lives, amongst the poor of Whitechapel and Mile End. When Positivists, destitute of any theology whatsoever, are known to be personal workers among the poor, it is obvious that the quality of charity is not restricted to any peculiar branch of Christendom.

Catholics, I am sure, would be quite as ready as others to admit that there is no more potent leveller of religious differences than the united and disinterested labour daily done east of Temple Bar by men of every theological belief. If the Catholic Church, then, has "a mission in this country," it will be in company with a number of other philanthropic agencies, equally devoted and equally ardent in their love and pity for suffering humanity. But what the speaker means is, that the present social crisis is an opportunity for an exclusive mission of the Catholic Church to the people of England. Just as the Judaisers of old held that Gentile converts were to approach the Gospel only through the Mosaic Law, so Cardinal Vaughan thinks we can only enter the haven of social salvation in the bark of St. Peter of Rome. "The Conversion of England" is a dream of his by night and day, and he is ready at any moment, with speech or pamphlet, to show that there are excellent grounds for believing that it is a by no means remote contingency, and that inestimable benefits must result therefrom to this country and the world. Now, it is precisely this belief, shared in more or less by a majority of his co-religionists, which invites some comment of an independent character, especially when stated in connection with the solution of the social problem.

Is the "key" in Cardinal Vaughan's possession, and would the "Conversion of England" turn "Socialists, Communists, and Atheists" into respectable citizens?

So far we have seen that the Cardinal has no more to say than Mr. Price-Hughes or Canon Barnett of Whitechapel, except that every one is to become Roman Catholic. If this means that England, once well within the bounds of Papal jurisdiction, would have no social problem at all, it cannot be said that Continental experience

justifies the prediction. If it means that the acceptance of the Councils of Trent and the Vatican would notably increase philanthropic effort, so that where there are now ten workers in the East End there would thenceforth be fifty, I do not know that there is any evidence to show that Catholicism has the effect of stimulating the charitable exertions of the community at large beyond any of its Protestant rivals. The "service of man" in France or Italy is not incontestably superior to the same article in England, nor is it more general. Our hospital system is indicative of a wider prevalence of private benefactions than the corresponding systems of the Continent, for, while ours is supported by charitable bequests and voluntary contributions, there the funds are supplied by taxation. It is not obvious, on the face of it, that English Protestants, of all shades, are less charitable or self-sacrificing than their Catholic neighbours abroad, whatever may be true of such members of the "upper circles" whose apathetic conduct the Cardinal so justly deploras. The idea that the Catholicism of the day produces deeper personal religion, more devoted philanthropy, or increased self-sacrifice amongst its professors at large, is not warranted by the plain teachings of experience in Catholic lands. It is conclusively shown that religion, and not creed, is at the root of the good done in England and abroad. The supreme test, "By their fruits ye shall know them," is conclusively against any such supposition, for it shows that there are good men in all religions, and that, consequently, all good men are fundamentally of the same religion, whatever their creed may be. But I am more concerned to touch upon the further statement of the Portsmouth\* address, that undenominational education and the prevalence of religious scepticism are responsible for the spread of Socialistic ideas. One would have thought that commercial depression, the glut of the labour market owing to unrestricted foreign competition, and the exodus from the country, are as accountable as any School Board or religious doubt. Economic laws are as irresistible as those that bind the spheres together, and given a combination of circumstances such as the above, no human contrivance can prevent a catastrophe. Secular education and scepticism can hardly account for the shrinking of trade, or the stringency of the money market in America, and the consequent distress, or the protracted horrors of the coal strike in England. Make such a condition of things chronic, or even periodical, and the most religious country would go Socialistic right off, if there were only some one to show them how. Desperate men in want of employment and bread evolve such revolutionary ideas by that law of necessity which turns a party of wrecked mariners into cannibals. Set right the economic conditions, remove the causes which produce a decrease of trade and the congestion of labour, and Socialism goes as surely as cutaneous eruptions after the blood

has been purified. Who ever heard of Socialism when trade was good and labour plentiful? This is the true cause of the Socialistic and revolutionary propaganda.

"The well-known Socialist" who told the Cardinal "that Board Schools and scepticism were doing the mischief," was as unreliable in his diagnosis as his interlocutor. Given a want of employment and money, and a knot of ardent and well-meaning, but viewy and faddist writers and talkers to set the Socialistic ball rolling, and all the dogmas in Christendom will no more prevent the starvelings from clamouring for a share in what others indisputably possess, than the sixth commandment will save hungry sailors from cannibalism. Neither Mr. George nor the Fabian Society, nor even more advanced teachers still, justify their tenets on the non-existence of God or hell; nor do the Hyde Park men accept the new evangel on these critical grounds. To them, it is a new business way of looking at things, and as it certainly promises to pay better than the old, they naturally go in for it. The idea that the compulsory nationalisation of land involves a breach of the eighth commandment does not enter their heads, any more than that a more equitable distribution of the profits of labour means stealing. We may think so; they do not. To suppose that belief has anything to do with it is to listen, without thinking, to an explanation which is more sonorous than satisfactory. Why, every single country of the civilised world is smitten with the fever, more or less, and are we to say that Christianity has been summarily discarded by them all? Are there not even Catholics who hold perilously advanced views? Are they therefore Atheists? It reads like a seventeenth century revival, where men like Bacon and Vanoni were denounced as Atheists, because they denied devil dealing and witchcraft. As to the Board Schools, what alternative is open to the Government? Christendom is shivered into uncounted sects and segments, and how is any one individual catechism to be set up as a classic in the public schools, when the whole community pays the bill? Unquestionably, the American system is the only possible one, until an Ecumenical Eirenicon appears, which shall succeed in gathering the lost or scattered tribes of Israel into the unity of one church or creed. Thinking men, even heads of religious bodies, tell us this is not possible, and even if possible, is not desirable. What, then, do men propose as an alternative to the Board School system? If that produces Socialism then Christianity must be indirectly responsible.

When we come to scepticism, we must remember that that term is as elastic as Christianity. It covers anything from a denial of the infallibility of the Bible, in which Dr. Driver and Dr. Jowett concur, down to the agnosticism of Mr. Spencer or the late Mr. Bradlaugh. Are the English working class sceptics? A whole paper might be written on this topic alone. If by sceptics, we

mean Atheists, I say there is no evidence to warrant any such opinion. Of course, there are secularistic clubs, which hold meetings in Hyde Park and Victoria Park, where I have heard untutored shoemakers disprove the Divine Existence by pointing out the immorality of parts of the Old Testament.

“D’ you think a God would order His chosen people to slaughter men, women, and little children?” I heard one Boanerges demand, his eyes in fine frenzy rolling, while the listeners seemed to treat the question as one of comparatively little moment. These atheistic bashibazouks and the clubs they represent are not the working classes of London, and still less of England. But I am prepared, not only to admit, but to maintain, that orthodox teaching has lost ground to a very great extent amongst the Orientals of London just as it admittedly has amongst the Occidentals. I mean that the old notion of the infallibility of the Bible is going fast, and consequently, the doctrines of the Trinity, the Atonement, and Hell-fire which the Bible teaches, or is popularly supposed to teach. That any man who is even slightly familiar with the trend of modern thought should marvel at this is inexplicable. Here are Church dignitaries like Dean Stanley and Dr. Jowett frankly confessing the purely human character of the book, acknowledging its many errors, abandoning its prophecies, and frankly treating it as a member of that large body of ancient religious literature which represents the hopes and fears and aspirations of all God’s creatures in every age and region of the world. Then we have the wholesale capitulation of Drs. Cheyne and Driver and Mr. Gore and the rest of the High Church freelances to some of the most advanced teaching of Leyden and Tübingen, which reduces the Bible to the position of a series of purely human documents, to be examined and studied in precisely the same way as Mommsen read his Livy, or Arnold his Thucydides. All this finds its way into reviews, magazines, newspapers, and popular lectures, until it reaches the lower strata of the reading community, and at one blow demolishes their faith in the inspired revelation of Scripture. Professor Huxley seizes on the unfortunate admissions of the capitulators with his, “I told you so,” and then proceeds to make hay of the remnants of their theological belongings after the bottom has been knocked out of the coffers that contained them. To suppose that even working-men are going to believe anything “because it’s in the Bible” after all the wholesale damage done to it by its official custodians, is simply ridiculous.

How are you going to get them to accept as a final authority what clergymen criticise like a newspaper article? Only the other evening I listened to a sermon in an Anglican church on one of the more startling miracles attributed to Elisha. The preacher, a moderate High Churchman, led off his discourse with the remarkable words: “Doubtless this account is very difficult to believe, but,

fortunately, the narrative lends itself admirably to an allegorical interpretation!"

When Bible miracles, which were all the Law and the Prophets to our fathers, are thus lightly brushed aside, how are we to look for the robust faith of Continental peasants in our artisans and colliers? If the loss of faith in the Bible's infallibility or inspiration, the miraculous, or the doctrines of the Trinity and the Atonement, is the direct and almost exclusive cause of the spread of Socialism, then let us prepare for it at once, for it is as inevitable as cholera after a pilgrimage to Mecca. But, as I have said, I do not believe it is. The causes are mainly economic, and all the credulity of the Middle Ages will not stop desperate men from listening to suggestions of novel, plausible, and seductive, but, as we think, dangerous and equally desperate remedies. The same thing goes on in France and Belgium, and with equally distressing results. If Catholicism cannot check it there, how could it mend matters here? With the example of the Irish agitation during the last fourteen years before us, the advantages of ecclesiastical intervention are not conspicuously obvious. We may be passing through a crisis, but it is a time for throwing light, and not shadows, on the path by the erroneous attribution of the world's troubles to causes which only remotely affect them.

No one questions the advantage of an abiding faith for the repression of covetous desires and violent feelings. No one doubts that it is able to reconcile both high and low to a life of enduring toil, and point to a recompense in the sense of a duty fulfilled, and still more "in the vision of another world shining athwart the dark-nesses of the present life, where all injustice shall be remedied and every inequality redressed," to quote Victor Hugo's superb defence of the doctrine of the after-life. No one is blind to the inestimable services that can be rendered to the humblest individual by an all-powerful conviction of the inherent nobility of the human spirit, of its undying life, and its glorious destiny. But what many people do doubt—and their number is an increasing one—is the advantage of teaching a number of speculative tenets with little or no bearing on practical life, which are proposed and defended in an hundred ways by the divergent sections of Christendom, and generally discredited in the eyes of thinking men. They see no connection between the truths of the majestic religion of Nature, which believes in God and holds on to the hope of immortality, and the variegated tenets of the current Christianity, or the elaborated dogmatism of the Church of Rome. They think that all this could go, and the world be no poorer for its loss, and that the theological fringes industriously wrought about the grand central truths of the religion of Jesus Christ have little or no bearing on the great social questions of the day.

W. R. SULLIVAN.

## BANKING ABUSES AND BANKING USES.

THERE is certainly something seriously wrong with trade and commerce, when the Board of Trade Returns show that the exports from Britain for the eleven months ending November 30 last have fallen off fully *twenty-six million* pounds sterling as compared with the corresponding eleven months of 1891. The home trade has fallen off likewise throughout the land, and complaints of bad trade and want of sufficient work are heard on every hand. Masters and men are at loggerheads about wages, and the end of strikes is not yet.

It was pointed out in our previous article on "Thorough Free Trade" (in our March number) how fearfully Sir Robert Peel's Bank Acts have hindered the progress of trade and injured the best interests of this country. It was also shown how Mr. Pitt managed to carry on the trade of the country in the most trying times on Free Trade principles, with an unrestricted banking system, and a circulating medium consisting of silver-coin, and bank notes, which provided a sufficient supply of ready money for the home trade. Then he allowed gold to be dealt in for foreign exchange at the market price, and this prevented any panic being created for the want of gold. Mr. Pitt followed the teaching of Adam Smith, as stated by Lord Rosebery in his most interesting volume on "Pitt." Mr. Gladstone and others are now finding out that Pitt was a sounder financier and statesman than Peel has been.

Mr. Carlyle fifty years ago said: "England is full of wealth, of multifarious produce, supply for human want of every kind; yet England is dying of inanition. With unabated bounty the land of England blooms and grows, waving with yellow harvests, thick-studded with workshops, industrial implements, with millions of workers, understood to be the strongest, the cunningest, and the willingest our earth ever had; these men are here; the work they have done, the fruit they have realised is here, abundant, exuberant on every hand of us; and behold, some baleful fiat of enchantment has gone forth, saying: 'Touch it not, ye workers, ye master-workers, ye master-idlers; none of you can touch it, no man of you shall be the better for it; this is enchanted fruit!'" Strong and rousing as that appeal was, with the exception of the repeal of the Corn Laws little has yet been done by Parliament to place the working



people into better positions. There is probably as many poor people now as there were then, still there are no greater facilities provided for working folks getting forward than there were then. There might have been a great improvement made in the banking system so that the superabundant capital which is locked up might be allowed to flow out more abundantly, to encourage and accommodate all kinds of manufactures and industries, especially the smaller traders, but nothing has been done by Parliament to establish banks for the people of this country, such as there are in other countries, for instance, the National Banks of the United States, and the People's Banks of Germany. Why are the interests of the common people neglected, while the interests of the monied classes are protected? The monied men and bankers are specially favoured. The Bank of England has got the sole right of issuing bank-notes in, and for sixty-five miles round, London. The old-established banks in England are limited in their circulation of notes, they are not allowed to increase their issue, nor to issue any smaller notes than £5. By the Bank Act of 1844 no new banks of issue are allowed to be established in either England, Scotland or Ireland. Such restrictions upon the circulation of money make a monstrous monopoly in banking. These Bank Acts should not remain on the Statute Book. No doubt they will be repealed when the people come to see how they are done out of the use of their own money by the big banks which have got the monopoly of banking. The first thing to set trade right will be to set up a popular and widespread system of banking for the people. Not mere savings banks, to gather the earnings of the poor and send the same to the National Debt Commissioners, at only sixpence a pound of interest per annum. There must be banks for the people, not only to take in deposits, but also to lend out their money on reasonable terms, in order to give as good banking facilities to the small but trustworthy traders and others, as are given to the middle and upper classes by the large and privileged banks.

Parliament has been patching up the Savings Bank Acts of late, but the large bankers have been very jealous and averse to let the Savings Banks be improved so as to be most serviceable to the people. The bankers in the House of Commons have objected to allow the savings banks to take in deposits above a small limited amount for fear of drawing away money from the large banks! I have had experience of savings banks. I was for several years a trustee of one. It was found that the restrictions of the Savings Bank Act were objectionable; so several of us trustees in 1875 formed an Auxiliary Banking Company, under the Companies Act, 1862, Table A, and gave loans and advances for the benefit of the smaller class of customers, and it has done far better than the old Trustees' Bank. We allowed three per cent. for deposits, and charged a reasonable rate for loans.

The business is done in the same office and by the same officials as the Trustees Savings Bank to save expense. This bank has been a great boon to the community; it pays the shareholders 10 per cent. dividend, and has gathered a good reserve fund. This is an example which other savings banks may follow with advantage. I may add I took the lead in promoting and establishing in Glasgow four years ago the People's Bank of Scotland, Limited, and I can strongly recommend the establishment of similar banks for the people all over this country. The industrial and thrifty classes cannot do better than start People's Banks for themselves. They have plenty of capital at their command. There is fully *one hundred and twenty millions of money* in the National Savings Banks, which capital is all lying dead stock with the National Debt Commissioners. It is good for nothing there; but if that money were lodged with banks under the control of the people themselves, with good managers, the whole of that money might be turned to far better account than it is, by being lent out in moderate and suitable sums to trustworthy people, in the ordinary way of banking. Then men would get better on in the world and be independent. With a little banking aid, many working men could start and do business for themselves at their own trades, or go in to company with others. By this means the working classes can help themselves, and in the course of time they may by thrift and industry become independent of the large capitalists, who show so little sympathy for the labouring classes in the present times. Let the working classes at once take steps to fortify their own positions by getting up People's Banks to gather in their own capital, and through these banks they will soon become their own capitalists, and their own masters, and share all the profits too. Mark this! Every million of pounds lying idle in the savings banks, if employed in this way, would give an average advance of £100 each to *ten thousand people*; this would set up as many new master workers, and improve trade so much that it would make quite a change for the better in the circumstances of the working classes.

The great strikes and differences which have taken place in England, and the spirit displayed, shows that the labouring classes cannot expect to get what wages they want, or a living wage, from their combined masters unless they can compel their employers to pay what the men think right, or commence co-operative companies themselves. To strike is a dreadful course for workmen to take, but what else can they do unless they start works for themselves? They have as much capital in the savings banks as would buy up all the coal pits. As has been said "the best way to keep peace is to be prepared for war," so in trade matters and wages, working men must look better after their own interests than they have yet done if they wish to be independent. Working men should take steps to get up co-operative manufacturing and other works of their own by

saving all the money they can, and putting that money in the first place into banks of their own, namely, people's banks, or co-operative banks. In the next place, they should form companies, under the Companies Act of 1862, to start manufactories to take up the works of their district, in the same way as the companies of Oldham and others. I noticed, when in Massachusetts, that the woollen and cotton mills and factories there were mostly carried on by "corporations" or companies, and that many of the workpeople held shares in these works, and were profit-sharers. That's the way to do! The workpeople "boss the shanty" and merely pay interest on capital!

There has been a great cry out amongst the military gentry, by General Roberts and others, to get more warships added to the Navy, as they say this nation is not sufficiently strong in that line. But that is not the line in which our country is weakest. The weakest point is that the working population is not well employed, and not sufficiently paid for their work when they have it. As for the men of the Army and Navy they are underpaid too, and in case of war men could not be got to fight for fourteen pence a day, nor to man the warships, nor to risk their lives in ironclads like the ill-fated *Victoria*. There is a far better way of strengthening this nation. It was first stated in the *Edinburgh Review* by Lord Jeffrey in 1816, the year following Waterloo, when people were tired of war, and only thinking of healing their wounds and their broken limbs. He said: "The spread of banks is of far more importance and far more likely to insure the happiness and even the greatness of the nation than the increase of the Army or Navy or the most brilliant success of its arms." The Scottish banking system was then perfectly free from the trammels which have since been put upon it by Sir Robert Peel's Bank Act of 1845. That banking system, as Sir Walter Scott wrote in 1825, "was attended with the greatest advantages to the country. The facility which it afforded to the industrious and enterprising agriculturists and manufacturers, as well as to others, has converted Scotland from a poor barren country into one where, if Nature has done less, art and industry have done more than in perhaps any country in Europe, through means of the credit which this banking system afforded" by cash credits, discounting of bills, and one pound notes.

Peel's Bank Act of 1845 had the same bad effect upon Ireland that it had upon Scotland. It prevented any new banks of issue from being established in either country, and blocked the way for the spread of banks and banking accommodation. Mr. J. W. Gilbert, who was at one time manager of the Provincial Bank of Ireland, and afterwards manager of the London and Westminster Bank, states, in his "History of Banking," that "the accommodation and assistance which the Joint Stock Banks in Ireland gave to the different industries, small as well as large, set the people into a new course of

prosperity, and the banks, by the abundant use of these small notes, were enabled to lend out money on advantageous terms, thereby supplying ready money to the country people to carry on their industries with." The *Bankers' Magazine*, for June, 1844, attributed the rapid improvement in the condition of Ireland, just before that time, to the Joint Stock Banks that had been recently established. Other writers have stated that the effect of Peel's Bank Act, in restricting banking in Ireland, was as detrimental as the potato famine. I was called to give evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons on Irish Industries in 1885, and I think I proved that if banks such as the people's banks in Italy were introduced into Ireland it would be the means of improving Irish industries quickly. Mr. Sexton and some other members of the Committee told me they thought my proposal of People's Banks for Ireland was well worthy of consideration. I hope these banks will be started yet. The Trustees' Savings Banks should be made People's Banks.

The great desideratum in the three kingdoms is the want of a great number of smaller banks, like the National Banks of the United States, to be set up in every locality, with local managers who are acquainted with parties in the district, and who know who are trustworthy, and to give them credit for reasonable amounts in cash credits wherewith to enable honest, industrious individuals to go into business or work for themselves or in company with others. It is necessary to give greater encouragement to small industries and to let people work for themselves as they used to do. It is ruinous to root out small trades and put all into the hands of large concerns, such as big coal and iron companies and other organisations for carrying on rough works. We should rather increase the skilled industries and the fine arts, so as to get better pay for work of the finer kinds. The bane of the Bank Act is that it has made the old banks so proud and exclusive that they turn decent, well-intentioned people, who have only moderate means to begin with, away from them, if they think them below their notice, and bestow all their favours upon the middle and upper classes and large capitalists. Hence it is that trade is fast going into the hands of big firms and companies, and the "common people" are shut out. A Liberal Government should devise liberal things. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer will only take in hand to *liberalise* our banking and monetary system in the way and manner suggested, no statesman can do a better thing for the good of this country. The want of a proper monetary system is what is wrong with trade. Let the currency expand as required, and all will go well.

The right way to reform our banking and currency is to take Pitt's plan. In 1797 Mr. Pitt said: "The circulating medium, he thought, should consist in anything that answered the great purposes of trade and commerce, whether in specie, paper, or any other terms

(or forms) that might be used." That is to say, he allowed the Bank of England and other banks to issue as many notes as were required to carry on the business of the country. In 1814 the Bank of England had a circulation of £25,000,000 to £30,000,000 of notes, and other banks in proportion. By means of these notes this country vanquished Napoleon. It was also by means of the "greenbacks" that the Northern States of America succeeded in their Civil War. They are finding the advantages of paper money still, and will soon outstrip us in trade and commerce unless our Parliament repeals Peel's Bank Act and adopts a more economical and convenient plan of finance. This can be done by an issue of Treasury notes in the first place. The credit of Great Britain is good for any amount of legal tender notes. The Banks should likewise be licensed to issue notes on the security of Consols lodged with the Treasury for the amount of their respective issues. These notes should be in *ten shillings, one pound, and five pounds* denominations, and they would gradually take the place of the half sovereigns and sovereigns. Thus the gold coin might be dispensed with for home circulation, as notes are generally preferred to coin wherever they are used in civilised countries. This would be a great gain to the State. Supposing *one hundred millions of notes* were issued, and Consols cancelled for that amount, that would pay off one hundred millions of the National Debt, and save two and three quarter millions of money yearly. *All that and good trade into the bargain!* This would cause little perceptible change in the currency—only substituting one pound notes for sovereigns. The Scotch and Irish people already know how much more convenient notes are than gold coin, and the English people would soon learn to like the notes too, when they get them introduced. See how much the postal notes are used already. Treasury or bank notes will be even better liked, because they will be *ready money* throughout the three kingdoms, and always as good as coin. Of course, the silver and bronze coinage will remain as it is. Gold will only be required for the foreign exchanges, and left to be dealt with on Free Trade principles.

As for foreign trade—when gold is treated as a mercantile commodity and bought and sold like any other metal, notes will be convertible into gold for export at the market price, and not at a fixed price (as now); then foreigners will have to pay Britain the market price for gold if they want it, or, otherwise, take our *goods* in exchange for their *produce*—corn, cotton, &c. This policy, as a matter of course, would force all foreign nations to adopt free-trade with Britain *volens volens*. That would be *fair trade!* Furthermore, let us have Free-trade in Banking, then we may leave the Old Lady of Threadneedle Street where *Punch* has placed her!

ROBERT EWEN.

## HABITS AND CUSTOMS OF MEDIÆVAL TIMES.

“MAN,” says Lord Bolingbroke, “is the subject of every history; and to know him well, we must see him and consider him as history alone can present him to us, in every age, in every country, in every state, in life and in death. History, therefore, of all kinds, of civilised and uncivilised, of ancient and modern nations; in short, all history that descends to a sufficient detail of human actions and characters, is useful to bring us acquainted with our species, nay, with ourselves.”

The history of the Middle Ages in Europe is to a great extent the history of the growth and domination of the priests. From the hut to the palace, their influence pervaded and ruled all except a few bold minds that refused to barter their freedom. An influence so vast might, if wisely and honestly directed, have ripened civilisation by some centuries earlier. But having been mainly exercised for the aggrandisement of their order and for their individual interests and superiority, it retarded liberal effort and free genius, and paralysed the nations by its gross superstitions. While, however, we shall, when necessary, censure the errors and crimes of the priests, we shall also do them justice for the benefits they occasionally brought about.

We selected the Red Man for most of our illustrations of savage and semi-savage life, and the Egyptians for a glimpse of ancient civilisation. In like manner we shall take one country chiefly for mediæval habits and customs, and, in doing so, shall prefer our own, beginning with Anglo-Saxon times to the close of the fental period.

It was a glorious union, the blending of the ardent, poetic Celt with the stolid and practical Saxon. A grand breed was the result. And, sneer who may, the world has produced none greater, nor any that has achieved so much, though yet in the infancy of its growth. A race that was the first to recognise truest beauty in usefulness, and to substitute mechanism for muscle; to prefer bridges and railroads to pyramidal tombs and vain monuments; and to multiply the industrial capacity of its toilers a hundredfold through its limitless ingenuity. A race that is sweeping over continents with resistless march, colonising and ruling, and carrying its arts and

institutions, its freedom, language, habits, and customs to the remotest corners of the earth. This little island, the envy of the world, may some day in her hour of intestine division be overwhelmed by a vast conspiracy, unless there should arise a great defensive confederacy of the English-speaking race; but what Power or Powers can ever overcome the colonies she has planted in America, Australasia, and Africa? The United States alone, if truly united, would prove invincible to attack from any possible combination.

The roving disposition of the Vikings and Saxon pirates is in our blood. We are of the sea, and our flag flies on every water. For sport, pleasure, profit, or discovery, we venture to the uttermost parts of the globe.

Who could have foreseen, when the Pagan Saxons and Norsemen wedged themselves by small detachments during two and a half centuries into our eastern and southern ports, that they would overrun the island from Devonshire to the Scottish Highlands and the Welsh borders, and impress their language and customs throughout? The Roman civilisation of our British ancestors was swept away by these barbarians. So much so that many well-informed persons are ignorant of the fact that the Britons had an old-established Church and a learned Christian priesthood before they came; and that St. Augustine, 150 years after, did *not* introduce Christianity into England. He introduced Romanism into Kent to the Saxon Pagans and he ignored the British Church, partly, perhaps, because she owed no allegiance to the Papacy.

The prevailing sentiment of the Anglo-Saxons was liberty. "We are all free men" was the proud boast of a warrior when asked who was his leader, for their fierceness did not permit them to be the passive instruments of their chiefs. Traitors and deserters they hanged; cowards were drowned; other offenders were fined according to their offence. They were polytheists, but Odin or Woden—the War God—was their chief divinity. They sacrificed quadrupeds at ordinary times, but on special occasions to their chief gods their sacrifices were human. They had a rude belief in the immortality of the soul, and in rewards and punishments after death. Their priests inculcated the worship of the gods with sacrifices, prayers, and thanksgivings; abstention from wrong, and intrepidity in the field.

The Hall of Odin was their Valhalla or heaven, where the spirits of valiant warriors of good conduct would pass their time as on earth—in war, feasting and carousing, and where lovely virgins would proffer them ale and mead from the skulls of their fallen enemies. But the place for the recreant and evil was a place of terror, of famine, and of eternal anguish. They were ferocious, turbulent, illiterate. They believed thoroughly in divination, charms, and

incantations. These robust pirates never knew fear in storm or battle, and loved to eat and drink to excess when these were over. They were desperate gamblers, and would hazard their persons on a throw of the dice; for although they exulted in their own freedom, slaves formed the most numerous class, and one into which a debtor might be reduced. Their virtues were: of the men, hospitality; of the women, chastity and connubial fidelity. Adultery of the husband was no offence against his wife, but only against the sinning wife's husband, whom he had to recompense by a fine as for murder, and to pay besides for the purchase of another wife. The adulterous woman was deprived of her hair by her husband, stripped naked before her relations, dismissed with ignominy from her home, and scourged in this nude state from one end of the village to the other. She was now an outcast, and, so long as she survived, lived a miserable life of infamy and contempt. High rank and great wealth would not shield her. Thus the daughter of a powerful king died in wretchedness and want.

The power of their monarch was extremely limited. He was a royal thane, the first citizen of the community, which consisted of noble, free, and servile; the last, being the property of their masters, were incapable of holding any property themselves. They were of two kinds: household slaves, like those of the Romans, and rustic slaves, who were sold with the soil as necessary adjuncts. A father could not give his daughter in marriage without the lord's permission and paying for the privilege. The lower free men were the ceorles, and were like our tenant-farmers of the present time. Hence churl and husbandman became synonymous.

The chiefs, the priests, and the warriors formed the national council, and no free man could become a warrior until he had been formally invested with buckler and lance in the presence of the council and with their consent. No votes were required, no scrutiny asked. They expressed their approbation by rattling their armour, and their disapproval by murmurs. Thus every measure was decided quickly and carried out with instant vigour. In battle each chief led his own tribe, the king commanding all; but in peace the monarch was often less powerful than some of his great nobles. They bathed and adorned themselves for battle as for a feast. "To die for the honour of their band was the height of their ambition; to survive its disgrace or the death of their leader was thought infamous. They even carried into the field their women and children, who glowed with the martial sentiments of the men."

The enervated and defenceless Britons, who had been disarmed by the Romans for four hundred years, were easily subdued. Their private and sacred edifices were burnt, their women violated and murdered, their bishops, their nobility, their children and aged were slaughtered, and the priests were sacrificed on their own altars.



Some fled to the mountains of Wales and the fastnesses of Cornwall; others took shelter in Armorica. Those who remained, and they were very numerous, became the slaves of the conquerors. Such was the Anglo-Saxon people who laid the foundations of the English nation, and introduced those habits and customs which have descended in softened measures to our day.

When St. Augustine landed to convert a people ripe for Romanism, it was by Brunehaute, Queen of Austrasia and Burgundy, that he was chiefly assisted in the success of his mission. Pope Gregory said of her, "Next to God, England was indebted to her for its conversion." She supplied Augustine with French priests who knew the English language, and who could interpret between Ethelbert and the missionaries. The latter landed in the Isle of Thanet, and Augustine sent an interpreter to the king, declaring that he was come to make Ethelbert offers of eternal salvation, and to preach to him the knowledge of the true Deity. And when the king repaired to Thanet, "he chose to keep in the open air from a persuasion that while he kept himself without doors no spells could operate upon him." On being summoned to attend upon him the forty-one missionaries advanced slowly, singing their litanies and bearing a silver crucifix with the painted image of the Saviour. Ethelbert was now thoroughly assured that they dealt in enchantments; nevertheless he soon became a convert. Christchurch in Canterbury, which had been built by the Britons, was made a cathedral; ruined churches were repaired; heathen temples were consecrated; the Roman Church rapidly replaced the British; and in 599, three years after Augustine had landed, 10,000 Pagans were baptized. In eighty-seven years after, when Egfrid, king of Bernicia and Deira, resisted the Papal authority, the Church had already acquired immense possessions. Lord York says that "Egfrid deprived Wilfrid, Bishop of York, of the bishopric, and seized all his possessions, which were great, even to an amazing degree of opulence." Eventually, through mistaken piety, the Church obtained one-third of the whole landed estate of the kingdom, and this proportion was about the same which the priests had acquired in Egypt—during thousands of years—to the time of Joseph. So similar are the operations of superstitious devotion and pious fraud in all times and places!

The only record of the manners of the Saxons which was composed before they settled here, is the *Romance of Beowulf*. A monster named Grendel came at night to prey on the sleepers in King Hrothgar's Hall. Beowulf, with his men, undertook to destroy this scourge. He succeeded, and Hrothgar feasts them. After dinner, the minstrel took the harp and sang some love-traditions of their tribe. "The lay was sung, the song of the gleeman; the joke rose again, the noise from the benches grew loud; cupbearers gave the wine from wondrous vessels." The Queen, "under a golden crown,"

served the cup to Hrothgar and Beowulf. Bed-time arrived: the leaders had a chamber, the men occupied the hall. "They bared the bench planks; it was spread all over with bed and bolsters; at the head they set their war-rims, the bright shield-wood; there, on the bench, might easily be seen, above the warrior, his helmet, lofty in war, the ringed mail shirt, and the solid shield; it was their custom ever to be ready for war both in house and field." So runs, but in pure Anglo-Saxon, the ancient poem of Beowulf.

From the barrows of our primitive forefathers we obtain a knowledge of the forms and designs of almost every article they used when alive. The drinking-cups were of glass, so made that they would not stand upright, and the contents were taken at a draught or the cups held in the hand until emptied. Their shape promoted conviviality, and gave rise to the modern "tumbler." We have retained the usual forms of the pitchers and basins, and, in a measure, of the drinking vessels which were in use centuries before the Saxons came to England.

The hall of every Saxon house was the chief apartment, whose doors were always open to those worthy of entrance. Here all dined together, for dining in private was accounted disgraceful. Here all business was transacted, and the evenings were rendered gay with song and jest. The wall had pegs or hooks for arms and armour, harps, or other objects needing handy removal. There were no chimneys nor fireplaces. The fire was made on the floor in the spot most convenient. The houses, being of wood, were sometimes burnt, through lighting it too near the wall. So the custom arose of making it in the middle. Next an opening was made in the roof for the escape of the smoke. When cold, they could stand all around the fire to warm themselves. Bede describes a king and his attendants doing this after hunting. The place of the fire was called the "heorth." They had words for tongs, bellows, coal, cinders, and fire-shovels; the furniture of the hall consisted mostly of benches with carpets and cushions. The majority sat on the floor down to the days of Elizabeth. The table was literally a "bord" on trestles, and was removed after meals. Laying it was an important preparation, and we still speak of "board" and lodging. In great houses there were kitchens, but generally the food was cooked in the open air. In early times one meal a day sufficed. Afterwards they had two, and sometimes three. Their hours were canonical; thus when they breakfasted at the third hour of the day, it was nine o'clock in the morning, and their "noon meat" was taken at three in the afternoon. Guests deposited their arms outside the hall with a porter, and strangers took their place at the board without any questions asked. Attendants sometimes kneeled as they presented the roast meat on spits, which they held at one end, and the diner took the other, cutting off slices which were

caught by the attendant on a thick round of coarse bread called a trencher, which he held in his other hand, and which served instead of a plate, for they used neither plates nor forks, and often neither knives nor table-cloths. The trenchers absorbed the gravy, and in later times and in great houses were thrown into the alms-baskets. When carving became an employment, *The Boke of Kerwynyng* directed the carver "set never on fyshe, flesche, beest, ne fowle, more than two fingers and a thombe."

Bread, milk, butter, and cheese were the staple articles of food, bread being the chief. "A domestic was termed a man's 'hlafoctan,' or loaf-eater." A lady was a "hlafig," a loaf-giver. Bacon was the principal flesh-food, and other meats were also salted. Hence boiling was the common form of cooking. They even boiled their geese. The knives of a late period resembled modern razors. One in the Cambridge Museum was labelled "A Roman razor." After dinner the cloth was cleared, hands were washed, as before the meal, and all commenced drinking. When King Edwy left the cup for the society of his newly-made queen, Dunstan forcibly dragged him back to the guests, because it was gross disrespect to leave off early after dinner. The cups were often of precious metals, curiously engraved and of much value, and were specially left in wills. The Abbey of Ramsey thus received from the Lady Ethelgiva "two silver cups for the use of the brethren in the refectory, in order that while drink is served in them to the brethren at their repast my memory may be more firmly imprinted on their hearts." In pledging they always kissed. Story-telling and singing in the humbler gatherings were partaken by turns. In this way Caedmon, the Anglo-Saxon Milton, was first made aware of his poetical powers. Dancing was expressed by words meaning hopping, leaping, and tumbling. It appears, therefore, to have been a somewhat violent exercise. The mirth among the men was often coarse to obscenity, and scenes occurred in the halls which may not be described. In some cases lands were granted to vassals on conditions which would degrade the roughest London costermonger. The ladies modestly retired early from these orgies, which frequently ended in quarrels and bloodshed, and in their bower, which was a chamber built separate from the hall, amused themselves undisturbed by the wassailers. The bower was furnished with a round table, stools, and generally a bed. Chairs were for the great. The bed was a sack filled with straw and laid on a bench, hence the words bench and straw were commonly used for bed. When the bed was to be made, they took the bed-sack out of the chest, filled it with fresh straw, and laid it on the bench in a recess of the room, provided with a curtain. Bedsteads were rare, and only used by people of rank. Both sexes on going to bed stripped themselves stark naked, wrapped a sheet around the

body, and then drew the coverlet over. This practice continued to late times. Lord Kames tells an anecdote of James I. when a child in charge of the Dowager Countess of Mar: "The king being seized with a cholic in the night time, his household servants flew to his bedchamber, men and women, naked as they were born, the Countess only had a smock."

When about 877 the Danish Prince Guthrum was baptized and adopted by his sponsor, Alfred the Great, he became the feudatory king of East Anglia. Alfred presented him with a short code of religious and civil laws. The former made provision for the propagation of Christianity, the regulation of ecclesiastical taxes and tithes, payment of clergy, observance of the Sunday and other Church festivals, the punishment of incestuous marriages, and the abolition of trials by ordeal, sorcery, and divination. The civil code laid down the fines for murder, provided for trial by a jury of twelve in cases of manslaughter, vouchers for the sale of cattle and other property, and prohibited desertion. In his own kingdom, pirates were hanged, no illiterate person could hold office, all freeholders owning two hides of land were obliged to send their sons to schools until they were sixteen. For when Alfred came to the throne learning was so rare that only a few this side of the Humber could translate a verse of Latin, and scarcely any could understand the Liturgy in English. Neither priests nor people knew the meaning of the words of their devotion. But when Alfred had set a personal example of learning, and had founded seminaries and halls for teaching, and collected able men from the Continent to instruct in his academies, and had provided by a militia and a fleet for the external and internal defence of the kingdom, the prosperity of the people was unexampled, and, from that day to this, the progress of knowledge in England has been onward in spite of all impediments. Trade and arts flourished, juries were established—he hanged Judge Cadwine for sentencing a man to death without a jury—sureties and bail were adopted, the kingdom was divided into shires, these into tythings or ridings, the ridings into hundreds or wapentakes, and these into the lesser tythings or dwellings of ten householders, each of whom was a pledge for the others, and was responsible for the good behaviour of his own family and guests. Any man not belonging to one of these tythings was outlawed and suffered death, and none could enter one of them without a certificate from the tything to which he had belonged. So effective was this system that it has been said golden bracelets were hung by the roadsides and none dared to remove them.

Alfred's public measures were submitted to three different Councils—a kind of Privy Council, a Council of Lords, and another of Commons, called Wittenagemote. Hume says of him: "The merits of this prince, both in private and public life, may with

advantage be set in opposition to that of any monarch or citizen which the annals of any age or any nation can present to us."

On the field of Senlac the course of English liberty was checked, and the bitter dealings which the Saxons had, in days gone by, measured out to the Celtic British was meted to them in turn by the haughty Normans. All the miseries the forefathers had inflicted the descendants were made to suffer. Proud nobles, who traced their descent from gods, were robbed of castles and lands, and saw their daughters given in marriage, or worse, to the offscourings of Europe. Royal ladies hid themselves in convents. It was a carnival of plunder and tyranny. And, notwithstanding the long and gallant defence of their liberties, so completely were the English subjugated that their very name became a reproach. Their mild feudalism was supplanted by the harsher system of the Norman, which converted the whole people into a nation of slaves and tyrants, and at the same time rendered the monarch the head of a large and disciplined army. The first influx of Normans, however, was the last, and in no long time the 60,000 mercenaries of William were absorbed by the larger population of English.

The habits and customs of the English were not so largely influenced by the Normans as is generally supposed. They were alien and hateful to the masses. Yet, as Norman families formed the bulk of the newly-made aristocracy, and scorned to adopt the Saxon customs, Norman words and usages percolated downwards in society, and at length obtained some influence on national manners. English was abolished from the schools and courts in favour of Norman French. As soon as the conquerors became English, they were copied by those beneath them in rank. Their chief merit, however, is that they assisted in moderating intemperance and coarseness, and that they gave a veneer of refinement and politeness which had been wanting to the blunt but honest English.

This national disaster—the conquest of the people—may be said to have been brought about through the superstitious reverence of the Confessor for the doctrines of the clergy. William of Malmesbury tells that, though Edward slept in the same bed with his wife, the beautiful Edgitha, he never ventured to contaminate his purity by one nuptial embrace. The king declared the truth of this on his deathbed; and for this violation of his marriage vow he was canonised. He was the first English prince that professed to cure scrofula by the touch.

William owed so much to the Church for his success, that he endowed her with greater powers, and from his time to the Reformation she was the protectress of every immorality, the upholder of every species of tyranny, the foremost in every cruelty, the suppressor of every liberty—the scourge of God. She cherished learning not because she loved it, but because learning gave influence,

and she loved power. Like the Egyptian priests, she hid the light, and caused the people to live and die in darkness. She helped to emancipate the slaves, not from love of freedom, but from desire of popularity. And even when she opposed the tyranny of kings, it was to make her own rule more complete and more despotic.

Yet there were many in her ranks who were true priests of the Most High, patient students, lovers of art, tender physicians; men who from pure piety did what they could to alleviate suffering, and to lead mankind to higher things. These were the salt of their order, and were worthy of a better Church and better times.

Whatever knowledge we have of those times is almost wholly due to monastic chroniclers, transcribers, and illuminators. But it is seldom they give us a glimpse of the inner life of the Anglo-Saxon household. In the thirteenth century, Walter de Bibblesworth wrote in French verse, "As soon as the child is born it must be swathed; lay it to sleep in its cradle, and you must have a nurse to rock it." At this time the cradle was called a crybbe, and infants were tightly swaddled from head to heel, so that they looked like bundles. Accidents were of frequent occurrence, and the *Penitenciale* of Archbishop Theodore in the seventh century directs that "if a woman place her infant by the hearth, and the man put water into the cauldron and it boil over, and the child be scalded to death, the woman must do penance for her negligence, but the man is acquitted of blame." Children were brought up during infancy with the mother in her chamber, which was generally both bed and sitting room. But when a boy was eight he passed from infancy to knighthood, which lasted until manhood was reached. During this period he was usually sent away to some courteous and valiant nobleman to graduate in knighthood.

There was no privacy about bedrooms. When a lady received a male visitor, it was common for both to sit on the bed-side. Dunstan went without ceremony to King Edgar's bed when he was sleeping with his queen, and stood over them and rated them both soundly. We find, moreover, that the Saxon woman, in every class, possessed those traits which we consider the glory of an Englishwoman. She was a good housewife, a tender companion, a lover of home, where she was the comforter and consoler; a virtuous and noble woman. A poem in the *Eveter Book* tells us: "It beseems a damsel to be at her board; a rambling woman scatters words, she is often charged with faults; a man thinks of her with contempt, oft her cheek smites." Women of every rank performed domestic duties; occasionally they even held the horse of the guest while he dismounted. Spinning and weaving, needlework and embroidery, were carried on by ladies in their chambers. So excellent was their embroidery that it was known on the Continent as *opus Anglicum*.

And the ill-used queen of the Confessor was as expert in literature as in needlework.

A very unpleasant feature was the cruelty practised towards servants. These slaves had no protection against their owners, who had the power of life and death over them. Mistresses frequently ordered them to be scourged to death. Slight offences entailed dreadful punishments and tortures, just as in old Rome, where for breaking a dish a slave might be put to death. The Sanctuary—a refuge for the vilest criminals—offered them no protection. The Church permitted them to be torn from it. High-born ladies were experts at flogging. King Ethelred, as a child, was beaten by his mother with a bunch of candles when she could not find her whip, and he could never bear the sight of a candle after. The same king humanely enjoined: “And the ordinance of our lord and of his Witan is, that Christian men for all too little be not condemned to death, but in general let mild punishment be decreed for the people’s need; and let not for a little God’s handywork and his own purchase be destroyed, which he dearly bought.” We thus see that public punishments were mild when private ones were severe. The aristocracy too often regarded their poor dependents as a class not possessing feelings similar to their own, but as a sort of intermediates between themselves and the lower animals. Nor has that feeling entirely died out. Perhaps it was never greater than in France under Louis Quatorze. Longchamp, who wrote memoirs of his master, Voltaire, and who had been a valet-de-chambre to Voltaire’s mistress, Madame du Chatelet, a highly cultured French Countess and a member of the French Court, apologised for this trait in her conduct, by saying of the great ladies generally, “On ne se genoit pas devant ses laquais.” He continued, “It was the custom, and I have been in the best situations possible to judge by my particular case, that their mistresses only regarded them as automata. I am at least convinced that Madame du Chatelet, in her bath, in ordering me to wait on her, did not even see in that the shadow of indecency, and that my individuality at that time was in her eyes neither more nor less than the kettle which I had in my hand.”

The Anglo-Saxon ladies paid great attention to their personal appearance. Tweezers for extracting superfluous hairs are constantly found in their graves. If the illuminators were correct, they also dyed their hair in the fashionable colour of to-day. They loved flowers and birds and the beauties of Nature. Their dress was most becoming, and often as graceful as that of the Greeks. Tight-fitting bodices and flowing skirts of various patterns set off their tall and shapely persons. Dressmakers would do well to consult the designs of early and mediæval times. The head-dresses of both men and women were very inelegant, and were worn indoors, and

even at table. They did not even remove them for dancing. Slender figures were preferred, and on the whole the dispositions of the women were warm and lovable. But the young men were vainer than the ladies.

During the Middle Ages, and notwithstanding the introduction of Christianity, marriage was a civil institution throughout Europe, including England. It was so little binding, in spite of the efforts of the Church, that couples separated at will from any cause they chose, and were at once free to marry again. It was common for men and women, without any marriage ceremony, to live together, and their conduct created no disgust, nor were their children subject to any disabilities or deprived of the usual legal rights. It was through the Roman Church that priests were compelled to divorce their wives and take to concubines, and that eventually no marriage was held binding unless she performed and blessed it. It was through her that innocent children were deprived of natural rights unless born in religious wedlock. Suicide, infanticide, exposure of infants, murder, and misery have been the lot of millions upon millions through her fanatical and pernicious influence regarding the relations of the sexes. That this influence was acquired through hypocrisy and lust of power may be illustrated by the conduct of Cardinal de Crema, who came to England and Scotland in the reign of Henry Beauclerc, commissioned by Pope Honorius II. as his legate to settle Church dissensions. At a general convocation of prelates and clergy held at London, Crema "was seated on a throne raised to an extraordinary height above the archbishops." His most remarkable canon was against the married clergy, whom he grossly abused. He said "that it was a sin of the most heinous kind, for a man to consecrate the Eucharist when he had just arose from the bed of a strumpet," meaning the wife. Yet this same zealot was detected sleeping "with a prostitute the very next night after he had consecrated the Eucharist in the morning, and was obliged to steal away privately next day to avoid the shame attached to such an action." Since that time celibate priests have directed the consciences of the women of Europe, have listened to the confessions of the married, the fancies of virgins, and the iniquities of the impure. If any one would know what all this means, let him read Jules Michelet on *Priests, Women, and Families*, or any other truthful work bearing on the subject. The law permitted few corporal punishments. All injuries could be compensated, and the price for any part of the person, as well as for life, was duly fixed for each class in society. Husbands, however, were not only permitted but were enjoined to chastise their wives. William the Conqueror beat his before he married her.

Industry and prosperity were encouraged by making a man's rank rise with his increase of wealth. A ceorle became a thane when



he had acquired five hides of land, with a belfry, chapel, and so on, on it.

The outdoor recreations were numerous, the indoor games were chiefly chess and backgammon. Play of many kinds was universal, and the word was applied to contests in arms. *Pleyaman*—a playman—was Anglo-Saxon for a gladiator. Each village had its play-place where every one assembled on holidays either to join or look on. There were wandering minstrels or a dancing bear to amuse the rustics. Bull-baiting and bear-baiting became common. Young men wrestled, and older ones fought with cudgels or single-stick. Hard knocks were given and taken in good-humour. They ran and jumped for prizes. In such places wakes and fairs sprang up.

The Anglo-Saxons were as fond of hawking and of the chase as were the Normans. The most pious joined in these sports. Any Norman or Plantagenet king could win the hearts of their English by restoring to them the power to kill their own game. The severity of the Game Laws from the Norman usurpation until now would demand volumes. Horsemanship was esteemed, and ladies rode sideways as they do now. Side-saddles were introduced, says an old writer, by Anne of Bohemia. The shoemaker was also the harness-maker of those times. Walter Mapes says that every parish had a drinking house called the Gild (or Guest) house. Private hospitality to wayfarers began to decline, and was enjoined from the pulpits. Bede says, the first act of hospitality was to wash the stranger's feet and hands. Mass priests were forbidden to eat or drink at alehouses. The sign of an alehouse was a stake, of a wine-shop a bush. Travelling was dangerous. Men went from place to place in large parties, like Chaucer's Canterbury Pilgrims, as a mutual protection. A man travelling alone was himself liable to be arrested as a thief. Money payment was made by weight. The word pound meant a pound weight of silver. Owing to the odious practice of cheating when sales were conducted orally, the law made no bargain valid unless before witnesses.

The English under King Harold, says William of Malmesbury, "wore short garments reaching to the mid-knee; they had their hair cropped, their beards shaven, their arms laden with golden bracelets, their skin adorned with punctured designs; they were accustomed to eat till they became surfeited, and to drink till they were sick. These latter habits they imparted to their conquerors, whose manners in other respects they adopted." The same author, writing of the Norman-English under William Rufus, says, "Everything was so changed that there was no man rich except the money-changers, and no clerks but lawyers. The courtiers then preyed upon the property of the country people, and consumed their substance, taking the very meat from their mouths. Then was there flowing hair and extravagant dress; and then was invented

the fashion of shoes with curved points ; then the model for young men to rival women in delicacy of person, to mince their gait, to walk with loose gestures and half naked." In the next reign, "they vied with women in length of locks, and wherever these were wanting, put on false tresses." In the reign of Stephen they had developed into utter lawlessness. Ale and mead, although still the common drinks, were now with the rich giving way to wine. A writer in the twelfth century somewhat wittily said that "good wine should be as clear as the tears of a penitent, so that a man may see distinctly to the bottom of the glass. It should represent the greenness of a buffalo's horn ; when drunk, it should descend impetuously like thunder, sweet-tasted as an almond, creeping like a squirrel, leaping like a roebuck, strong like the building of a Cistercian monastery, glittering like a spark of fire, subtle as the logic of the schools of Paris, delicate as fine silk, and colder than crystal"

In cookery, garlic was used with very many dishes. Garlic sauce was a favourite. "A great prince ate garlic with a goose." Roasted hen or broiled pork "required a strong garlic sauce." Fish were cooked in wine and water, and "served with a sauce composed of sage, parsley, cost, ditany, wild thyme, and garlic, with pepper and salt." The Normans liked their dishes highly seasoned. Bread, butter, and cheese, the food of the poor, still retain their Low German names which had been brought from Friesland. Flesh meats took the Norman names. Bread was baked in the form of buns, and marked by the superstitious bakers with a cross. Plain food and drink were abundant, and the poor had "easier times" than they have now. But then their wants were fewer.

Early rising was common to all. In one of the romances, a hero "is accused of laziness because he was in bed after the cock had crowed." People warmed themselves in ways strange to us. In winter they sat bare-legged before the fire, and ladies warmed themselves in a free-and-easy way before the other sex. During the Norman period the habits and customs of the women became very corrupt. They were liable to outrage with impunity, and the honour which they could not preserve became little prized. It would be difficult to find in the pages of all history a more atrocious set of ruffians than the Norman landowners, and their women were worthy of them. One of these feudal barons—a very bad type of a bad class—was Robert de Belesme, Earl of Shropshire and of Arundel and Shrewsbury, a man so powerful that he successfully defied the authority of Henry I., who had granted him the Conqueror's demesnes in Normandy. Henry of Huntingdon, who lived in his time, says of him : "He preferred the slaughter of his captives to their ransom. He tore out the eyes of his own children when in sport they hid their faces under his cloak. He impaled

persons of both sexes on stakes. To butcher men in a horrible manner was to him an agreeable feast." Of another contemporary feudal lord, the same author says: "When any one by force or fraud fell into his hands the captive might say, 'The pains of hell compassed me round.' Homicide was his passion and his glory. He imprisoned his own countess, an unheard-of outrage, and cruel and lewd at once; while he subjected her to fetters and torture by day to extort money, he forced her to cohabit with him by night, in order to mock her. Each night his brutal followers dragged her from prison to his bed, each morning they carried her from his chamber back to her prison. Amicably addressing any one who approached him, he would plunge a sword into his side, laughing the while; and for this purpose he carried his sword naked under his cloak more frequently than sheathed. Men feared him, bowed down to him, worshipped him." If these men were mad—and no one deemed them so—then the greater part of the Norman nobility was also mad—mad with the lust of uncontrolled power—for each was a sovereign in his own district, and could laugh at right and law. And it is from such villains as these that so many are proud to derive their ancestry. We refuse to be dazzled by the glamour of names. One Alfred was worth the whole Norman monarchy and aristocracy combined. One humble worker for the good of his fellow-men was of more value than a cartload of barons. For which of them all would we exchange the poet-ploughman Burns? Yet we will do them this justice: ignorant and idle as they were, the Anglo-Normans were good fighters. They were amply gifted with brute courage. And it was from them, too, in their hours of idleness that gallantry and chivalry sprang up in our country, producing in time a more general refinement. Their lavish expenditure was named generosity, but then they extorted their means of exercising this by plundering those who toiled and traded. This extravagance caused them to be attended by a host of base flatterers, such as fed at the ancient tables of rich Romans, and were the butts of the guests. The common names for these were lechers and ribalds. A lecher was a dish-licker. Both words are still used by us, but their meanings have changed.

Although the laws enacted under the Norman and Plantagenet kings superseded those of the Confessor to a large extent, especially in all that bore on feudalism, yet these monarchs were frequently compelled to yield to the popular love of the old habits and customs. When therefore feudal customs were abolished, the bulk of the laws that remained were based on the Anglo-Saxon. The Land Laws and the Game Laws are derived from the Normans, the Common Law from the Anglo-Saxons, and almost all our Statute Law breathes the spirit of pre-Norman England.

Scholastic learning was no accomplishment to a mediæval

gentleman. "In the historical romances of the Middle Ages, a prince or baron is sometimes able to read," but only accidentally. Reading and writing were for clerks and secretaries. A gentleman was taught deportment, manly exercises, the use of arms, horsemanship, hunting and hawking, carving at table, and chess, and occasionally music. Chess was a necessary accomplishment. Learning, however, was not so derogatory to ladies as their lives were more sedentary. Hence they were permitted to read and write a little. But the middle, and even the lower classes, were fairly taught. The teacher was the parish priest; and the school-house the priest's house, or the parish church. Curiously enough, Lord Beaconsfield's description of our modern aristocracy is that "they read little, and are much in the open air." Writing was done on long narrow scrolls, which rolled up like our school maps.

The slight wooden buildings which sufficed for the Anglo-Saxons did not accord with the habits of the Normans. They required structures which could resist powerful attack, otherwise they might have been annihilated by the oppressed people, or by each other. Thus substantial edifices of stone were constructed, until every good farmhouse became a small fortress. The Freemasons of the Continent taught the English architecture. Bishops were sometimes noted architects; and for beauty, solidity, and ornament, no buildings in England can compare with those of their kind in the Middle Ages.

The weapon in which the English delighted was the bow, one which requires strength of arm, keenness of sight, sound judgment, and an unshaken nerve. Bow and arrow are words of Saxon origin, but it was after the Conquest that the English made them as terrible on the Continent as they were to the Hibernian Scots, who called the arrow "a flying devil."

When the exorbitant powers of the aristocracy were modified by the growth of the great middle class which has made England what she is, we find an improvement in all directions. Wealth became more divided, and a burgher or yeoman's house was one of comfort and plenty. "The ordinary dinner of a respectable burgher consisted of a soup and two or three plain dishes of meat, followed by cheese, pastry, and fruit." Meal-times changed. The old proverb said:

"Lever à cinq, diner à neuf,  
Souper à cinq, coucher à neuf,  
Fait vivre d'ans nonante et neuf."

But a later and more fashionable one was:

"Lever à six, diner à dix,  
Souper à six, coucher à dix."

In Chaucer's *Schipmannes Tale*, the monk likes his dinner at

*prime*—nine o'clock in the morning. When plates came into use, two ate out of the same one, often a lady and a gentleman. Habits at table, as we find from the *Boke of Curtasye*, would be too disgusting to us to endure in any company. Handkerchiefs were not in use, but the table-cloth was an object of pride to the owner. Dishes were multiplied, and so far were our ancestors from living on "the roast beef of old England," that our dishes are few and simple compared with theirs. Yet so greedy were they, that when anything tempting appeared on the table, "ten hands at once swarm in the dish." The fare of the poor was of the homeliest, but the chroniclers rarely deigned to mention these, and their circumstances did not improve to the same extent as those of the other classes. With the latter, luxuries increased so that two or three courses of a dozen dishes each were not uncommon. Riding on horseback became general, and was ostentatiously indulged in by the clergy. In the Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*, Chaucer says of the monk :

" Full many a deinte hors hadde he in stable ;  
And whan he rode, men might his bridel here  
Gingeling in a whistling wind as clere,  
And eke as loud, as doth the chapell belle."

A satirist in Edward I.'s reign sang :

" While God was on earth and wandered wide,  
What was the reason he would not ride ?  
Because he would not have a groom to go by his side,  
Nor the grudging of any gadling to jaw or to chide."

The Isle of Man had a good breed of its own, and the best war-horses came from the Orkneys.

In drawing, as we must, this paper to a close, we would remark that the mediæval times do not offer a satisfactory picture of society. It was a transitional period of great contrasts, great hardships and of much suffering. Diseases abounded, and none knew how to cure them. Leprosy was as common as it is in the East. Barbers were the surgeons, and men were bled and poisoned to death with the best intentions. Wars and pestilences often decimated the people and left the fields bare of tillage. Every now and then the sturdy spirit of the English peasants, stung by hunger, broke into insurrection, and their bodies hung, till they dropped to pieces, from tree and gibbet. Suicides rotted at the crossways with a stake driven through them to the earth. Every jail, castle, municipality, and monastery had its instruments of torture. Every village had its stocks, every town its pillory. Maniacs were flogged and chained, and immured and starved in nakedness and filth. Robust beggars robbed in gangs, and paupers swarmed daily around

the doors of religious houses. Helpless and ignorant women were drowned or burnt alive in the name of religion, because it was written, "Ye shall not suffer a witch to live." The highest class was corrupt from choice, the lowest was corrupt from necessity, and the morality of the burghers and farmers was low, because, as Wright in his great work truly says, "the clergy were the great corrupters of domestic virtue among both these classes." The small gentry was the only one that remained comparatively pure in those impure times, for their blood had little or no taint of the Norman. And if modern habits and customs exhibit a better state of things; if our women are more virtuous and our men lead cleaner lives; if we are more humane, more enlightened, more temperate, more considerate of others, we owe it, under Providence, to those noble ones of all ranks who wrote and pleaded, satirised and sang, who investigated and bare witness, and who resisted alike the physical shackles of the nobles and the mental fetters of the priests, giving their energies and their lives a sacrifice for truth.

LADY COOK  
(*née* TENNESSEE CLAYLIN).

## THE BRITISH NAVY.

A BRIEF examination of the nature of the fundamental properties required in the design and equipment of a man-of-war, whether for offensive or defensive operations, will probably prove that our Naval administrators are not keeping pace with the times.

The majority of those who witness our port naval reviews, in their inexperience gaze on the spectacle with awe and admiration, and return to their homes fully satisfied that our fleet is the finest in the world; and the still greater number of the public who read the high-flown statements of our Sea Lords, and glance over the wondrous maze of figures and data prepared to establish the comparative excellence and undoubted supremacy of our fleet over those of any combination of allies likely to operate against us in time of war, place the blindest confidence in all they read and hear, and are thus fully determined to turn a deaf ear to the warning of naval reformers.

To predict the exact nature of the design of the battle-ship of the future in every detail would be to solve at once problems destined for many years to baffle the skill of numberless naval architects. If the quality and thickness of armour could be definitely established, and if the size and weight of guns, and the velocity and penetrating power of projectiles had reached a limit—in short, if the means of attack and defence were to be restricted to those now in use—it would still be difficult to predict a hard-and-fast design of the future battle-ship.

But, when it is remembered that these elements are subject to constant changes and modifications, and that they are even exchanged for others more suitable, the problem becomes more complex and the solution more difficult. The class of war-ships which calls for the greatest amount of study and attention is that which forms our first line of defence—viz., the first-class battle-ships of our fleet, built at a cost of about £1,000,000 each; these occupy the first position because, as floating fortresses, or marine fighting machines, they are expected to be capable of successfully contending in fair fight against similar hostile ships, coast defence forts, or any and every class of auxiliary types of war-ships afloat. In general terms, it should be understood that a battle-ship of the first class which will best fulfil the conditions for which she is required should preserve a comparative platform in any but the very worst weather; that she should keep

a steady course, and be perfectly controlled by the helm; that she should possess a large margin of surplus buoyancy and initial stability, and that she should be made as invulnerable as possible against all forms of attack likely to effect vital injury and to endanger the safety of the ship.

A brief examination of these leading conditions will suffice to reveal the weak points of our much-lauded white elephants, and will show how easily such overrated costly fabrics may be instantaneously destroyed. The first point to be noticed is that of preserving in battle-ships a comparatively steady platform, which is necessary to admit of their heavy long-range artillery being used with anything like precision.

It is an established fact that this desideratum is conspicuous by its absence, as all our battle-ships are, owing to their excessive top-weights, more or less noted for their heavy rolling proclivities in what would be considered by our ordinary merchant ships as moderate weather, and many of them are also liable to eccentric gyrations, alike dangerous to themselves and their consorts owing to defects in steering powers.

The *Resolution* furnishes a proof of the liability to rolling which is inherent, to a greater or less degree, in all our armour-clads, and her dangerous performances are of such recent date as not to need lengthy comment to refresh our memory. As an example of erratic and ungovernable movements when under weigh, the *Ajax* is the most notorious offender in the British Navy.

When this armour-clad underwent her steam and gun trials on Thursday, May 21, 1885, she proved herself to be a complete failure in design—nothing would keep her steady on her course. At times she required two and a half turns of starboard-helm, and at other times three turns of port-helm would not check her wild career; her course was serpentine, and she appeared to be turning circles, when, in reality, Captain Kennedy and Staff-Commander Hutton, under the direction of Admiral Corbett, were endeavouring to keep the ship to her course. On her passage round from Sheerness to Spithead she was anchored off Dover, as the danger of proceeding at night down Channel with such an unmanageable ship was considered too great. While at anchor she suddenly surged violently from side to side, parted her cable, like a wild beast might its chain, and drifted away with the tide. Captain Kennedy reported the *Ajax* to be a dangerous ship to be trusted with a squadron, and his prediction that, if sailed in company with other armour-clads, she would not fail to damage a number of her consorts, has proved too true.

The *Agamemnon*, a sister ship, is as bad, and many other of our line of battle-ships develop like defects.

The next point as to the preservation of a sufficient margin of surplus buoyancy and stability to ensure some immunity from the



risk of our battle-ships sinking or capsizing with alarming celerity, is one of the greatest importance.

Many of the ships of our Navy, which are classed as first and second class battle-ships, are officially restricted to harbour service or coast defence operations, because\* their liability to capsize in a sea-way is too great to admit of their making an ocean voyage; and all our other battle-ships, capable, with everything intact, of making such voyages with a fair prospect of safety, are liable in many ways to damage, which may be inflicted by accident or design, by reason of which their small margin of buoyancy would disappear, and the ponderous mass sink to the bottom; or the small amount of stability they possess be destroyed in a moderate sea-way, with the prompt result of the vessel capsizing in a few minutes.

The last point to be considered is that of making our battle-ships as invulnerable as possible against all forms of attack likely to effect vital injury and thus to endanger the safety of the ship.

Up to the present time the ideas of our Naval administrators and the efforts of our Admiralty naval architects and constructors have been solely devoted to the greatest endeavours to make the sides of our men-of-war, both above and near the water-line, invulnerable against the attack of modern marine artillery; and here, without gaining their object, our naval constructors have introduced dangerous elements in men-of-war designs, which, by their neglect to keep pace with the scientific modes of attack from time to time directed against the fragile under-water part of these top-weighted, unstable monsters, most materially assists the submarine aggressor in easily bringing about the inevitable destruction of these unseaworthy fighting machines. It is a matter of serious regret that men-of-war containing elements of such enormous offensive and defensive powers above water should possess such very weak points below the water-line wholly unprotected; and this is still more to be deplored when it is known that for a generation past these armour-clads have been from time to time designed and constructed by our Admiralty officials, in spite of the warnings of the best outside shipbuilding experts of the kingdom, and in defiance of, and in direct opposition to, all the acknowledged laws and rules of stability and safety so clearly established and made compulsory upon all mercantile ship-owners. The loss of the *Captain* and over five hundred souls, about twenty-five years ago, was due to the Admiralty officials neglecting to heed the grave warnings, and to accept the scientific proofs offered by the then Chief Constructor of the Navy, Mr. E. J. Reed (now Sir Edward J. Reed), K.C.B., F.R.S., M.P., as to the instability and unseaworthiness of this ill-fated ship.

The recent loss of H.M.S. *Victoria* is a case more fresh in the mind of the public, but, as Sir Edward J. Reed observed some time ago in the House of Commons, the catastrophe to the *Victoria* was neither unexpected nor unforeseen; at the same time this great

authority enumerated a long list of our battle-ships equally bound to fail in maintaining their stability if damaged in a similar manner.

Even on the occasion of the launch of the *Victoria*, Lord (then Sir) William G. Armstrong, the builder, said the development in modern artillery, naval mechanism, and armour-plating, which were so strikingly exemplified in the features of the great battle-ship, were hardly of a character to inspire confidence in the policy which inaugurated the construction of such war-vessels; and still more significant were the remarks of Lord Armstrong, when speaking in 1889 on the question of great battle-ship construction, he particularly expressed the disfavour with which he regarded the armour-class, and distinctly said, "They cannot be made invulnerable, and their cost is so enormous that we cannot have a numerous navy with such vessels."

The sum total of the whole of the trouble attending the safety of our first-class battle-ships is that, with the weight of guns and armour to be dealt with, a safe ship is practically beyond the naval construction department of the Admiralty, as instanced by the statements of the present Director of Naval Construction at the Admiralty, Mr. W. H. White (now Dr. W. H. White), C.B., and a Professor of Naval Architecture, made at the Institution of Naval Architects in 1889, when he said that "the integrity of the unarmoured portion of the ship's bottom lying below the armour is as essential to the maintenance of her stability as the integrity of the sides above the armour-belt; yet it is no exaggeration to say that very frequently when the greatest fears are expressed of what may result to the out-of-water portion of ships, it is virtually assumed that the parts under water are not liable to injury in action."

This brings us to the pith of the question as to the comparatively defenceless nature of our modern men-of-war, and it may be briefly summarised in explaining these inefficient battle-ships, constructed with gigantic and towering superstructures, carrying with them all the elements of top-heaviness and consequent instability.

As regards the *Victoria*, the conning tower was a massive superstructure plated with 14-inch armour perched high over the spar-deck, connected with 6-inch plated bulkheads which ran athwart the superstructure. The two 111-ton guns, with 18-inch armoured turret, were also at a considerable elevation; the redoubt, similarly armed, being at the same time above the water-line. In point of fact, every feature of this ill-designed battle-ship tended to enhance the probability of her swift destruction if previously wounded in a vulnerable spot, and that spot anywhere below her water-line about two-thirds the length amidship.

Other nations recognise the fact that such large battle-ships cannot be made invulnerable above water, and, profiting by the statements and opinions of such eminent authorities as Sir Edward J. Reed,

Lord Armstrong, Dr. W. H. White, and others, they are endeavouring to eliminate the dangerous features presented by such heavy top-weights as referred to for offensive operations and defensive measures to the out-of-water portion of the ship, and to give some better protection to the easily vulnerable and most vital under-water portion.

To this end the Russians have built the *Rurik*, armoured to the keel. Others are on the stocks, and these are unmistakable indications that complete protection to the under-water portions of the ship will in future be well considered abroad.

France, too, has not been slow to take the hint. The *Duguay de Laon* is armoured in the most complete sense of the word, as she is protected by 4-inch armour over the whole of her hull proper and over a part of her superstructure.

She differs from all modern ships of her class in that she is covered with what is practically a complete coating of armour.

There are now being built five other cruisers which partake of some of her leading peculiarities. But this complete coating of 4-inch armour is a poor expedient against the attack of torpedoes, as experts on explosives will tell us that the destructive effects of a torpedo explosion at a distance of ten feet from the hull of a man-of-war would be less than if the explosion were in close proximity to the hull of the vessel, protected as it might be by several feet in thickness of armour-plating.

The Americans are at work on the same lines, and the reason these three leading Powers are giving such attention to the protection to the under-water part of their battle-ships is because they are alive, not only to the exigencies and probabilities of ordinary torpedo-warfare as practised and developed for the last quarter of a century, but that they are also alive to the strides now being made in perfecting the diving and submarine torpedo-boats, whose deadly operations, unseen and unchecked, are directed against the bottom of a ship. Is it not now, then, time, in consideration of the altered modes of modern warfare and of the steady progress in the various forms of submarine attack, that our Government should obtain for the ships of the Royal Navy as much under-water protection as possible to preserve them from the diabolical combination of a submarine boat and torpedo attack? It is well known that many skilled advisers and practical inventors have frequently approached our Admiralty with offers of sound practical help, only to be treated with ridicule and contempt, and their patriotism with their inventions "sat upon;" and who have subsequently submitted their inventions to foreign Powers, where the inventors have been well received, to the benefit of the countries recognising the advantages of their inventions and to the great gain of those who had been snubbed in their own country.

There is also "the other side" of this bungling ridicule and contempt, when the departments of our Government, both at the Admiralty and the War Office, subsequently entreat the inventors to dispose of their patents to the Government of the day at a greatly enhanced figure. Such the history of the Whitehead torpedo depicts; and it is also illustrated by the Maxim-Weston gun, which was rejected by our authorities until recognised and adopted by foreign Powers, when our Government, as in many other such instances, had to pay double the price to the inventors of that for which the invention might have been originally obtained, to say nothing of the danger of such delays.

These remarks are *à propos* of one of the most important of modern inventions concerning the safety of battle-ships. This invention consists of a torpedo-guard for ships of war invented and patented by Dr. George H. Jones, F.R.S.L.

The guard is furnished with a movable outer steel-plate shield which can be applied effectually to protect the sides of a ship against not only the ordinary form of torpedo attack which the nets of the present system are intended, but utterly fail, to protect; and, further, this improved steel-plate torpedo-guard can be extended from the water-line to the keel to furnish a complete protection for the whole of the under-water part of a man-of-war; and this guard can be mechanically placed in and out of its operative position almost instantaneously by hydraulic power, which is so much used on board of men-of-war ships for working guns, &c.

Space will not admit of a detailed description of this valuable invention, and a technical account of its various excellent "points" would also perhaps not be suitable to the pages of this journal; but it will be sufficient to establish its great value to quote the indisputable opinion of Sir Edward J. Reed, who says: "In view of the enormous experimental and actual outlay in all navies of the world upon torpedo defences of mere network, it may be presumed that it is of vital advantage to arrest an approaching torpedo at a distance of several feet from the bottom of the attacked ship. These net defences are assuredly much inferior in many respects to the sheet-steel defence provided by Dr. Jones, especially as regards the relative quickness and efficiency of bringing them into and out of position—operations for which Dr. Jones makes provision by means of most ingenious, but perfectly sound, mechanical arrangements. Nor must I omit to mention that the torpedo-guard of Dr. Jones protects the bilges of the ship, from the keel outwards, in a manner wholly unapproached by the net system, or any other system with which I am acquainted."

If during a war this invention only saved, say, one iron-clad, which costs upwards of a million of money, besides the lives of the entire crew, the service rendered would be enormous.

## PHASES OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT.

### II.

THERE can be no doubt that the great source of difficulty and danger in all our social problems, is the fierce strength of those original passions, which the conditions of life (as was pointed out in the last article) have been fostering and inflaming by every means at command, from the beginning of history. Had it not been that during those centuries, an infinite number of rival powers and possibilities of man had also been developing, and thus drawing him away to other thoughts and other longings, the race would never have attained its present rank in the scale of nature. As it is, man's aspirations and his efforts are incessantly checked by the tyrannical presence of these internal enemies. Even institutions which he established for the supposed regulation of such tyrants have but added to their power.

Marriage, if it has produced a fair appearance which lulls our fears, forms an accredited model of a low standard of morality. By it we are taught that right and wrong are matters of legal ordinance or ecclesiastical ritual; that these constitute the real difference which divides saint and sinner. Men and women of the world, while respecting the convention for the sake of prudence, do not take it very seriously to heart; and what guide or principle is there for them to fall back upon, in the absence of any devotional faith or strong conviction? Without a standard founded on a spiritual truth, instead of on a legal fiction, they are in peril of offending not merely against the legal fiction but against the spiritual truth. Often indeed a devoted cultus of the outward sanctions cloaks consistent sacrilege against the real divinities. At the law's command sin is committed by estimable people for conscience sake!

The idea of compulsion—which is virtually the *raison d'être* of marriage, in its legal aspect—is in itself an offence against morality, seeing that (according to the more developed moral sense of latter days) the only sanction to the relationship that is worth anything is one that refers itself to the sentiments of the persons concerned; whereas if that emotional sanction exists, compulsion is unnecessary. In either case it is degrading in its very nature from the threat which it implies of enforcing the tie should it prove irksome. Instances of ideal marriages are not pertinent. They would not dissolve, one must suppose, though there were no legal necessity for

their continuance ; otherwise where is their ideal quality ? It is only the unsuitable, unhappy, immoral marriages that the compelling force of the bond affects. Moreover it teaches humanity a lesson that will have to be unlearned in pain and remorse : that a man can acquire over a woman, in a perfectly honest and acknowledged and respectable manner, claims well-nigh limitless : service of body and soul, boundless renunciation of ambition, health, life, hope,—nothing less than the extinction of the essential being is asked as a matter of common duty. It is undeniably hard upon the man who has married in the ordinary fashion, taking everything for granted as right and fitting, and the current standards as binding on him and his wife, if she shows tendencies to rebellion. He married with certain definite expectations, intending himself to fulfil what the same authority appointed as his duty, and he not unnaturally considers himself ill-used if these expectations are disappointed.

But what can be said of the institution which allows him to entertain the expectation of actual property rights in another human being, which are to bind and command that fellow-creature during the whole term of existence ? If a man were living in a community, according to whose laws and ideas he possessed a vested right to the services of slaves—his whole stake in life depending on them—it would be very hard on him, no doubt, if those slaves were to mutiny and he were to be left penniless. Why should he, who was at least no worse than others, be thus picked out for affliction ? He is honestly desirous, we will suppose, of doing his duty by his slaves, as he conceives it, and he cannot understand why they insist on shirking their part of what he regards as a right and natural arrangement. Yet one could scarcely inculcate it as a duty on the part of the slaves to remain enslaved in order to fulfil the expectations which his country had raised. That, nevertheless, represents the general idea on which is founded the present scheme of feminine morality. There is indeed a flaw in the analogy, but not so great a one as many will suppose, for the society which makes the livelihood of women mainly depend on their power of attracting men resembles in many of its conditions a nation which forces a whole race to earn its bread in slavery.

Scarcely more choice exists in the one case than in the other. Even where there has been nothing but inclination to prompt a marriage, the terms which bind the couple are compulsory and therefore the situation is analogous to a state of slavery which might be voluntarily embraced (care being taken to cut off all other means of livelihood), but once embraced was eternally binding in all its detail.

In these circumstances there can be no claim to fulfil the terms of marriage except as the law may compel. By tacit consent, such enforced conditions become null and void between honourable persons, who know that honour is involved only in fulfilling obligations entered

into without any sort of coercion, blackmail, or other form of penalty. Honour on the other hand *is* involved in not attempting to reap the benefit of such legal and moral coercion when it exists to our advantage.

All these conditions of bondage tend to the continuance of a low moral standard; the real test being always left by them entirely out of the question. This must be granted even if one were to admit the conclusion that nevertheless a standard lower still would follow the removal of such bondage. Admitting that to be the case, for the moment, how is it that we come to be writhing on the horns of this very awkward dilemma; so that the removal of the centre and sanction of one low estate should bring about a lower? Evidently we have to thank for this predicament the condition of average human nature. It is the savage in the civilised man who scares us from attempting to honour the relation of man to woman as we believe, in our hearts, it ought to be honoured. We submit to degrade that relationship, by our own confession, lest it should be delivered over to the desecrating fury of our tyrants, and so be degraded still more terribly. We pathetically try indeed to persuade ourselves that there *is* nothing debasing in these compulsory relations; we adopt a tone of great severity towards peccant individuals, whose duty it is, we insist, to put everything right, and make our creaking machinery turn smoothly. We blame *them* for anything that we perhaps acknowledge may be wrong and barbarous in their position, if they do not manage thus neatly to fit their feelings to the institution. It is a sad and dreadful thing, we admit, if husband and wife have to live together when entirely out of harmony; the wife perhaps submitting to the indignity of the position rather than injure the future of her children, or from fear of causing pain to her relations. Only—we ask in a severely virtuous spirit—why did she not show herself more unselfish and considerate, more successful as to *entrées*, more vigilant as regards shirt-buttons? Why were these unseemly and unfortunate feelings ever allowed to arise to the inconvenience of our excellent system? It is only the persons whom it concerns who are at fault, and they must continue to suffer for their mistakes and imperfections. The sabbath, in short, was not made for man, but man for the sabbath.

But it is not to attack the institution *per se* that these considerations are brought forward; it is to point emphatically from every side and every aspect to the element in human nature (in its present stage of growth) which creates at once the difficulties of reform and the dangers of quiescence. The difficulties of reform jump to the eyes; the dangers of quiescence are more hidden.

The system and sentiment at present dominant go on educating the race in habits of thought and action which are incessantly

encouraging the element in civilisation that is threatening its health and its very existence. And, at the same time, they perforce go on increasing the perils of reform. Our worst evils are merely branches of a tree which is rooted in our most respected traditions.

It is for that reason that we have to bestir ourselves to avert the fate that has overtaken so many nations after a certain stage has been achieved—decadence through corruption, or through failure to produce varieties of type.

It is inconceivable that a people can go on progressing while they continue to cripple half their numbers. A bird cannot fly long with a broken wing. It is significant that the flight of the creature so injured is not only halting and difficult, but it tends to return upon itself: to describe a painful circle, never making way with all its breathless exertions. The often cited fate of brilliant and apparently sound civilisations suggests significant reflections with this fact in view.

Now, if it be true, and assuredly it cannot be denied, that the present relations of the sexes are of a nature to encourage *non-human* instincts, through every channel of influence to which both are subject, and if it be also true (as is equally difficult to dispute) that progress depends upon the relative increase of authority and strength of the human as compared with the non-human elements, then the present order stands condemned. We are sure, at least, what we have to aim for, and we are not without guide as to how to take that aim.

We can, at any rate, learn by former mistakes that mere restriction is useless in the absence of persuasive and educating measures. Society has dealt with her problems after the fashion of a stupid schoolmaster, whose one idea is to guard against the inherent evil in his pupils by restraint and punishment, while making no attempt to alter the disposition to evil which in the last resort is ever the fault of circumstance. Society is indeed stupider than the stupidest schoolmaster, who at least does not deliberately make all his rules and all the conditions of school-life conduce to the encouragement of those faults and tendencies in his pupils which he thinks it necessary to guard against by means of corporal punishment. If he chastises the sinner, at least he has not left him altogether without defence against the inducements to sin. He does not lay a trap and then fall upon the victim with curses when he lies struggling in its grip.

Yet that is a parallel to the method by which society deals with the savage elements in its composition. These are accepted as unalterable; they are fostered and excited by the very fundamental constitution of our State, by our domestic theories and practice; and then, when the harvest of this is gathered in, we punish and restrict, and wail over the terrible iniquity of the human being, insisting on the necessity for more rigid enforcement of coercive laws. It would be scarcely more unreasonable to expose a man to perpetual infection of scarlet fever and indignantly punish him when he caught it. What



human being, who is not of heroic build, can hope to escape altogether from the combination against him of nature and mankind?

Indeed, even heroes do not always conquer. Heroism is not so very rare, but it is usually exercised in accordance with popular notions of duty; very seldom do we find the hero where he is not likely to be admired; not so much because he craves applause as because it has never struck him to wander from commended pathways. He can be heroic in obscurity, but not so easily in defiance of opinion.

A really good man—well up to and even beyond the standards of his day—may support with all his strength the ideas on which is founded the old system of barter, and commit deeds himself for the least of which he would consign a woman to outer darkness. His heroism seeks the well-worn tracks. Man still continues to believe that by altering names we can alter facts; that with predatory habits we can enjoy peace and security. He still hopes that, by some readjustment of the machinery of restriction, he is going, in the happy future, to reap a fine crop of figs from his luxuriant plantations of thistles.

In the movements of modern life, the supremely momentous question is whether we are to yield to the animal or to the human in our composition. That is to say: are we to consult what we are pleased to term man's nature (as our institutions have made it) and fit our moral standards to that regrettable consummation, or are we rather to take counsel of that element within us which we do not consider "natural;" the ideal and aspiring side of the being, which desires and conceives an existence impossible to us now only because men have made it so through their own faithlessness and their own subjection to "nature"?

If the body were a rigid affair of mechanism, whose habits and needs were absolutely unmodifiable, so that in hearkening to the human demands of our being it were necessary to sacrifice the physical welfare, the race would indeed have but little to hope for. But this is far from being the case. The body is a creature of habit. It can create for itself good habits and bad habits; needs which are purely artificial, yet as peremptory as the demand for food and air. It can, moreover, encourage a natural impulse so persistently as to bring it to the condition of an artificial and morbid necessity. On the other hand, it can emancipate itself from these claims—a process which, in the course of generations, might be carried to a far greater length than can be hoped for in one lifetime. The more common tendency, however, is to create needs, not to overcome them. The body can be brought into such a state by, for instance, immoderate habits of drinking that to cease the indulgence would cause terrific suffering, while to continue it means ruin to the health and destruction to the mind. Drunkards, and the victims of various narcotics, are extreme cases of such a

creation of artificial requirements. When the case *is* an extreme one of this nature, and the indulgence is not a universal habit but an occasional vice, nobody disputes that the demands thus engendered are unreal, or rather that real as they are to the sufferer, they are induced by his own weakness and do not constitute a primary condition of the race which social institutions must provide for. The needs of the drunkard and the victim of chloral are not taken into account in the organisation of the State.

But, let the habit be one in common practice, one that almost every man regards as indispensable to his well-being, then a very different attitude is assumed. In that case it must be treated seriously, as one of the final conditions of existence, although it may not be possible to deny that in its present state of development it plays havoc with the welfare of thousands and runs amuck in society as a wild beast that knows no mercy.

Such insane instincts, as a matter of fact, do exist among us, revealing their destructive ferocity in a thousand forms of suffering, sin, shame, and temptation. Not a living soul has entirely escaped some injury, hereditary or immediate, direct or indirect, from their lordship. Yet we are instructed to regard them as scarcely modifiable factors of existence. They recall to memory the fabulous monsters of ancient story, who used to ravage and destroy whatever crossed their path, carrying terror to the hearts of men, until at length some hero went forth to slay them. The monsters of to-day, unhappily, do not permit themselves to be slain so easily. They spit fire, as of yore; they rend and pierce and tear, but they are no longer to be overcome in one sharp struggle, after the fashion of their more worthy ancestors. It is through the mysterious forces of heredity that the evil gathers such unholy strength. It seems as if Nature had some mystic storehouse wherein she garnered secretly, moment by moment, the thousand influences of daily life; the lurings and compulsions of circumstance; and that these, accumulating silently and inexorably, became transmuted into living passions, imperious needs, which we are wont to call "natural impulses," and to accept in the same resigned spirit as that in which the Germans welcome typhoid fever, as part of the divine scheme. There is something appalling in the knowledge that because a man's grandfather allowed evil habits to grow upon him, that man is to be cursed all his life with some awful punishment; tormented, perhaps, with a strength of mere crude instinct entirely out of harmony with his whole character, causing him infinite struggles, unless the worse thing happen—again through the existence of some hereditary weakness—and he surrenders the human side of him to the encroachments of the animal.

It is equally appalling to realise that every man, woman, and child—stupid, weak, ignorant as each may be—is busy forming the

forces of heredity that are to determine the future world and to modify the present one. It is not only parents of children who take part in this work; parents of thoughts and of deeds are also called to "the making of the world."

We hand on our weakness and our cowardice, or our steadfastness and our strength, as the case may be; we encourage the growth of healthy, sweet, and rational living; or we lend our little aid to the encroachments of some pernicious habit, some unlovely custom, some ungenerous tyranny, some contemptible mode of thought which makes the better and more beneficent lives harder for others to lead. We oppress instead of liberating.

Some facts, while adding to the sense of moral responsibility, must make clear the utter folly of accepting the leading characteristics and passions of the average man of to-day as the final type of humanity.

We have seen how the conditions of society have given opportunity and encouragement to the primitive passions; and it needs but little perspicacity to infer that the standard of what is a necessary indulgence of such passions is likely to rise very high in these circumstances, just as a man's idea of the moderate and necessary amount of smoking or drinking rises with the facilities for gratifying these tastes. A fixed opinion gradually establishes itself that a man more or less *needs* these luxuries, and universal custom has even gone the length of establishing a strange idea among many that their health demands the use of alcohol, not as an occasional stimulus, but as a habitual prop to the system. Perhaps, after a time, they do arrive at such a morbid condition (and this applies, of course, not merely to alcohol), for one of the insidious dangers of these superstitions is that the artificially created needs become actual ones after a while, constituting a sort of disease which has to be propitiated by a form of food which increases the hold of the disease on the system. By what sign are we to know when an instinct is running riot in this fashion? Surely by the evils which it engenders, by the destruction of health, happiness, hope; by the obstacles which it opposes to a less corrupt state, by the confusion and distress that follow in its wake.

How far beyond the limit of the necessary has the race allowed itself to go in gratifying and sustaining those disastrous instincts?

If we are to judge by results, we must surely reply that the excess is at least as great as in the case of the victim of chloral or of opium, or of the habitual drunkard. Doubtless if it became general to indulge in these drugs, our standard of what was necessary, or at any rate of what no man could be expected to do without, would rise to the level that now regulates the supply of these slaves of habit. The obviously evil results would not dismay us. When a man falls down in an epileptic fit, we conclude that he has some-

thing wrong with him ; and that either his heredity or his conditions had been at fault. But if epileptic fits occurred by hundreds every day, and continued to do so persistently, the disease would soon cease to be regarded as a sign of anything abnormal or unnecessary. We might deplore the existence of epilepsy, but we should come to regard it as an accompaniment of existence and to smile at enthusiasts who supposed that society could exist without it. Something parallel to this has in fact happened with regard to some of the savageries that run riot amongst us. We see and regret their results, but we believe the evil to rest upon natural and necessary impulses which only dreamers can hope to see radically modified. Such being our melancholy conviction, we feel it unavoidable to continue to offer as propitiation to the ravenous monster an entire sex, and so keep him in riotous health and spirits and a preposterous appetite. As for our unequal, lop-sided attempts at restraint, the monster only regards them as affording him a little healthy exercise. He has all society for a happy hunting-ground.

If we find that the ferocity of primitive passions creates infinite and heart-breaking evils in the State, can we hesitate in pronouncing those passions to have gone far beyond the limit of the necessary? Have they not passed the limit of the endurable? Can we be so blind as not to see that their over-indulgence has engendered in the race a morbid condition which may very well be compared to that of the opium-eater? And if it be true that a resolute rebellion against their tyranny brings upon the rebel a stern punishment, is not this exactly parallel to the vengeance taken on the slave of a nerve-destroying drug? But even if this be denied (on the ground that the taking of drugs is not a natural but an acquired instinct), it can surely not be doubted that it would be entirely possible to modify the force of the "oceanic brute" in the constitution of the race, not merely by general cultivation of self-control (now a neglected department of education), but by the encouragement of desires which are more conducive to development and happiness. The average man appears to be pitifully lacking in mental resource. If he has not something to destroy, Time is his enemy. If in this frame of mind his forms of amusement are not more or less brutalising, he has not the wisdom of Society to thank. Her methods are all coercive rather than educating. Yet we recognise that the teacher who seeks to touch the mind and soul by attacking the body belongs to the dark ages. We are beginning glimmeringly to understand that we can only eradicate a habit or weaken an instinct by actually altering the processes of the intellect, of the conscience, of the will and, finally, of the physical constitution. The enemy has to be met and fought within the man's own soul, not merely by laws from without. The real triumph is to destroy the will and tendency to evil, or the desire to practise at the expense of others what might in itself be innocent.

It is idle to say that this is impossible, for the savage will to do evil has already been destroyed, even in defiance of the strongest passions, when influences were favourable to this conquest. We can only teach to any purpose when we have made the pupil willing to learn. And to this end his circumstances must conspire. There are in man many regions of the conscience as well as of the intellect still uncultivated. The elements of existence have to be remodelled in order to redeem these wastes. But to deny the possibility of redemption is to ignore the testimony of all history. The very fact that our conditions are so preposterous, so ruinous to all chance of a healthy moral life, is a ground for entertaining high hopes of human possibilities when these conditions shall be more propitious.

It is not beyond human power, though it may, in its first steps, be terribly difficult, to destroy the survival of the old purchase-system that now desecrates the relations of the sexes. But that accomplished, even partially—through the might of growing opinion—a universal change of standard would become inevitable. The whole matter is a question of standard. Imagine a troop of school-boys with a caged-of birds at their mercy. What sort of views would be likely to grow up amongst the boys as to their right to amuse themselves at the expense of the prisoners? Moral precepts would be in vain so long as the birds remained behind the bars. But release the captives, and the owners perforce cease their tyranny, and in a short time their conscience begins to harmonise with their lack of opportunity. That is the hopeful element in the matter, for sentiment is the real force that rules mankind.

The race has seen changes of feeling before now, great enough to alter the fate of millions for all time. The very nature of man has obediently adapted itself to the changed sentiment. New habits have arisen, old supposed necessities have disappeared; customs once accepted as right and needful have become disgraceful. There is no limit to the revolutions that have taken place in human sentiment and usage, nor is there any limit which it would be safe to assign to the developments that may take place in the future. A new opinion is even now confusedly arising regarding the relation of man to woman, even among many who insist that there is nothing wrong in the present system. They wear their rue with a difference. Just as many will read fresh meanings into old religious doctrines, so there is a strong tendency to take a new rendering of the doctrine on which rests these relations. In opposition to this more civilised feeling, "practical" minds point back to what are called the "facts" of human nature, for whose history we must seek during the centuries of man's absolute power over woman, and of his abuse of that power to his own and her age-long injury. In that simple fashion has this troublesome human nature been manufactured to the confusion of mankind. "Practical" philosophy—as usual on the side of

the devil—preached, and still preaches, the inevitable necessity of these depredations, and the belief (otherwise expressed) became firmly fixed: that the nature of man demands the martyrdom of woman.

It is often regarded as unfair to treat men as the only offenders; women, it is urged, are not so often sinned against as sinning, and they are generally the first to point out to men the descent to *Avernus*. This may be true or false; probably it is partly true, for the mere fact of womanhood does not provide an antidote to the moral poison that is inevitably generated by evil lives and evil thoughts. Such influences are subtle and penetrating, and it is not to be supposed that men can live corruptly and yet bequeath a pure heredity to their descendants, male or female. It is the system rather than the sex that deserves reproach.

If the fault is really to be laid at the door of women, then it is because of the training they have received at the hands of their fellows. Their field of life has been ruthlessly curtailed, and we must not be surprised if we find them trying to make the most of what is vouchsafed to them and practising the only permitted arts in a somewhat destructive fashion. In short, whichever may be the peccant sex, or whether both are equally culpable, the fact remains, that the real first cause of the corruption is the *position that one holds in respect to the other*. To bicker over minor sub-causes, to seek to weigh out blame with nicety, is merely to confuse the mind in the mazes of these intricate problems. Heap upon women all the reproach and leave men spotless, if so it be desired; the conclusion remains steady and unaltered that men's rule and women's subjection lie at the root of all the evil and distress.

That such results would follow from such antecedents might have been predicted *a priori*; we have long and painful experience to confirm such a process of reasoning.

Whatever may be thought as to the amount of blame attaching to women in these matters, it is, however, generally the nature of *men* that is indulgently considered when there is a question of methods of reform. Women may be regarded as sinful and as leading others in the paths of sin, but we hear nothing about the absolute necessities of *their* nature which would make changes impracticable; whence this distinction may be gathered: that a man's transgressions are regrettable necessities; a woman's, detestable aberrations, to be fiercely punished and rooted out.

Yet if women are equal to men in equity, how does it happen that they, too, have not imperious "natures" that must be indulged at all hazards?

It is impossible not to see the absurdity of assuming a certain State of the human constitution to be the result of an eternal and unalterable law when all evidence points to that state as the result of

man's own accumulated habits, these having reduced him to a condition of slavery, which offers him the choice between suffering himself or making others suffer for him. Probably this slavery is often endured because the man has been persistently trained to think submission inevitable. There is no enemy so awe-inspiring as one's own despair of victory.

If we are really to take human nature exactly as we find it, and provide respectfully for its manifold demands, heaven help our descendants! The imperious natures of our grandfathers called out for wine in such liberal quantities that they ended their repasts under the table. Thence the imperious nature of our gout. Truly a more insane mistake than that of consulting the mass of evil habits, evil heredity, evil instincts which flourish in that rich soil which our social system has provided for so many centuries, is hard to conceive; yet the practical person enjoys the credit of calm and mature judgment who assures us that in all these matters the nature of man must be our guide. It is in vain, he says, to oppose it. He forgets that just as an individual can found a robust dynasty of tyrants in his body and his soul, so can an entire race enthrall itself; in which case, however, be it observed, the demoniac possession will not be regarded as disease but as a normal state, which indeed it is, but not the healthy or the necessary one. The practical person is opposed to revolutions, even when directed against the tyranny of evil habits. When such habits engender gout and rheumatism and consumption and heart-disease, the sufferers have to bear their pains, for they have not yet found the means to thrust these things directly on to other shoulders (vivisection seeks to accomplish this indirectly); but when the folly and wickedness that circulate in the blood, bequeathed by the sins of ancestors, break forth in the form of fierce passions, then their force may be expended to the injury of other human beings who are plentifully provided by the foresight of society as its scape-goats. All pain and trouble thus are spared—for the moment—to the heir of the ages. He settles his account later on.

It may take some time yet to educate the human intelligence and moral sense to the point of understanding the inconceivable meanness of thus thrusting suffering on others, which fate has apportioned for oneself. An age which sees nothing devilish or dastardly in vivisection, is not in a condition to see that it is carrying out the same idea as regards certain doomed classes of humanity.

But all radical changes in society must depend so closely upon the difficult economic problems which the race will have to solve in some way or other, that it is impossible to project definite plans of what is called practical reform. Changes of this kind can only come gradually by the gathering together and the working together

of new sentiment and thought from all sides ; a process which seems slow, but which is very sure ; for the whole fabric of belief and usage becomes transmuted, atom by atom, till, looking back, the race finds that it has built for itself a new universe. The first thing needful is change of standard ; the education and the development that such a change would imply. Amendments of law would follow that of sentiment.

There is danger to be guarded against now as at all times of social movement. At these disturbed moments, when the in-harmony becomes intolerable between the condition of man's life in civilisation and his still unconquered barbarism, there is an outcry, not against the barbarism, but against the civilisation. Men blame the civilised state for the evil that is caused therein by the savageries which they have failed to extirpate ; and a cry is raised for a return to Nature. And Nature<sup>1</sup> is always waiting eagerly—like a hungry beast of prey on the outskirts of a populous city—to reclaim her own. She rejoices at the falling to pieces of the State which had defied her incessant endeavour to undo it ; in the voluntary surrender to the crude impulses which have always held the civilised in a state of siege.

She triumphs in the stupendous waste of power and effort implied in this retracing of the steep uphill road that has been trodden by so many weary feet, for so many troublous centuries. The fruitless agony and toil of Sisyphus, who has to watch the huge stone that he has so painfully thrust to the summit of the hill, blundering stupidly down again to the lowest point that its idiot weight unswervingly suggests : this is a sight after Nature's own heart.

In the progress from stage to stage of human life, there come inevitable epochs of confusion and darkness. Who does not know that the paths of development are full of shadowed places ? Man is naturally impatient of such obscurity. He hates to grope. He prefers to turn his steps backwards. He cries out for a return to original wild conditions, because he finds evils and suffering in the conditions of a still very superficial civilisation. He indolently justifies the cruelties, the terrors of life, the torture of the weak by the strong, the rule of man over woman by the authority of Nature. It does not disturb him that the existence of the State, as such, depends upon a *departure* from Nature and from elementary impulse. Throughout the universe, he urges, the same natural law holds sway ; let not the weak, above all let not woman, seek to evade it. But that is exactly what every progressive being *has* to do if he wishes to avoid degeneration. That is what the merest vegetable has to do if it is to escape the atavism that sets in as soon as it has to resign itself to the processes of wild nature. All its complexities

<sup>1</sup> Nature is here used in its usual popular sense of primitive impulse and law, unmodified by human intelligence or moral development.



of structure, the glorifications of its original forms and organs disappear, and it reverts to a weedy undeveloped growth struggling for standing room with a host of unkempt brothers in adversity. Nature has no mercy on those who yield themselves to her dominion. She bids the very flowers of the field bring forth millions of seeds that one may survive; she raises myriads of strong young lives where there is no possibility of their continuance; lives of plants, lives of men—it is all one—full of yearning and the mysterious “will to live,” yet foredoomed to slow processes of death.

In opposition to the widely-accepted theory that whatever is natural is always right, it would be almost safe to assert that whatever is natural is certain to be wrong. It is unquestionably by becoming less and less “natural” that the human being becomes more and more tolerable. It is by presenting to the imagination a new method of diverging from the tame and barren wastes of “Nature” unredeemed that a new step of progress is begun.

There has been a very strong tendency of late to an entirely opposite view, although those who hold it allow their bosom’s lord to sit lightly on its throne, for they do not after all believe that society ought to return to entirely natural conditions which would commend the adventurous highwayman and the sturdy house-breaker to the support of a wise government.

There are, however, some who go even to this length, holding that we suffer from over-civilisation, and that it is folly to protect the weak against the strong, since such protection confuses the action of natural selection and enfeebles the race. They are prepared to defy the fact that in a community where each man had to be perpetually on the defensive and perpetually at war, he would have time and mental leisure for very little else, so that art and industry must languish. Then “Nature” would have a gala time of it! The intelligent mechanic, whose conversation with her father Emma Hooker Woodward records, perceived plainly the aims of Nature, and how entirely artificial was the condition induced by education in any form; for when asked why he opposed “the Act that brought it within reach of the poorest,” his answer was, “I go agin it on principle, Sir; not because of its unconstitutionality, but because it’s onnat’ral. Ign’rance is nat’ral,” he said, “we was born ign’rant and ought to be kep’ so.” This is undeniable. The intelligent mechanic was only more logical and dauntless in his application of the principle than others who hold the same creed.

Either, then, we must take primitive nature for our guide, submitting to the dominion of brute force and to the tyranny of our own undisciplined instincts, or we must chose a gentler sovereign. In the second case, we should obey Nature only when her crude compulsion proved too strong for the resistance of weaklings enervated by the centuries of obedience which our ancestors have devoted to the

barbaric goddess. In defying her power, on the other hand, we should make progress in the *human* direction, adding in some sort to the creation, as an artist adds to it who brings form and being out of inchoate material.

There is no question more difficult for man to answer than "What is good?" or "What is evil?" It is utterly false to assert that every man knows in his heart, in each case, the right from the wrong.

At critical moments the power of early training and the prejudices of his race assert themselves as oracles, unless their exact opposites have usurped their function through a violent reaction. But if in particular cases the decision be difficult, there is a general analogy between what we may call good, and that which is in its nature organising or creative. Order, balance, form, method, life; these, in the sentient world, are beneficent; while disorder, aimlessness, formlessness, disruptiveness, incoherence, death, stand on the other side as evil. Now nature—in the sense of primitive impetus—is the high priestess of all that is fortuitous and incoherent.

Imagine for a moment the career of one who really allowed her guidance unresisted. And imagine the still more appalling fate of a whole society which accepted her counsels without question. In such a case, almost inconceivable, the man and the race must instantly undergo a process of spiritual disintegration till reduced to their original raw material. They have suffered moral death which they courted. The glory has departed from them.

Of course "good" and "evil" are terms relative to human consciousness. The race progresses in its conception of good; it develops finer and subtler notions of moral loveliness and is less satisfied with primitive standards. In a healthy state, the creative forces are at work; it forms, and fashions, and sustains, showing a marked contrast to the decadent condition when everything grows slack, falls apart, slips back towards chaos. If a man is to extend the limits of his universe he has to build up a larger consciousness. This can certainly never be done under the guidance of primitive natural impulses. Man has to escape from the vicious circle of these, or to remain a prisoner for ever in a narrow dungeon.

\* For him the universe exists in vain. An image of an ideal human soul might perhaps be found in that masterpiece of ancient art: the Pantheon, whose serene magnificence overwhelms while it soothes the imagination. Its vastness and its grandeur are detailed with infinite richness of subordinate beauty, sustaining without disturbing the general splendour of the great temple through whose stupendous and shadowy dome the blue of heaven is seen by day, and at night the stars look down.

Life may be to a man a temple or a hovel, according as he permits the enslaving or the liberative forces of his being to obtain the mastery. Our present life, in the heart of civilisation, is a fierce

struggle between these elements—between the original idiocy of savage appetite and the acquired wisdom of less material aspiration. We are at once too civilised and too barbarous not to find the present conditions almost intolerable. We cannot rest content with the half animal, half human standards that form our social organisation; the human in us is strong enough to be wounded and outraged by the barbarity that surrounds us still; but we are not sufficiently human as yet to insist on the extirpation of that savage basis to our existence. Not a breath is drawn by the noblest of the race which is not drawn involuntarily at the expense of pain or sacrifice to some other being. It is scarcely possible for any one to escape this curse which rests upon the human family. Were we more wholly savage we should feel no pain in these conditions. The beast of prey probably finds life very satisfactory, and he is not tormented as we are by the thousand incongruities, inequalities of development in our own nature and in that of the race, which disturbs so cruelly the life of the civilised. The more we develop, the more keen will be the anguish that we shall suffer from these survivals; but the more broad and full and exquisite our power of enjoyment. All change in the direction of greater complexity has seemingly to be accomplished through struggle and unrest, and often through sin and failure and humiliation. This conflict is the secret of half the pain of life.

Thus, in an age called materialistic, we are forced back with stronger impulsion than ever to belief or to hope in some power that is formative and coherent beyond and in man's own soul (or whatever we may choose to call that which we all more or less imply by the latter word). That this soul is itself, to all appearance, at the mercy of external conditions is certain, yet it gives man the only hold which he has over their formation, and the only means of influencing his fate.

Existence seems to be like a chain of infinite length with link depending on link, in eternal sequence, man himself and man's soul included in the endless coils, whereof he can never find beginning nor middle nor end.

Thus considered, Nature does not stand apart from man, for man— aspiring, progressive, victorious over primal impulse—is still a part of Nature and obedient, in a higher sense, to her dictates than he ever was in the infancy of the race. So that if we regard Nature in this wider sense as including all that the universe contains, or all that the powers of man can ultimately perceive or command, he is not in real revolt against her when he ceases to be a half-redeemed savage. Nature will not, in the long run, punish him for such emancipation of the god within him from the idiot who has carried on for so many ages his senseless rule.

She will acknowledge and bow to the divinity. She has shown her approbation of man's progress in a thousand ways, and in

ways most unexpected. The man who is the outcome of civilisation, with all the evil conditions that he has therein to contend with, through stupidity and ignorance, with all the thousand foes to health and sanity that surround him in the restless life of modern communities, that man is yet stronger, physically, than the savage who has lived what we call a natural life from his infancy, and has a long line of ancestors who so lived behind him. The nervous force in the savage, while it has endured fewer shocks, has received less cultivation and discipline. It is in nervous organisation that the civilised are more complex, more highly wrought, more lords of themselves. Thus, while the latter are, it would seem, incomparably more sensitive, more capable of pain, than their untutored brothers (who undergo ordeals that would be torture to ourselves, with scarcely a sign or a groan), yet if it be a question of endurance of hardship over a long period, when courage of what may be called the nervous kind is required, then the civilised man lasts out where the savage succumbs almost immediately. His actual physical strength is less than that of the civilised in such conditions. He seems to stand to the educated, more complex example of the race, as a straggling weed stands to a cultivated plant, whose qualities have been artificially improved by intelligence and art.

There is no mistake greater than to suppose that savage man is stronger and healthier than civilised man. The latter suffers indeed from his own follies and sins; from the persistence with which he lives, and forces others to live, in circumstances which every handbook of physiology assures him are inimical to body and mind; yet, with all those easily removable disadvantages, the general education of nerve and mind that he has received has ended by producing a more physically efficient human being, who has *not* been made to pay for spiritual advance by bodily degeneration. It is not spiritual advance, but spiritual blindness that he has had to pay for. It is a fact full of hope and significance; that sane, steady, mental activity of any kind, so long as it be not carried on under conditions of anxiety, or pushed to wild excess, has a strengthening and life-giving influence upon the body, tending to the balance and regulation of its forces.

All this tends to show that the dictates of primitive nature are not by any means the best guides to physical well-being. And if this may be said of the savage whose surroundings are in harmony with such promptings, how much more must it be said of the civilised man, whose conditions clash so infinitely more with the following of the non-social passions? Can one not foresee possibilities of human development on the same lines as that which has already taken place? Instead of physical degeneration in consequence of the more highly organised life which a progressive civilisation demands, there is every promise of indefinite development.

even in physical powers and health ; probably in length of life and in prolongation of youth. These things follow if the others be true. It may appear Utopian to expect so much, but so would have seemed a prophecy of the conditions and sentiments of our present state (with all its troubles) to the most hopeful of our ancestors.

As for the change being impracticable, changes have always been impracticable until they took place. Let not *that* dismay us !

It will be said that such standards, in hopeless opposition to the strongest impulses of the human being, are absolutely useless when we have to deal with the desperate and complex problems of society. Human nature, as it now is fashioned (through whatever causes), is too fierce an animal to be tamed thus by means of transcendental principles. A man cares not how he came by his passions, all he wants is to gratify them.

But this is not true. It is the perennial mistake of what we call the practical mind. History is a tissue of transcendental principles solidified into national religions, aspirations, policies, movements, laws, conventions, revolutions. From the day when human beings formed into communities, they began to fashion for themselves standards which referred them to some object more or less raised above that of mere greed and selfishness. The idea of the tribe gave a centre for feeling not self-directed. From the beginning, it is almost safe to say, there has been a religious element in human society, different from that mere terror or desire to propitiate an unseen foe—generally at the expense of some weaker brother—that we have been accustomed to call by that name.

And it is a striking fact that for the sake of this religion, men have shown themselves able to defy the most powerful instincts of their nature.

There is no normal propensity that is really beyond control, even in the present chaotic and excited condition of human propensities, with all heredity and all circumstance to strengthen them. At the command of perhaps one man, dead centuries since, whole nations order their lives even as to what they shall eat and what they shall drink and wherewithal they shall be clothed. Some prophet whose very existence is so enveloped in clouds of legend and fable, that the man himself seems scarcely more than a fable, can hold in thrall vast lands and populations, century after century ; promise, threaten, command ; dictate beliefs, actions, abstentions, to millions of his fellows. At his voice, calling for ever across the ages, "natural instincts" crouch down in submission and passions subside ; the animal is conquered and the man is born.

Once more, mankind is *not* the slave of primitive instinct, except when mankind so wills it. It is not instinct but emotional belief that has moved the world. Instinct has troubled, harassed, and often unfashioned that which human faith and mind and sympathy

have built up, but it has not played the leading part, or we should not now be in a position even to discuss the matter. We should all be scalping our enemies round some forest fire, and employing what faint glimmers of intelligence we possessed to add to the extremity of their tortures.

The world is ruled through the creeds of mankind; and those creeds are woven, strand after strand, by the ceaseless efforts of individuals, most of whom are unconscious that they are thus plying the immortal business of the Fates.

MONA CAIRD.

*August 1892.*

## CHURCHMEN AND THEIR POLITICS.

DR. JOHN BROWN, in a fine piece of psychology, has pointed out that, with experience, pity in medical students ceases to be an emotion, and becomes a motive. So it is with other emotions; they cease in time to be emotions, and become motives. The democracy is undergoing this process, with the indignation which the bishops kindle by their persistently wrong politics. There is no great outburst of fury when their lordships ardently support Cæsarism and Coercion, when they do their best to worsen betterment, to nip educational projects in the bud, and in general to continue the policy which led their predecessors to uphold fraud and rotten boroughs. The indignation is all there, but it does not express itself in shrieks and vituperation. It has become a motive, and the motive is a settled determination to curtail the power which has been so continuously used on the side of purple, power, plunder, and privilege.

The abuse of political power by our unfatherly fathers, and their constant effort to thwart the desires of the people, has become so common that, however indignant we feel, we are never in the least surprised at them. We take it as a matter of course. And yet how astonishing it really is! For one has but to glance at the political and social teaching of the primitive Church, about which we hear so much and know, as a rule, so little, to discover that the early Christian writers took quite a different line. Indeed, it is doubtful whether even the Radical papers would cheerfully report the strong language of the Fathers, and it is certain that the zealous police would truncheon the aureoled heads of many of the saintliest writers of the first four centuries, if they could be resuscitated, and taught modern newspaper English, and be set to talk in Trafalgar Square. Yet these are the writers whom our bishops admire, and are supposed to read in the learned privacy of their palace libraries. This is the period of Church history to which all parties look with satisfaction: and, if one wants to please a bishop and make him purr and throw out sparks, one has to stroke him with the compliment that he is a successor of the Apostles, not only in that part of him which fills a chair, but in head, heart, and lips.

And yet the early Church was an entirely socialist affair. That was the view of her enemies, and that was certainly the view of her friends. It is quite impossible else to account for the great waves

of persecution. Atheism, Thyestian banquets, and immorality generally might be pretexts, but they could hardly be causes of persecution in the Roman world of Lucian and Juvenal. Nor when the ten thousand beast, reptile, spirit, planet, and monster religions were easily tolerated would the worship of a man-god be objected to, unless it were that the Christian worship belonged to the *cerimonia illicita*, the worships which contradicted the spirit of the constitution. Hence, on the one hand, the test applied to sift out tumultuary Christians from among the law-abiding and loyal subjects was the sacrifice to Cæsar; and, on the other, the Christian emblem of the dove, the lamb, &c., can only be explained by reference to the political emblems of the conservatives of the empire—the eagle, wolf, and the like.

The Roman notion of the Church was that she was a secret and seditious society, likely any moment to bring about the thing which Romans most dreaded, a slave war; and, though it was not true that she would ever countenance an appeal to the clumsy weapon of her enemy—viz., the sword—the Romans were thus far exactly right that the foundations of their society were being sapped, and knowingly sapped. The Christian apologists in vain asked what riots, what insurrections, what conflicts with the military could they point to? In vain they pleaded that they prayed for the Emperor, for they prayed that he might become such as themselves; and that meant that he and the society which he represented should cease to be all that was to them most honourable.

Domitian fairly represented the opinion of Roman society. His great notion of Christ was that He was a pretender to the empire, and when some of our Lord's collateral descendants were discovered they were given a State trial as treasonable persons, and contemptuously acquitted because of their horny hands and the fact that they lived off some mean little allotments and had no income to speak of, and looked for a heavenly kingdom, not one upborne by legions. Nevertheless, one of the family, says Hegesippus,<sup>1</sup> was actually crucified later on on suspicion of treason.

The more we examine into this question the clearer does it become that, though the Church was pacific enough, she was a most revolutionary body, such as our bishops would abhor and shudder at and vote against with all their power. There is a notion about that the Christian faith, especially in its pure and primitive forms, confined its aspirations to "the skies," and the secularist working-man considers that the office of the bishops and clergy is to be sky pilots. But this not uncalled-for jeer is precisely the one which Christian apologists used to cast at their pagan opponents. Justin Martyr<sup>2</sup> incidentally gives his view of the Word, that where human law failed in making men righteous and just to one another, Christ had stepped

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Eusebius, iii. 20 and 22.

<sup>2</sup> *Apol. c. x.*



in to make up our political and social deficiencies, not to conduct us to "the skies." His Assyrian pupil, Tatian, put forth an oration against the Greeks, and ridiculed them as sky pilots.<sup>1</sup> "While you are staring up to heaven, you tumble into the ditch," he says. It was the political anomalies as much as the baseness of Greek moral life which made Tatian a Christian. In the modest barbarian Scriptures he lighted upon he found not "sky pilotage," but principles which could deliver the world from slavery, and rescue us from our numberless tyrants, and give us what God has sent but human error prevents us from having.<sup>2</sup> Hermias, the philosopher, too, mocks at the Greek philosophers, even at Plato himself, for their other-worldliness; and this is also the criticism which afterwards struck St. Chrysostom when he compared the republics of Plato and of Christ, that the former was far too other-worldly. The attitude of our bishops is to this extent Platonic!

From the very first the Church declared war upon social injustice and the anarchy stereotyped in laws which are but conspiracies of covetousness. Her teaching did not stop short at the individual life, nor did she think that social health and a satisfactory sewage system could be arrived at by each man merely sweeping the dust off his own doorstep and on to the next man's compound. St. Clement of Rome<sup>3</sup> orders the Christians not to stop at cleansing themselves from injustice and covetousness, "for not only those who do these evil things are detestable to God, but those, too, who compromise with them and acquiesce in them." He saw<sup>4</sup> that the sympathy, which is of the essence of the faith, was inconsistent with the money-grubbing on which our commercial system is built, and which our modern bishops not only treat tenderly but uphold tenaciously. St. Clement's notion of "the other world" is that it is a thing which is here and now and at war with this world.<sup>5</sup>

Or shall we take St. Barnabas' Epistle? A large section of the Church, and that not the least educated and critical, used to hold this book as genuine and canonical. The writer<sup>6</sup> says, almost in the words of the Rev. Stewart Headlam, that those who come to the Holy Communion are bound to be Holy Communists. "Thou shalt communise in all things with thy neighbour, and not call things private property; for if ye are communicants in what is imperishable, how much more should ye be in what is perishable?" Would my lord of London licence such a revolutionary apostle, or make him an archdeacon? St. Ignatius, the little child who sat on Christ's knee, was the apostle of Unity, and included in that idea the notion we now call Unionism. Blacklegs were his *bêtes noires*, and he certainly believed that the grace of our Lord was a thing that would burst the fetters of social tyranny.<sup>7</sup> My lord of Wakefield

<sup>1</sup> *Contra Græcos*, 26.

<sup>2</sup> *Ep. ad. Corin. I.* (Gebhard's ed.), c. xxxv. 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* II. vi. 3.

<sup>6</sup> *Ep. Barn.* c. xix. 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 29.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* II. v. 4.

<sup>7</sup> *Philadelph.* vii.

has lately issued a feeble pastoral bleat to the locked-out miners in his diocese. He is shocked that they have destroyed some property ; but confesses he does not know the rights and wrongs of the strike. But St. Ignatius says that this is a note of heresy, of heterodoxy from the grace of Christ, not to bother oneself about the victim of oppression, about folk's slavery and emancipation, hunger and thirst.<sup>1</sup> No doubt the bishop does not know about these things, and it is perhaps hard to single him out for chastisement ; for none of these right reverend gentlemen do know, or even want to know, about such matters (if we except my lords of Durham and Chester), although St. Ignatius does say that carelessness about social wrongs is a note of heresy. St. Polycarp considered an overweening affection for endowments to be the exact opposite of the faith, which is the mother of us all. He is the apostle of unworldliness, and his social message is, therefore, that the panoply of social justice must be put on, whatever endowments have to go ; and indeed the endowments, or the want of them, to which he draws the attention of the clergy, are those which God has provided for the sick, widows and orphans, and the destitute, and which he wants elders to look after. He does not mention benefices, by the way.

Now we all are aware that bishops have to be chosen from the wealthier classes, which may of itself account for much defection from the primitive spirit. They have to be chosen from among men with large private incomes. But such men were spoken of very rudely by the primitive Christians. The Shepherd of Hermas<sup>2</sup> thinks that even the godlier among them are like round stones, impossible to build into the fabric of the Church triumphant until they be pared. Clement of Alexandria thought that the mere possession of riches tended to push a man off the strait path,<sup>3</sup> and he even wrote a treatise to discuss whether such an one could be saved. There is some suspicion of the genuineness of this treatise, we must admit, because he a little stretches the words of the New Testament in favour of the plutocratic Neoplatonists, and decides that there is a bare chance for the very very spiritual wealthy. Neoplatonists, we may remark in passing, had about as much to do with Plato as Bible Christians have to do with the Bible and Christianity. Our bishops, of course, have to be gentlemen. Even the puritanical angel of the Church of Liverpool would not have been promoted if he had not been, as he constantly reminds us, educated and taught manners in the genteel academies. But the long lost Aristides<sup>4</sup> tells us that class distinctions were not recognised in the Church in his day. Justin Martyr's view of social inequalities is not that they entitle men who are richer to rank above their fellows, but that the second great commandment will cause Christians to aim at equality in such

<sup>1</sup> *Ad. Smyrn.* vi. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *De Divite Servando* (Dindorf), p. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Via.* iii. c. 6.

<sup>4</sup> *Apol.* xv.

matters, "for the man who loves his neighbour as himself will want for the latter the good things he wants for himself, and he will try both by prayer and effort to get these for his neighbour, if he loves him."<sup>1</sup> He goes further still, and declares that Christ, when He made carpenter's works, was symbolically teaching the necessity, justice and duty of an active life,<sup>2</sup> not the life of learned and padded leisure which entitles a modern priest to promotion.

The early Christian writers are very strong on this question of equality. No Radical working-man could say things more emphatically than they do—no, not Mr. John Burns himself. They not only dash and dot the texts of the Bible which teach this doctrine, but they even press other texts into the service. Take, for instance, Clement of Alexandria's *Miscellanies*;<sup>3</sup> in the fifth book where he is pleading that Pythagoras was a student of and plagiarist from the Old Testament. "But Pythagoras poetically sums up the Mosaic teaching," he says, "when he bids us not turn the yoke (*zugon*) of the scales"—*i.e.*, in the distribution of wealth we must so respect justice that we must not overstep equality.

"Friend leans on friend, and State depends on State,  
Each comrade bears about his comrade's fate:  
Equality is man's most natural law.  
But always strife and days of war abide,  
When Have and Have-not dwell here, side by side,"

as it is poetically put. It was, in this sense, that the Lord said "My yoke (*zugon*) is easy and light:" and to those who were competing about precedence, he gave one straightforward word of command—equality; he told them to become as little children. Likewise the Apostle writes "that in Christ none is slave or free, Greek or Jew, for the new creation in Christ is non-competitive and non-covetous, and is a just equality." This writer indeed is as strong as St. Polycarp was before him, and as St. Chrysostom was after him, in his hatred of covetousness, which he regarded as the very citadel of all vices.<sup>4</sup> But who ever heard our bishops speak against thrift, enterprise, advertisements, spirited foreign policies, and other forms of this same covetousness? For covetousness, as used by these writers, means a desire to get more than our faculties can respond to.<sup>5</sup> This is St. Chrysostom's explanation of *pleonexy*, which was not quite the same vice as *philargury*, the sin which reveals itself when our episcopal wills are sworn under some huge sum.

It is impossible to escape the conclusion that the teachers of the early Church had very decided political convictions, and those the very opposite ones to the tentative and timid prejudices of the

<sup>1</sup> *Dial. cum Tryph.* 95.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* reading *ἐνεργῆν*.

<sup>3</sup> Migne, *Cl. A.*, vol. ii., p. 54.

<sup>4</sup> *Vide Paul.* Lib. ii. 70; *Strom.* v. 260; *Pred.* iii. 7.

<sup>5</sup> On Acts. xxv.

modern bench. The Greek writers, being finer and bringing their thoughts to finer issues, are less obviously teaching political theories, and John Bull will not easily believe that the disposal of the whole pudding of the world hung on the letter *o* or *i*, in the Homocousion controversy. But it was so. The Arian movement was, as John Henry Newman often pointed out, the attempt which the world made to master the Church from within. Foiled in the attempt to subdue the new Society and the new social Order from without, the conservative spirit tried to pare down the divine humanism of the faith, till property and possession should be able to hold their own as of yore. The result was Arianism: and if St. Athanasius speaks in phrases too subtle for our blunt minds to understand their political import, nevertheless they had a decided political import. The Greek writers all have this disadvantage when they address an English audience. They are people who love universal ideas. It never strikes them that people can, for instance, heartily and honestly subscribe on every Sunday to the command to love one's neighbour as oneself, and pass the rest of their days in trying to bankrupt and beggar him, and yet all the while possess no consciousness of hypocrisy. Therefore, the Greek writers, as a rule, lay down principles, and it is when we get to the Latins that we find those principles applied; for the Latin audience, like the modern English audience, did not quickly and clearly and at once apply the principles to details. When Clement of Alexandria<sup>1</sup> caps Mr. Joseph Chamberlain's *mot* to the landlords about ransom, by declaring that all private property is, spiritually speaking, ransom, he does not think his audience will need him to weave that opinion into detail. His old world audience could do that for themselves. Origen, whose natural sympathies were with the aristocracy of intellect, yet frankly recognises<sup>2</sup> that God the Word taught a democratic doctrine of Equality, which the Church so received that "in orthodox churches, especially in the larger towns, of the leaders of God's people, none is afore or after other, no not even excepting the highest saints." He expects his readers to deduce at once, that inequalities outside the Church are contrary to that Divine Word, but does not expand the thought for his quick-witted hearers. So St. Hippolytus<sup>3</sup> merely lays down the rule that thrift and saving beyond the needs of the day is inadmissible. He had no need not to add, "This principle strikes at the accumulation of capital in private hands." It was obvious.

But when one comes to the Latin writers one finds a more "practical," or actual vein. Our three favourite Fathers, whose folios one finds on every English bookstall, are Tertullian, because he was a bit of a Paritan; St. Cyprian, because he was rude to the

<sup>1</sup> *Ped.* iii. 17.

<sup>2</sup> In Matt. viii. 56 (§ 784, Migne).

<sup>3</sup> In Matt. vi. 11. (frag.).

Pope; and St. Augustine, because his ideas were clear, unpoetical, and to some extent necessitarian. Now there is not one of these whom Bishop Ellicott would not have ducked in the horse-pond, whom Archbishop Maclagan would not inhibit, and whom his Grace of Canterbury would not rebuke with chastened sigh for setting classes and masses by the ears by mischievous communist teaching, abhorrent alike to landlords, merchants, and the plumper clergy, and grateful only to the lapsed masses, who never come into contact with our bishops unless when they come and burgle and drink the claret. Tertullian<sup>1</sup> points gleefully to the fraternity and absence of caste which is a note of Christians. The pagans thought them mad, but the apologist exclaims: "Why we even call you brethren too, by the tie of Nature our common mother, though you are scarcely men, being so unbrotherly. How much more worthily are they called and held as brethren who have got to know a common Father—God; who belike have drunk the common spirit of holiness and trembled from a common womb of ignorance into a common light of truth. But perhaps you think us hardly legitimate, for in our fraternity there are no startling tragedies, or because we are brethren in those very matters of family income which, with you, tear fraternity to tatters. Yes, we who are collectivists in mind and spirit, do not balk at common property holding. All things are joint property with us except wives"—for Christian socialism, as he sarcastically tells them, ends where the socialism of the world usually begins, in the sexual relation. Again Tertullian<sup>2</sup> condemned the rich as such, and, unlike *De Divite Servando*, justified the poor *quâ* poor as by their very state closer to Christ, who always justifies the poor and always contemns the rich beforehand. As for St. Cyprian,<sup>3</sup> he emphatically laid down a Christian theory of property which is in line with that of the English Land Restoration League. "Whatever is of God is common to our use, nor must any one so appropriate his benefits and gifts as to prevent the whole human race from an equal enjoyment of the divine bounty and generosity. Thus equally for all the day lightens us, the sun shines, the shower waters, the wind blows, and a common slumber comes to the sleepers, and the shining of the stars and of the moon is collective property. By this example of equality the man, who owns in the world rents and profits which he shares with the fraternity, being himself by his free gifts both common and righteous, is an imitator of God the Father." Is it possible to doubt which way St. Cyprian's Acts of Parliament would have tended, if these were his sentiments when he had no power over the laws?

Lactantius,<sup>4</sup> too, speaks with no uncertain sound in his books on

<sup>1</sup> *Apol.* Oehler ed. § 39.

<sup>3</sup> *Traact. de Opere et Eleem.*

<sup>2</sup> *De Patient.* vii.

<sup>4</sup> *Div.* v. *De Justitia*, 5, 6.

Justice. He is talking about the golden age and how then the land, capital, means of production and exchange, and even wages, were "nationalised"; and the mad blind covetousness of competitive materialism had not yet put up everything to sale. He quotes these lines of Virgil, which more than any other sum up the Socialist's aspirations:<sup>1</sup>

"Ne signare quidem, aut partiri limite campum,  
Fas erat: in medium querebant."

"Yes," he says with a sigh, "all this old story means a glimpse the poets had of true religion, which means that man holds man dear, and sees his fraternal interdependence with him, for God is the common Father of all. But," he goes on, "God sent His Son into the world that men should not wander thus for ever again, and with Him came back a vision of that golden age and Justice returned to the earth, though she revealed herself only to a few people."

St. Ambrose<sup>2</sup> thought much the same. He objects to a definition of justice, as "the using of communal goods for public ends, and private property for private ends. It is unnatural, he thinks, for Nature lavished all things for the common property of all. Yea, and so, too, God bade all things spring forth for there to be common food for all, and that the land should be for all a kind of communal possession. Nature then made common right; a seizing of her gifts made private ownership."

St. Augustine<sup>3</sup> comments upon the cxxxii. Psalm and third verse by a little lecture, such as one can hear from the Fabian Society, but never from the dignitaries of the Church, upon the utter peril and danger and spiritual mischief of private property compared to communal property. It is the cause of law-suits, hatreds, rows, wars among men, risings, faction fights, scandals, sins, wickednesses, homicides. And no wonder the Psalmist, if he wanted to find a place for God, could not do so, if He went up into his own house. We do not quarrel ever about the air and the sun, which are common property for our lungs and eyes. "Do let us give up private property, dear brethren (or if that is practically impossible, from the love of it), and we make then a place for the Lord."

One could go on at great length showing how the Apostolic communism, which modern clergymen belittle and pooh-pooh, was enthusiastically taken up by Father after Father, and how, when heretics such as Epiphanes,<sup>4</sup> exaggerated it into the Platonic community of wives, they were rebuked for their lewdness, but never for their communism. St. Chrysostom, like most of the others, harps again and again on this string.<sup>5</sup> That robust Father actually, amid the cheers and hooting of his congregation, put a lively picture of the total

<sup>1</sup> *Georgic* I., 126.

<sup>2</sup> *Quar* in *Pa.* cxxxii.

<sup>3</sup> *De Offic. Ministr.*, c. xxviii.

<sup>4</sup> *Cl. Alex.* Strom. iii. p. 428.

<sup>5</sup> See vi. Horn on 1 Cor.; *Acts in Loco.*, 1 Thess. x., Horn, &c.

communisation of all their goods. He showed them how immensely less expensive Socialism must be than Individualism, by instancing a family of ten children, who have a common house, table, and attendance. He cites the "beautiful text": "Great grace was upon them all, and there was none that lackt," which contains the secret of opening the channels of God's grace. He finishes his lively description by the words: "If God grants us life, I trust we shall soon get our politics on these lines."

My lord of London recommends the study of St. Chrysostom's homilies to his divinity students. If he takes his own prescription we may still be startled by a little primitive Christian teaching even yet. When the angel of the Church at Brummagem has been hooted in his See, or the many-palaced Bishop of Winchester has had his lawn sleeves torn off his elbows by enraged capitalists and landlords, then we shall know that we have bishops who are safe men, not in the language of time-serving politicians, but in the language of the exposition of St. Athanasius.

CHAS. L. MARSON.

## SHORTHAND WRITING IN FOREIGN LANDS.

MOST people will be surprised to know how largely shorthand is employed on the continent of Europe. Little attention has hitherto been paid to the comparative study of this particular branch of education, but the distribution among many of the Free Libraries of this country of a carefully compiled volume on *Shorthand Instruction and Practice*, by Mr. Julius E. Rockwell, and issued at the instance of the American Bureau of Education, may be expected to give an impetus to inquiry in what is undoubtedly a most interesting field of study.

Among continental peoples the Germans lead the way in the study of shorthand. Herr Bäckler, of Berlin, tells us that the oldest system of shorthand in Germany was an adaptation, published in 1679 at Frankfort-on-the-Main, of the English *Tachygraphy* of Thomas Shelton—by the way, a very prolific but almost forgotten author of shorthand works, who flourished as an “Authour and Professour of the said Art . . . in the Poultry, near the Church.” Two systems followed, that of Mosengiel, in 1796, and that of Horstig in 1797, both adaptations of the English system of Samuel Taylor. But those old systems have long been abandoned in the Fatherland and the two leading German systems of to-day are those of Gabelsberger and Stolze.

Franz Xavier Gabelsberger, born in the memorable year '89 of the great Revolution, was secretary to the Bavarian Ministry in the early years of this century. He invented his system of shorthand about 1817. Having practised it in the first Bavarian Diet, and having had it critically examined by the Bavarian Academy of Sciences and pronounced the best that had been brought under the notice of that body, he published it to the world in 1834—three years before Mr. Isaac Pitman published his famous system in England. At the present day Gabelsberger's shorthand is being propagated by over 700 associations, with a total membership of about 19,000. About 550 of these associations are scattered over the German Empire, with a membership of about 14,000; more than 100 of the associations flourish in Austro-Hungary, while there are ten in Switzerland, about a score in Italy, others in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Bulgaria, Greece, France, and America. Till very recently, at least,



there was a Gabelsberger Association in England, and it is rather remarkable that a periodical for the propagation of this celebrated German system of shorthand was actually started in this country.

The other great German system of stenography was published by Henry August Wilhelm Stolze in 1841. It is based on Gabelsberger's system, and, like it, is practised by many writers. As many as 6000 persons have been taught the system in Germany in one year. In the Prussian House of Deputies only the Stolze system is used by the stenographers; and in the Upper House all the stenographers are said to be Stolzean writers with one exception. In the Diets of all the other German States the system of Gabelsberger is practised; while the corps of reporters in the German Reichstag consists of an equal number of Gabelsberger and Stolzean writers.

It is specially interesting to note that in France, in which probably more shorthand systems have appeared than in any other continental country, among the first to introduce "the winged art" was a Scotchman. The very first French system published was that of Jacques Cossard, in 1651; but thirty years later a very ingenious system was published at Frankfort and Leipzig by one Charles Aloysius Ramsay. This edition was in Latin, but two years afterwards, in 1683, Ramsay's book was published in French at Paris under the title of *Tachographie: The Art of Writing as Fast as one can Speak*. Ramsay, whose work was really an adaptation of the English systems of Witt and Rich, was described on the title page of his book as "a Gentleman of Scotland."

Theodore Pierre Bertin was a man whose influence still affects the practice of stenography in France. In 1792 he published an adaptation of Taylor's English system, and, although it is very little used now, the two modifications of it—one by De Prépéan, published in 1809, and the other by Hippolyte Prévost, in 1828—continue to be widely practised. Among the numerous other French systems the chief undoubtedly is that of the Frères Duployé, which is best known in this country as adapted by Mr. J. M. Sloan and published under the title of the Sloan-Duployan system.

The systems chiefly used by the stenographers in the French Chamber and the Senate are those of Prévost, Grosselin, Aimé-Pâris, and Duployé. It may be remarked, by the way, that shorthand reports of parliamentary proceedings, such as we know in this country, are practically unknown in France. Journalists are admitted to the Houses, but they are seated near what corresponds to our own "Strangers' Gallery," and they are seldom shorthand writers. They make notes simply for descriptive reports of "scenes," hence the undue prominence given in the newspapers to rowdy proceedings in the French Chamber. If a detailed report is desired by the newspapers it is obtained from the official shorthand writers.

In Belgium shorthand is but little used, except in the Houses of Parliament and in public assemblies. Among those who do practise stenography the system chiefly followed is that of Prévost. Duployé's is used, but to a very limited extent.

We have already indicated the large following that the Gabelsberger system has in Austro-Hungary. It is only necessary to add that this system is almost the only one practised in Austria, although a few use Carl Faulmann's combination of the Gabelsberger and Stolze systems, published in 1875. Gabelsberger's system is taught in public schools throughout Austro-Hungary in German, Italian, Czechish, Polish, Ruthenian, Slavonian, and Croatian, and it is used exclusively in the legislative bodies. There are ten shorthand journals published in Austria—seven in German and three in Czechish—devoted to the spread of the Gabelsberger system; and three journals are published in the Faulmann system.

In Bavaria, Gabelsberger's system has been taught in the high schools since 1854; and in Roumania the same system is used in reporting the proceedings of the Senate and Chamber of Deputies at Bucharest. An adaptation of the French system of Tondeur is also largely used in Roumania.

It may well be said that to the making of shorthand systems there is no end, and even in Russia many systems of stenography have been issued. The first was by Baron von Wolke, in the end of last century—a cumbrous, useless method. It was followed by others equally cumbrous and equally useless, and, finally, in 1864, the Russian Ministry of Education offered a reward of 1500 roubles for the best treatise on the art. First one translation of the Gabelsberger system appeared, and then another, and shortly afterwards a translation of the Stolze system followed. The Government reward was divided between the two great German systems. Since that time the knowledge of shorthand has spread in the kingdom of the Czar, and stenography is now freely used in the law courts of St. Petersburg and of the large provincial towns.

From Russia to Turkey is but a step, but, as may be imagined, the Sultan's dominions are still a "dark continent" so far as the study of shorthand is concerned. Yet the practice of the art is not utterly unknown even there. In 1876 the Grand Vizier ordered the organisation of a stenographic bureau to report the proceedings of the Imperial Ottoman Parliament formed in that year. A president was appointed at a salary of 22,000 piastres for the session and everything promised well; but alas! the expense proved too great for the treasury of the Sultan, and at the present time the use of stenography in Turkey has fallen into sad neglect.

When Servia became an independent State in 1876, and a Parliament was formed, one of the first things to be done was to provide for the reporting of the proceedings. Accordingly the

Government sent an official to Austria to learn stenography and adapt it to his native tongue. He studied Gabelsberger's system and his students are now employed in the Servian Senate. Public instruction is also given in the art. Almost a similar plan was adopted in Bulgaria. The first Bulgarian Ministry sent to Austria for Professor Bezenšek, who settled in the Principality and imparted a knowledge of the Gabelsberger system to very many. According to Herr Konstantinoff, teacher of shorthand in the Classic Gymnasium at Sophia, the present position of stenography in Bulgaria is very encouraging.

As a branch of general education shorthand is quite unknown in Italy. It is used to chronicle the proceedings in the Chamber of Deputies, but in no other assembly in the land. And the Italian newspapers make almost no use of it. A calculation was recently made that there were about 700 shorthand writers in all Italy, of whom about 500 were writers of the Gabelsberger system. But the number of Italian shorthand writers is rapidly increasing. Those in the Chamber of Deputies use a modification of Taylor's English system.

It is of interest to note that in 1883 a society was started in Rome for the propagation of Isaac Pitman's Phonography, and the fact that on the 11th of June of last year the committee distributed teachers' certificates to four gentlemen, and certificates of proficiency to about a hundred others, shows that even in Italy this famous system is making considerable headway.

In Spain the Government organised a school of shorthand in 1802, which for many years did splendid work. The system taught was that of Francesco Pauli Marti, who brought out a translation into Spanish of the English system of Taylor in 1800. There is another system in use in Spain, however, which is becoming very popular—the Garriga system, and propagated as it is with great energy by means of several associations and a shorthand journal, it threatens to drive the older system from the field. The systems of Duployé, Stolze, and Gabelsberger have all been adapted to the Spanish, and have a certain following in the country.

Switzerland is well to the front in the study and practice of stenography. Shorthand associations are scattered all over the country, and in many of the schools the art is taught as part of the ordinary curriculum. At the present day the Stolze and the Gabelsberger are the systems chiefly taught.

In Norway the Gabelsberger system of stenography is used exclusively. It was introduced in 1867 by Herr Cappelen, the skilful chief Parliamentary shorthand writer in Christiania; and a free course in the art is given in Christiania every year. Generally speaking, however, stenography is not widely known in Norway. In Sweden it is different. There the study of shorthand has made remarkable progress. In 1890 about 2400 persons were taught

shorthand, and instruction in the art is imparted in the schools of Stockholm, Upsala, Göteborg, Vexjö, Landskrona, Sundsvall, Skara, and other places. Associations for the propagation of shorthand exist in nearly every important town in the land. The systems chiefly employed are those of Gabelsberger and Arends.

Many systems of shorthand were tried in the Netherlands from the year 1673, when a merchant of Rotterdam introduced an adaptation of the English system of Thomas Shelton; but none of them took root until, in the forties of this century, Mr. Steger introduced an adaptation of Taylor's system. This is still chiefly used—exclusively in the States-General, where Mr. Steger is director of the stenographic department. In Denmark Gabelsberger's system is mostly used. It was introduced in 1853; but the art is not very widely practised in Denmark. This system is used in Finland also, in the two Chambers of the Nobility and Cities, as well as in the Chambers of the Clergy and Peasantry. The shorthand notes are translated by women, who are very expert at the work, and who, it is very interesting to note, use typewriters.

In Finland stenography is, in one respect, very curiously employed. It is extensively used by students in making notes of lectures at the University of Helsingfors, and these notes, transcribed by typewriters, and lithographed, are frequently offered for sale.

The only other European countries to be spoken of are Greece and Portugal. In Greece the first system published was that of one Panos Heliopoulos, in 1853. It never made any headway, and when, three years later, Joseph Mindler, a German stenographer, adapted Gabelsberger's system to the Greek language, the fate of the native system was sealed. Mindler's adaptation is now used, under the supervision of Mindler's son, in reporting the proceedings of the National Council at Athens; but outside this official use of it, stenography in Greece is little known. Of Portugal, also, it may be said that stenography is little practised outside the walls of Parliament. The Marti system is used in both the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies, but the Stolze system is not unknown.

A word as to the use of shorthand in other parts of the world. In Brazil a native system was issued in 1852; and since then Marti's system has been introduced, as well as an adaptation of the Gabelsberger. In the Argentine Republic the proceedings in the Chamber of Deputies have been officially chronicled by means of stenography since 1831. Marti's system is used, and those of Garriga and Gabelsberger have been introduced; but the most popular system is that of our own Isaac Pitman, as adapted to the Spanish by Parody. In Mexico the Congress proceedings were reported by means of shorthand as early as 1822. Marti's system was used. And the same system is used in Venezuela. In Australia Isaac

Pitman's Phonography is very widely and almost exclusively used; and in India, where stenography is as yet but little practised, the same system has the lead. Japan is waking up fast in this matter, as in many others. Minamoto Koki published his system of stenography in 1879, and within a dozen years afterwards, by means of this system, verbatim reports of the debates in the two Houses of Parliament were published in the *Official Gazette* every day. It is quite impossible to say how far back the use of shorthand in China dates, but there is every reason to believe that long before Cicero placed his shorthand writers in the Roman Senate, or the youth of Athens took to scribbling down the sayings of Socrates, the sons of the Celestial Empire were acquainted with the art. Of the United States it has briefly to be said that in 1890 2178 teachers of shorthand gave instruction to 57,375 persons, more than half that number being females. Of the teachers, 747 were Benn-Pitman writers, 363 Graham writers, 228 writers of Munson's Phonography, 185 of Cross's shorthand, and 143 of Isaac Pitman's Phonography. Perhaps the most curious fact in relation to shorthand in America is the circumstance that an Indian of the Cherokee nation, Sequoyah by name, actually invented a species of shorthand as early as 1822. The characters were adapted to the Cherokee language, and were used partly phonetically. On this point Sequoyah seems to have solved one of the main problems in the construction of a shorthand system.

G. M. FRASER.

## A FRANCO-AMERICAN'S NOTES ON THE UNITED STATES.

FOR years past English periodicals have teemed with the impressions of English travellers concerning the United States, and the recent Chicago Exhibition will probably give birth to a new series of articles of this same kind. But it is not so common a thing for a Franco-American—if some fifteen years' residence in France confers this hybrid nationality on a citizen of the United States—to present his observations on this topic in a British monthly. Hence the origin of this paper, and the reason for its seeing the light in the pages of the WESTMINSTER.

The first shock to the foreign visitor on landing at New York comes from the excessive slovenliness of the immediate surroundings. After the delightful sail up the bay, with charming effects on every side, this sudden and marked contrast is all the more offensive. The horrible thoroughfares which line the Hudson river-front leave such an indelible imprint on the mind that it is rarely effaced by the beauties of several of the up-town avenues and streets, by the Riverside Drive, with its incomparable view of the river and the frowning Palisades opposite, by the exquisite perspectives of Central Park, and by the clear blue sky which generally smiles on New York at all seasons of the year. And the effacement is rendered all the more difficult because the tourist is continually stumbling on the like at the most unexpected moments, and in the most unexpected quarters, not only in New York, but in most of the American cities. Let me give a few examples of the causes of the repetition of the initial shock.

At the Broadway entrance to Central Park stands, in the centre of the circle, a lofty white marble monument in honour of Columbus, the gift of the Italian residents of the United States. But the setting of this work of art is seriously marred by the unkempt surroundings, for the rickety fencing and weedy gravel at the base of the pedestal are in sad keeping with the cheap sheds, rough broken side-walks, uneven curbstones, and unrolled, macadamised roadway, besprinkled with loose stones, and cut up by badly-laid car-tracks, which go to make up the general appearance of this forlorn square.

It is difficult to believe that here is a principal gate to what is, in some respects, one of the most beautiful city parks in the world. Yet such is the fact.

If you walk along Fifty-ninth Street from this point eastward, with the green flowering park on the left, and, on the right, superb dwellings, flats, and club-houses, the large majority of which would be ornaments to any city on the globe, you soon reach the northern terminus of the Sixth Avenue Elevated Railway. Here is another entrance to the park, and here again eyesores meet you on every side. The "Elevated" ends in a rough shed, which, from its lofty position, is all-conspicuous. Nor is this the only sin committed by this shed. It has been pushed forward far beyond the line of the buildings on the south side of Fifty-ninth Street, so that much before you reach Sixth Avenue, and while your eye is charmed with the massive fronts, this ugly thing obtrudes itself on the perspective. Words would almost fail to describe the disorder and untidiness which prevail in the street under this shed, and the surprise increases when it is seen that all this exists actually within a stone's throw of the park gate.

At a supper which followed one of the World's Fair concerts in Chicago, I met a well-known Croatian violinist, who, though he resides in Boston and is *de facto* an American citizen, remains an Austrian subject, in order that his aged mother, who lives in that Empire, may not suffer persecution. Every summer the dutiful son crosses the ocean to visit his parent, and then dilates, among his friends, upon the greater freedom enjoyed in the United States. As a result, one or two young men generally abandon their native land, and return with him each time. "As our ship passes through The Narrows, and even while the beauties of the bay are on everybody's lips," the musician said to me, in a tone tinged with regret, "the recollection of the condition of New York's streets suddenly rushes upon my mind, and then, for the first time, I feel called upon to apologise to my friends for something American."

I hasten to add that progress has unquestionably been made in street-paving, in street-cleaning, and in the proper laying of sidewalks, since I saw New York and other American cities seven years ago. In these respects Broadway, Fifth Avenue, and many of the up-town streets, are scarcely inferior to the thoroughfares of European cities. The spreading of an asphalt coating over the paving-stones, which serve as a solid foundation, is giving New York, rapidly and at a very slight cost, I should say, many neat, smooth roadways.

In Chicago, also, I noted an advance in this same direction, though many of the streets, even in the best parts of the city and during "the Exposition summer," were bad beyond description. In fact, one could scarcely take a half-hour's walk in any direction without stumbling into a quarter whose condition was such as to mar the

whole promenade. How the Chicago municipality could invite the world within its walls, while its highways and byways were left in so neglected a state, was the wonder, as I too well know, of more than one foreign visitor. Like the Croatian violinist I often found myself the blushing apologist of our municipal shortcomings.

During my first Sunday in Chicago I was strolling alone near the heart of the town when I found myself in a street which was being paved with wood. The work, left in its uncompleted state Saturday night, could be easily inspected. I saw at a glance its utter worthlessness, the blocks of wood being placed directly on a bed of sand. So great was my astonishment, mingled with indignation, that I could not resist sharing my feelings with two men near by who were leaning against a lamp-post.

"Why, this is not the way to lay wooden pavement," I exclaimed; "in Europe the blocks are stood upon a solid foundation of cement and gravel. This will not last six weeks."

"We don't want it to last," came the quick reply from one of the men; "there would be no money in it if it did."

I guessed forthwith that I must be in the presence of the contractor for this particular job, or perhaps of two of his workmen; and whenever thereafter I crossed a bit of Chicago's wood pavement, with its deep holes and ruts, its oozing mud and rotting blocks—and this was a daily, even hourly, experience—I at least had the unsatisfactory satisfaction of knowing why I was undergoing an experience akin to an ague chill.

American side-walks are, perhaps, more dilapidated than the roadways. The curbstone is narrow, irregular, and laid in a most unworkmanlike manner. The flags are of poor quality, often cracked in several pieces, and with the corners generally broken off. The edges of contiguous flags seldom join neatly, and one is, as a rule, higher or lower than the other. Between the curb and the line of flags next to it there is a gap in which you could sometimes insert your whole foot. Knocking off a heel or "stubbing the toe" is avoided only by the most careful attention, and at night, in the poorly lighted side-streets, walking is really a painful operation. I used to tremble for the safety of young children swaying along these pavements. But like the *bambini* in the steep lanes of Genoa they seemed to escape with only an occasional fall and bruise. The advent of the "sky-scrapers," as the towering buildings of American cities are called in the West, has improved the side-walks, which, in front of these imposing structures, consist of immense slabs of stone reaching from door to curb and which, in fact, form the curbstone also. The only objection the pedestrian can offer to these thick broad flags is the roughness of their surface, which, however, gradually grows smooth under the continual rush of many feet.

Perhaps the chief sign of progress in the domain of art in



America is seen in architecture. It is probably no exaggeration to declare that the United States possess more fine specimens of modern architecture, both in city and country, than can be found in any other part of the world. The average may be inferior to that of Europe, but the good is better. The wearisome monotony of Parisian streets, and the excessively ugly rows of brick houses, plain to a degree, without even a cornice, which line whole squares even in the fashionable quarters of London, would be looked for in vain in American cities. Hundreds of country houses in France, particularly in the South, which are known by the high-sounding title of Chateau This and Chateau That, would not be accepted as the barns or stables of any of the artistic stone, brick, or wooden mansions scattered over the American continent, especially in the vicinity of towns. The admirable work of Transatlantic architects does not always stand out so prominently as it should, because it is too often lost in an ocean of surrounding cheapness. Mean frame-houses are still too frequent even in the Metropolis, and poor low specimens of masonry sometimes dwarf a veritable monument, much as was the case with the Tour Saint Jacques and Notre Dame before the advent of Napoleon III. and Baron Haussmann.

Thirty or forty years ago Broadway fronts were of marble. Then came a period when iron was employed both inside and outside, Stewart's store being perhaps the finest example of the use of this material. But to-day bricks of various colours, forms, and qualities, terra-cottas, and stone of many sorts give greater variety to façades. Fortunately a stop has been put to the "brown stone front and high stoop" style of dwellings. It may be that the new houses are a trifle too *rococo*. English visitors, accustomed to the severe simplicity and leaden hues of London, are sure to find them so. But that the residential quarters of American cities, great and small, will bear comparison to-day with those of European cities cannot be questioned; and if we turn to the larger structures used for business and trade, the like of them is rarely seen outside of New York, Chicago, Boston, and the other centres of American activity.

I was particularly struck by a mode of construction now prevailing throughout the United States. A building seems to be composed, at least during the period of erection, of two distinct shells—the external one of stone and brick, and the internal frame of iron. The latter is often run up to the roof long before the masons are able to hide it, and then the black skeleton stands for weeks towering into the air till the iron and masonry are finally welded together. This mode of building must produce a peculiarly solid and, at the same time, elastic structure, especially in New York, where foundations are always laid on bed rock.

For the past ten or fifteen years American architects have been devoting their attention to "flats," or apartment-houses, and have

produced several remarkable varieties. When the public taste began to turn in this direction a careful examination was made of what had been done in this field in Europe. Paris apartment-houses were especially studied, and then, as is customary with the Americans, their architects went home and surpassed the European models. They have not succeeded, however, in handling one feature of the apartment-house. Courtyards are either entirely wanting, or are quite inadequate. The consequence is that the common run of American flats have gloomier interiors than those of Europe, especially in winter, notwithstanding the brighter sky of the New World. I believe, however, that this fault is not to be laid so much to the door of the architects as to the lack of some municipal regulation requiring each property owner to give up, in conjunction with his contiguous neighbours, a portion of his precious land for courtyard purposes.

Before leaving this subject, a word should be devoted to a craft akin to architecture, and to which high praise must be given. I refer to American plumbing. There was a time when plumbers were famous only for the length and exorbitance of their bills. Perhaps this is the case still. But in America their work is so thorough and superior in finish that one can pay the total without too much vexation of spirit. In the best houses all the plumbing is in view, and it can be pronounced almost a work of art. An American bath-room is frequently treated as a "show piece." If there be a "religion of the tub" the United States have surely furnished altars worthy of its practice.

I return, for a moment, to the subject of flats, in order to call attention to an odd prejudice against them, which prevails in a certain portion of American society. It is not considered fashionable to reside in them. I met an aristocratic lady of eighty-three who burst into tears one day at the thought of her sister being ensconced in the fifth storey of an apartment-house, neat and comfortable though it was. This disdain springs, however, from causes far deeper than the behest of mere fashion. It is mainly due, doubtless, to the old English desire of possessing a home of one's own, "for a man's house is his castle," as Sir Edward Coke put it two hundred and fifty years ago. The native American, like the Englishman, prefers to be alone behind his own front-door and under his own roof. Although the flat system will probably never take such root in the United States as it has in Continental Europe, still its popularity is unquestionably on the increase, for even some of the wealthiest families of New York have not hesitated to take up their city residence in the palatial apartment-houses in Fifty-ninth Street.

Continental influence on American life shows itself still more strongly in another direction. The old Puritan idea of Sunday is slowly but surely passing away. The popular and press agitation

over the Sunday opening of the Chicago Fair, though it ended in a drawn battle, perhaps was the cause of much liberalisation and a sturdy blow at New England Sabbatarianism. I noted, besides, several minor signs of the weakening of the former strictness. For example, the New York papers announced one morning that there had been a dress-parade, for the first time in the history of the West Point Military Academy, on Sunday, October 1st. One Sunday afternoon in July I saw ladies and gentlemen playing croquet in full view on the sward of the Yacht Club at Oyster Bay, and all summer long the merry-go-round of Central Park was kept whirling Sunday afternoons, though a slight concession was made to the old idea by confining the accompanying music to selections from the Moody and Sankey hymns!

A most encouraging sign of the growth of culture in the United States is the remarkable spread and development of university education; and when it is remembered that the money for this purpose comes in very large part not from the State treasuries but from the pockets of private citizens, this advance is all the more significant. Last autumn two leading institutions of learning—Cornell University and William's College—celebrated the anniversary of their foundation, when it appeared that the former, which is but twenty-five years old, possesses invested funds and equipments valued at the princely sum of about \$10,000,000, at least half of which is due to private beneficence. Within the last two or three years Chicago has laid the foundation of a great university whose professors are receiving the highest salaries paid anywhere in the world and every cent of whose endowment fund is the gift of citizens. While this important institution is being organised in the outskirts of the city, a resident of Chicago, Mr. Armour, has donated a handsome sum for the erection, nearer the heart of the town, of a good mechanical institute. At this moment, too, the venerable Columbia College, at New York, is engaged, under the energetic propulsion of President Seth Low, in drawing within its circle the various schools scattered about Manhattan Island, thus building up on its new grounds at Washington Heights a real university worthy of the American metropolis.

Another evidence of the hold which the universities now have on the population of the United States is seen in the fact that, notwithstanding the severe financial crisis from which the country is only just beginning to emerge, the entering classes of the principal institutions not only did not show, last autumn, a falling off in numbers, but were, on the contrary, larger than ever.

Perhaps the most repulsive thing in America is the spitting. While crossing the Atlantic some of my fellow passengers, Frenchmen, spoke of their disgust at this habit. In extenuation, I reminded them that a hundred years or more ago expectorating was

common in France, and I expressed the hope that the United States were improving in this respect. But on landing I was disappointed, and after seven months of observation I cannot report progress under this head. In the first elevated car I took this notice stared me in the face: "Passengers are requested not to spit out of the window;" which reminds me of what is to be seen at the Natural Bridge in Virginia. A correspondent of the New York *Nation* writes: "The narrow country road runs close below the wide pleasant verandah in front of the second-storey bar-room—so close as to prevent the Jedge or the Colonel, or the casual Northern visitor, with his feet on the railing, from seeing what is passing below. A modest sign reads: 'Gentlemen will please look over before you spit.'" A notice in the Broadway surface cars was more to the point, for it prohibited spitting *within* the vehicle. I went once, but never repeated the visit, into what is called, by courtesy, I suppose, the "Gentlemen's Cabin," or to be more correct, the "Gent's Cabin"—that barbarous abbreviation seen everywhere in the United States—of a North River ferry-boat. But I will save your readers from a description of what I saw there. Suffice it to say that the deck of a Channel steamer during a rough crossing is scarcely more offensive.

While noting my own observations on this point, I received a letter from a Buffalo friend who had married a German officer. I make the following extract from it: "When I ascended to the dome of the Capitol at Washington, for the first time with my foreign husband, I was mortified to find that it had been used by patriotic American men as a cuspidor and was covered with tobacco stains from pole to equator."

Drunkenness is another crying evil. Although I cannot say that I noticed a decrease in this vice, I would not declare either that there was an increase; but tipping is much too common among gentlemen. I had not been in New York a week before I saw a well-dressed young man fall prostrate on the marble floor of the Hoffman House café, a sight I had never once beheld on the Continent during a fifteen years' residence. It is rare to see water added to *vin ordinaire* at table—in fact, decanters for this purpose do not seem to be provided. During a certain dinner champagne was the only drinkable at hand, and there was plenty of that. Most laudable efforts are being made to check intemperance, the newest and most radical ever tried, perhaps, being that of the South Carolina Legislature, which makes the sale of intoxicating liquors a State monopoly. This curious "Dispensary Law" went into effect only last July, and it is too early, therefore, to pronounce upon its efficacy.

Matthew Arnold, Dean Stanley, Professor Freeman and other English travellers in the United States, who have left printed

impressions, have dilated upon the shortcomings of the American daily press. The grounds of their complaints have not been removed. In fact, it seems to me that the American newspaper was never at a lower ebb than it is to-day, and that it is sinking still lower year by year. While it is true, perhaps, that the best journals have retained all their former good features, it is as equally true that they have superadded many bad ones. You are surprised at times to see the names of writers of repute at the bottom of articles of real merit, which are sandwiched between columns containing the most questionable matter, often illustrated by the most unartistic "cuts." One of the absurd tendencies is towards the increment of the Sunday edition of the great city dailies. Most of them are already vulgarly big, and yet the editors and publishers go on making them bigger and bigger. That the long-suffering reading public does not like these poorly-digested *omnium gatherums* is beyond doubt. At one of the sessions of the Press Congress held during the Fair a remark condemnatory of the coarse bigness of the Sunday daily was warmly applauded by the large and intelligent audience. What a relief it is, after a season of the average American newspaper, to take up once more the wonderful London *Times*, which, on the whole, is still the model journal of the world.

American clubs are as excellent as American newspapers are bad. They are generally magnificently housed and very comfortably arranged, and often own art and literary collections of considerable value. For instance, among the New York clubs, the Players' possesses a unique histrionic library and museum, the Union League a gallery of rare American historic portraits, while the Century acquired last summer the library of the late Lorimer Graham, rich in drawings, autographs, and costly editions. Next door to the Century is the handsome Racket Club, with its queer courts and games, while further up-town is the more popular Athletic Club, of which a word will be said further on.

Since my last visit to the metropolis a new sort of club has been developed, due to the peculiar geographical conformation of the city. The down-town dining clubs were a natural outgrowth, and their number and luxurious get-up are a striking sign of the spreading rage for club-life in America. A New York business man cannot go home for his midday meal, for his house may be four or five miles away from his office. The members of a certain profession unite, therefore, and form a club or private restaurant. The lawyers are organised in this way. Nor is it simply a good *cuisine* that attracts thither members of the Bar. I am told that one of the best legal libraries in the country belongs to this club, and that the leading men of the profession are often glad to consult it. But it is not the lawyers alone who are thus banded together into a dining guild. The leather merchants of "the swamp," and the financiers

of Wall Street unite in the same fashion. I visited one of these clubs—that of the insurance men—pretty carefully, and was astonished at the admirable manner in which everything was arranged. The new rooms occupy the whole twelfth and thirteenth floors of the lofty solid Mutual Life building, in Liberty Street. Swift-mounting lifts carry you in a jiffy from the street to the top, where is a view of the city, bay, and country for miles about, which you can drink in while dispatching an excellent dinner. There are private dining-rooms, a café, a library, and special accommodation for the lady friends of the members, whose boudoir and dining-room have been copied from the Trianon. The participation of the female sex in the privileges of this and many other clubs—the up-town Colonial Club especially—is to be noted, for it is a sign not only of the growth of club spirit, but of the rapid tend towards the equality of the two sexes which is seen on every hand in the United States.

Mention of the New York Athletic Club reminds me of the wonderful advance made by all out-of-door sports in the United States. It is within the memory of the middle-aged man when physical exercise was in the inchoate stage which France is just now entering upon. But so rapid has been the growth, especially among the youth of the universities, that some educationists are beginning to fear that study is no longer getting its share of attention. A field-day at Travers Island, on the Sound—the country headquarters of the New York Athletic Club—offers an epitome of the athletic life of the United States. Lacrosse, baseball, cycling, boating, yachting—you suddenly find yourself breathing a new atmosphere, though but an hour before you stood bewildered in the feverish money-making bustle that centres about City Hall Park. A cruise over the Sound where yachts, yacht clubs, and yachtsmen are so numerous in summer as to transform this charming land-locked sea into a little maritime world with a peculiar stamp of its own; a drive in Central Park among the cricket and base-ball fields and tennis courts, with men and women, boys and girls, flying by your carriage-wheels on their fleet bicycles; a tour among the universities, with their well-equipped gymnasiums, their professors of gymnastics, their navies, their athletic grounds, their lawn-tennis courts, for professors as well as students, and their inter-collegiate contests in baseball and football, played in the great cities in the presence of applauding crowds of ladies and gentlemen,—all this, and much else, shows that physical development is no longer neglected among the middle and upper classes by the United States, and that the national ailment, dyspepsia, has at last met a formidable foe.

From whatever standpoint we regard the United States the outlook to-day is very encouraging. In art, music, and letters great progress has been made since the Civil War. American architects,

painters, and sculptors displayed the high order of their talents in the creation of the Chicago Exhibition. In New York and Boston is a school of young composers, several of whose compositions were warmly applauded last summer at Music Hall in Jackson Park. The writers and periodicals from across the Atlantic are too well known in England to call even for mention here. In the field of education never was there more activity, never were better results attained than at present. In morals and general culture an advance all along the line can be reported. In politics, the darkest side of American life, are encouraging signs of a revival in favour of higher ideals. The nomination of Mr. Cleveland in 1892, and sundry episodes in the elections of last autumn, prove that "machine politics" and "boss rule" are not so solidly intrenched in the Republic as many people imagine; while the Behring Sea Arbitration redounds to the honour of both branches of the Anglo-Saxon world, and sets a noble example to follow to the less fortunate peoples of Continental Europe and South America.

THEODORE STANTON.

## CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

### PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

THE man of average education and ordinary intelligence has a more or less vague idea that something which is called Darwinism is accepted by all scientific men and philosophers as proved beyond a doubt; and though he is not quite clear what it is, he is not disposed to question their conclusions. The man of special scientific qualifications is absolutely convinced, and regards any disposition to scepticism upon the matter as only the sign of ignorance or the want of intelligence. Notwithstanding this special and general acceptance of Mr. Darwin's theory, Dr. J. Hutchison Stirling is daring enough to enter the lists against it, and in *Darwinianism: Workmen and Work*<sup>1</sup> has sent forth a polemic of no little ability and interest. It will be for scientific men to settle its importance.

Dr. Stirling undertakes to show what "Darwinianism" is, where it came from, how it was evolved, and what it is worth. The author naturally writes more as a critic and a philosopher than a man of science, but he is not without qualifications even from a scientific point of view. He reiterates what everybody ought to know, but what is often forgotten, that the evolution theory did not originate with Mr. Darwin, but that he "discovered the law of natural selection." The title of Mr. Darwin's *magnum opus* is *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, though, as Dr. Stirling says, there is nothing about *origin* in it, and *modification* would have been a more accurate term. While rejecting Mr. Darwin's theory, Dr. Stirling admits that he has no doubt there is a true theory of evolution, which we need scarcely say is more according to Hegel. In order to make the distinction clear, he expresses the single Darwinian proposition thus: "Species are *naturally* modified into species, by *natural* variation, *naturally* realised into a new *natural* relation, through *natural* divergence (selection); and *naturally* in the struggle for existence." This may appear clumsy, but the intention is to emphasise the exclusion of any supernatural or even psychical interference in evolution. Indeed, the word "physical" might be substituted for "natural," perhaps, with some advantage to clearness.

<sup>1</sup> *Darwinianism: Workmen and Work*. By James Hutchison Stirling, F.R.C.S. and LL.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1894.



The sum and substance of Dr. Stirling's criticism is that Mr. Darwin did not make out his case, and that the doctrine of Natural Selection is an unproved assumption.

The present work is virtually a development of the concluding chapters of the author's Gifford Lectures on *Philosophy and Theology*, in which the attack on Darwinianism was commenced. We can promise that readers will find this present volume entertaining and suggestive, though much of it may appear irrelevant. The first part of the work is biographical and psychological, and we are treated to an exhaustive inquiry into the characteristics of the Darwin family, especially those of Charles Darwin's grandfather, Dr. Erasmus Darwin, and his father, Dr. Robert Waring Darwin. Incidentally there is a good deal, too, about Dr. Thomas Brown, Buckle, Carlyle, and other contemporaries of the three generations. It is in Erasmus Darwin, the author of the *Botanic Garden* and *Zoonomia*, that Dr. Stirling finds the prototype of his grandson Charles; and in the *Zoonomia* he declares he can find all that is in the *Origin*, except the struggle for existence and natural selection, the honour of discovering which belongs in part to Malthus and in part to Charles Darwin. The doctrine of the *Origin* contains several propositions: the struggle for existence, the appearance of variations, and the preservation and increase of variations favourable to species in the struggle for life. The appearance of variations Dr. Stirling does not dispute, but he denies their importance or their naturalness, and their preservation—left alone, they always "revert." He contends that the struggle is non-existent or at least exaggerated, and, therefore, that the whole theory falls to the ground.

Artificial selection, upon which Mr. Darwin laid so much stress, Dr. Stirling affirms is utterly valueless as evidence, as the whole effort of the "selector" is confined to the prevention of the reversion which would naturally take place, and no breeder has yet produced a new species. As to favourable variations, according to Mr. Darwin every variation which survives is necessarily a favourable one or it would not have survived; but this is only arguing in a circle. The fittest survive; but which are the fittest? Those who survive! There are two faults which the critic finds with the *Origin*: one is that it is a compilation, from all kinds of sources, containing much which has never been verified; and the other is that many of its conclusions are purely conjectural. We read that things "may have been" thus and thus—that it is "not difficult to believe" so and so. Dr. Stirling makes the most of this looseness, which certainly is a weak spot in a work intended to demonstrate a far-reaching law of nature; and the various difficulties admitted by Mr. Darwin himself are not passed over lightly by his critic.

The most interesting feature in the book is the way in which the author uses the *Life and Letters*, by Mr. Francis Darwin, to throw

light upon the origin of the *Origin of Species*, &c. The extracts from the correspondence with Lyell, Huxley, Hooker, Carpenter, and Asa Gray are full of interest, and Dr. Stirling's book is likely to cause the *Life and Letters* to be in fresh demand. As to the scientific case, we do not profess ourselves to be qualified to pronounce an opinion; but looking at the whole subject broadly we confess that we think "philosophic doubt" is still justifiable. It has always appeared to us that Mr. Darwin's theory was "too easy"—that the time has not yet come when we can with certainty embrace a great part of the most important of the operations of nature in a single formula. Admitting so much, we nevertheless are of opinion that Dr. Stirling has not done Mr. Darwin anything like justice, and has not treated the subject with the consideration it demands.

Contrasts are always refreshing, and after Dr. Stirling we can welcome Mr. Hiller<sup>1</sup> with his absolute rejection of all metaphysics and everything outside of organic evolution. Mr. Hiller is a vigorous writer and is disposed to cut every theory which opposes his own into shreds. He has gone beyond Darwin by adopting the doctrines of Weismann; the continuity of the germ-plasm added to natural selection explain everything. It is only in his applications of the theories he accepts that Mr. Hiller comes into contact, or rather into conflict, with philosophy. Metaphysics, free-will, theology, are all lumber, and organic evolution is the only thing that explains the past or can influence the future. All our hopes for the improvement of the race on any other ground are futile, since no improvements acquired by the individual can be transmitted. Education, social expediency, all kinds of influences may affect individuals and societies at a given time, but cannot affect their descendants or successors. A tradition may be transmitted, knowledge handed down by means of books, customs adopted and improved by successive generations, but the species is only modified by variations due to sexual reproduction. On this point it is curious to come across such a sentence as the following: "The true significance of sexual reproduction is not the multiplication of individuals; what then is its significance? Sexual reproduction is demonstrated by Weismann to have come into the world to ensure an illimitable typical diversity." This is the language of a believer in design, and appears to postulate an intelligent power behind organic evolution. This may be Mr. Hiller's belief, but so much of his doctrine appears to be materialistic that it does not seem easy to reconcile it. There is a great deal in the book "against dogma" with which we heartily agree, though it does not need all "Weismannism" to demonstrate its reasonableness. As to free-will, we shall have a word to say in a minute. A short account is given of the theory of Weismann which is at least

<sup>1</sup> *Against Dogma and Free-Will and for Weismannism*. By H. Croft Hiller. Second edition. London: Williams & Norgate. 1893.

acceptable as information, though we do not commit ourselves yet to accept it or Mr. Hiller's deductions entirely. The first edition of this book involved Mr. Hiller in a controversy with Mr. Robertson in the *National Reformer*, all of which appears to be reprinted in an appendix, though it is scarcely of permanent interest.

On the question of the Will with which a part of the above book deals we turn with some relief to *L'Education de la Volonté*,<sup>1</sup> by M. Payot. The writer takes a position in which many philosophical minds are seeking a solution of the question of freedom. Mr. Hiller says that we must either grant free-will absolutely or deny it altogether. Indeed, as there is nothing but organism, "will" itself is an illusion. M. Payot, on the contrary, contends for freedom, or rather the possibility of freedom with limitations. Freedom is not the first but the last term of a series; it is a result to be aimed at, it is not given as a lever; it is the end and not the beginning of evolution. M. Payot admits that the majority of men are practically without will, that they are only "marionettes" led by their impulses; but it is possible and desirable that men should use intelligent efforts to obtain self-mastery, and this is only another name for the use of will. The author affirms and with reason that the defect of our age is want of will; indeed, he goes further and declares that the ruling passion in man is the love of ease, that there is nothing so painful as continuous effort, and this is an evil against which we have to contend. But the power to contend against it implies will and a certain amount of freedom. The education of the will is to be effected by concentrated and continuous attention upon some task, the result would be the strengthening of our powers and the acquirement of self-mastery. We are busy enough, M. Payot allows, but only in a way which dissipates our energy. We do everything in a desultory fashion, though we may throw abundant energy into a particular task for a short time, but the persistency which is the source of mastery is lacking. This is as true of students as of men of the world, and it is this feature in our modern educational systems that M. Payot earnestly desires to see removed. As to the practical suggestions of the author, leaving metaphysics out of the question, we can have nothing but praise, bearing in mind that the work has in view principally those whose education is not yet finished. He prescribes meditation, action, and the study of the conditions of bodily health, a matter too often neglected by those who have the responsibility. The enemies of the will enlarged upon are vague sentimentality and sensuality, companions, and the sophisms of the idle. The pleasures of work are dwelt upon as fortifying, and the environment and opinion, tutors, &c., and the influence of the "mighty dead," are regarded as of inestimable value. In a measure it is the rational

<sup>1</sup> *L'Education de la Volonté*. Par Jules Payot. Paris: Félix Alcan. 1894.

application of the methods of Catholicism, and should be warmly welcomed as an important contribution to the science of education.

We have yet another work of a semi-scientific character, but which, like the three books noticed above, goes a step further than science has yet reached. The full title of Mr. J. H. King's *Man an Organic Community*<sup>1</sup> will justify this remark. It is "An Exposition of the Law that the Human Personality in all its Phases of Evolution, both Co-ordinate and Discordinate, is the Multiple of many Sub-personalities."

A great deal of the book is a compilation of facts gathered from various sources in order to show, what no one doubts, that all that goes to make a man is, or should be, co-ordinated—though often, to use Mr. King's word, discordinated. But this does not convince us that the parts have a separate personality. We are not clear whether the personalities are confined to complete organs, or whether every cell has its own personality, and perhaps "mental and moral life." There are plenty of interesting quotations in the two volumes, and many curious but familiar cases, but we are not convinced of the correctness of Mr. King's thesis. Unfortunately, the book has been written in a hurry or with very great carelessness and is full of faults. A page is accidentally open before us and we read: "Dr. Crichton records a case in which the unbroken abstraction became a mental disease. *He* was a young gentleman," &c. "Betimes" is used for sometimes or often; "detergent" apparently for "deterrent"; "retrogradation" for "retrogression." We must give the whole sentence in which this occurs: "But whatever the cause, for they, as we shall see, are many, it marks deterioration, reversion, that is, a retrogradation to a lower type." This is one of the worst sentences in the two volumes, but there are many others nearly as bad. It is the more to be wondered at as we were favourably impressed with Mr. King's book on the *Evolution of the Supernatural*. We fear "discordination" is at work in the author.

The first volume of the "Ethical Library" contains a number of addresses by Dr. Bosanquet, one of which gives the title *The Civilisation of Christendom*<sup>2</sup> to the book. The editor, Mr. J. H. Muirhead, tells us that the Library is not intended as a new "science series," but will deal with questions of the inner and outer life from a philosophical point of view, instead of the theological. The addresses may therefore be looked upon as a substitute, and a very good substitute, for sermons. Dr. Bosanquet approaches religious, moral, and practical problems in an appreciative spirit, and does full justice to the old way while adopting the new. This is particularly evident in the paper on the "Civilisation of Christendom," in which he shows

<sup>1</sup> *Man an Organic Community*. By John H. King. Two vols. London Williams & Norgate. 1893.

<sup>2</sup> *The Civilisation of Christendom*. By Bernard Bosanquet, M.A., LL.D. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1893.

the distinction between Christian and "heathen" civilisation, and affirms that the members of the Ethical Society, to whom he was speaking, would deny that they were heathens.

"We feel, I believe, that though much in the Christianity of many Churches is no longer intelligible to us, yet the mind and life of Christendom have gone through a process and reached a standpoint which makes *its* civilisation an essentially different thing from the mode of existence, however wealthy or refined, of non-Christian countries." The essay is devoted to showing in what the distinctive features of Christian civilisation consist. "Old Problems under New Names" and "Are we Agnostics?" are both essays of religious interest, while other papers are of a more practical character.

A very interesting pamphlet by Père Hyacinthe<sup>1</sup> is before us, but its contents are more striking than its appearance. It contains the letter which he addressed to the General of the Barefooted Carmelites at Rome upon his resignation of his ministry at Notre Dame in 1869; secondly, the letter, *Sur Mon Mariage*, 1872, in which he gives his reason for that important step and defends himself from the charges which it brought upon him; and, thirdly, a solemn declaration of his adhesion to the position he took twenty-four years ago. This was written only last year, and is entitled *Derant la Mort*. The first sentence explains its purpose, *Ceci est mon Testament*. M. Loyson still adheres to the "Old Catholic" position, but he has broadened considerably since the days of Notre Dame, and expresses himself as being in sympathy with the spirit of the age. The little book has an historic as well as a personal interest, and should be read sympathetically by all who admire honesty in religion. A number of letters to the author are included in the volume, one by George Sand being particularly interesting. We have a very sincere admiration for and sympathy with M. Loyson, and have read his little book with much pleasure.

Two books<sup>2</sup> by the Rev. A. T. Wirgman are in advocacy of disestablishment of the Church of England in the interest of the High Church party. The author's colonial experience has led him to desire the freedom of the Church from the dominion of the civil power, and he proposes a kind of English pope in the person of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who is to be Patriarch of the English Church throughout the world. We are in favour of disestablishment for other reasons than those of Mr. Wirgman. His volumes enable us to understand the aspirations of the High Church school.

*The Religion of Jesus*,<sup>3</sup> by Mr. Picton, is a reprint, we believe, but it may be the first appearance of some lectures delivered in

<sup>1</sup> *Mon Testament*. Hyacinthe Loyson (Père Hyacinthe). Paris: A. Fayard. 1893.

<sup>2</sup> *The Church and the Civil Power*, and *The Spirit of Liberty*. By A. Theodore Wirgman, B.D., D.C.L. London: Bemrose & Son. 1893.

<sup>3</sup> *The Religion of Jesus, its Modern Difficulties and its Original Simplicity*. By J. Allanson Picton, M.A. London: James Clarke & Co. 1893.

St. Thomas' Square Chapel, London, in 1876, of which place of worship Mr. Picton was then the minister. Mr. Picton is now M.P. for Leicester, and is so described upon the title-page. The subject is dealt with from what we may call the rationalistic-spiritual point of view, and will be found acceptable by many religious people who have given up dogma and still desire to retain their association with the Christian Church. Mr. Picton criticises with freedom and reconstructs with intelligent sympathy.

### SOCIOLOGY, POLITICS, VOYAGES AND TRAVELS.

IN the WESTMINSTER REVIEW of February 1892 we noticed Professor Smart's *Introduction to the Theory of Value*. The Professor has now gone a step further towards encouraging the study of his favourite theory, and has given English economists a translation of Wieser's *Der Natürliche Werth*.<sup>1</sup> There is no question as to the interest and importance of Wieser's work. As the best exposition of the Austrian theory of value, it compels the attention of every modern economist. It is stiff reading; books of this kind are of the mathematics of political economy. As a consequence it is no easy task to review it in the best sense of the word; deep and careful study must precede the expression of any final opinion on its merits.

Passing from the chapters which lay down "the law of marginal utility" as "the general law of value" to discuss price, exchange value, and natural value, Wieser upsets the Socialist theory of value in which "pretty nearly everything is wrong," goes on to the "problem of imputation" to the theories of rent, of capital, and of interest, and winds up with "cost theories" and "value in the economy of the State." It will be clear at once that the book is very technical, and this involves the first difficulty—it is the one which we alluded to in February 1892. In dealing with the subject of men's ordinary ideas it is well to stick to their ordinary language; to go into a special technical jargon is to court confusion and misunderstanding. Analysis of ideas is useful only so long as it remains intelligible. In our opinion metaphysics fail utterly at an early stage of their inquiry, because they seek to analyse the unknown, which is impossible. The Austrian school of economists are in similar danger. Yet it is fair to quote the claim to practical results which Wieser puts forward.

"The man who has thought out the theory of value to the end

<sup>1</sup> *Natural Value*. By Friedrich von Wieser. Edited, with a Preface and Analysis, by William Smart, M.A., LL.D. The Translation by Christiana Malloch. London: Macmillan & Co. 1893.

... will have cause to point with pride to the help which this has afforded him in political science and practical statecraft. It is a matter of the first importance—one without which no decision can be arrived at—to recognise that there is a sphere within which the estimate of exchange value is practicable, and another in which it is not."

We doubt whether his claim is justified. Take, for instance, one of the most important parts of the book—the theory of interest. What practical explanation does Wieser give of the phenomenon? "All capital transforms itself in the last resort into a gross return. In this gross return the capital reproduces itself with a physical surplus, the net return." "If physical productivity of capital involves, as we have maintained, the imputation of gross return and the imputation of net return, we have at once a clear and simple principle for the valuation of capital." But this is merely a re-statement of the phenomenon: it does not explain it. Again and again we feel as we work through the book how much we need a simple exposition of the practical part of the theory.

We may, however, call attention to the author's own preface as a good historical account of the theory of value; and still more to the editor's introductory analysis of the work, which seems to us deserving of very high praise. Professor Smart certainly has succeeded in putting some of Wieser's points with greater clearness than the Austrian himself. We think we may go further and say that he has rounded off some parts of the theory with a precision of thought which is not found in the original. And though we have not the original to compare with it, we must thank Mrs. Malloch for what seems to be a very careful and able translation, which must have cost her much hard work.

In passing on to Professor Commons' little book on the *Distribution of Wealth*<sup>1</sup> we may at once quote the opening words, in which he shows his own opinion of the achievements of the Austrian School:

"It is proposed in this chapter to give only enough of the theory of value to introduce the principles of distribution. The theory is based primarily on the work of the Austrian economists. But the Austrians, in simply holding that value depends upon usefulness and scarcity, have added nothing to the classical dogma of demand and supply, except the mere conception of marginal utility. This is a serviceable conception, but it does not help us out of the dogmatism and logomachy of the older doctrine."

And a little lower he refers to *Der Natürliche Werth*, Vienna, 1889, "a translation of which is announced by Messrs. Macmillan & Co."—the translation which we have just reviewed.

<sup>1</sup> *The Distribution of Wealth*. By John R. Commons. New York: Macmillan & Co. 1893.

Here again we have a book of the mathematical type, but with much of the matter capable of being read by ordinary men. After the brief introduction of the theory of value, it discusses first the factors in distribution, then the law of diminishing returns in its relation to rent, and finally the effect of both in distribution.

Now, starting with the theory of value very much as Professor Smart puts it in his *Introduction*, and pointing out how value arises out of the limitation of supply, Professor Commons soon plunges into a number of ideas which are more or less novel :

“It is important to get a clear distinction between land and capital. . . . Land is held to be almost identical with nature. The material of nature becomes capital as soon as labour is applied to it, and it is worked up into useful forms. According to this definition it logically follows that a tree standing in the forest is land, but as soon as it is felled it becomes capital. A mustang roaming over the plains is land ; when captured and trained to do man’s bidding and satisfy his wants, it becomes capital. . . . Taking these examples into consideration, there must arise a suspicion that the analysis of capital and land from the economic standpoint has not been thoroughly made. Such is indeed the fact. . . . What land furnishes to all industries is simply *room* and *situation*. . . . All that man can do by labour in any industry is to change the places of things.”

Throughout the analysis of the factors in distribution we meet ideas which are at once convincing and suggestive, and when the Professor applies these ideas in his subsequent argument, we still find them leading up to an originality of thought and expression : “We gain the important advantage of simplicity in investigating the problems of distribution if we take the standpoint of the *entrepreneur*. We can refer all other partners to him as a single starting point, and so we avoid the danger of doubling on our tracks.” And as Professor Commons goes on from this standpoint to discuss the phenomenon of interest we are bound to say that he makes a much more satisfactory statement of it than Wieser and Böhm-Bawerk.

Mr. Mallock’s new book<sup>1</sup> should be read with the work just noticed : it is a practical rather than a scientific treatment of much the same subject,—of “the labour question, the social question, the social claims of the masses ; and . . . these claims and questions as connected with practical politics,”—in other words, again, the practical distribution of wealth.

Mr. Mallock’s reputation is such as to lead us to expect some originality of treatment, and we are not disappointed. We have only to run through the first chapter and we say to ourselves, “this

<sup>1</sup> *Labour and the Popular Welfare*. By W. H. Mallock. London: Adam & Charles Black. 1893.



is a book that will do : it has life in it ; and there's some grit in the writer."

"My own aim," he avows, "in writing this book is to educate the cupidity of voters, no matter what their party, by popularising knowledge of this non-controversial kind (*i.e.* what wealth really exists and the fundamental conditions on which its distribution depends").

In pursuing this end, Mr. Mallock jumps down upon a good many popular fallacies, and he does so in a racy style that goes far to carry his reader with him. Not that he always steers clear of certain other fallacies himself. But we can forgive him a great deal for the bright and lively way in which he writes.

We are particularly pleased with his defence of ability. Indeed we commend the book on the very ground on which it has been attacked by Socialistic reviewers. A good part of his work is directed against that great fallacy of Trades-Unionism and Socialism, so often attacked by the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, that all men are entitled to equal reward irrespective of their ability.

We do not think as highly of Dr. Schäffle's last work<sup>1</sup> as we have done of some others : it has too much repetition, and its points are often too much laboured. What Dr. Schäffle means by protection of labour he takes pains to define, inserting in pp. 24, 25 a very complete tabulation of industrial wage labour, according to the kind of protection required, the chief heads being :

- I. Labourers requiring protection against external dangers—
  - (a) According to the kinds of occupation.
  - (b) According to the type of business.
- II. Labourers requiring protection against *personal* dangers—
  - (a) Having reference to the common need of protection as men and citizens.
  - (b) Having reference to the need of protection arising out of differences in the position occupied by the wage-workers in the business.

The book contains very full discussions of the chief questions of which "labour" is the centre, in particular of the maximum working day. Mr. Morant, in his preface, specially calls attention to Dr. Schäffle's adverse conclusions as regards a compulsory eight hours day ; and we may also notice his argument as to the impossibility of enforcing such a day without an international convention. There is a great deal of interesting matter which we might notice, and the book falls short only by a little of being a valuable little work.

"There is probably no more important question than that of providing dwellings for the working classes. The right solution of this question must have immense influence on the moral welfare of the

<sup>1</sup> *The Theory and Policy of Labour Protection.* By Dr. A. Schäffle. Edited by A. C. Morant. London : Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

people, and its bearing upon many of the so-called 'labour questions' is, I believe, far greater than is generally supposed."

So writes Dr. Poore in wishing well to Mr. Worthington's book<sup>1</sup> on *The Dwellings of the Poor in and around Towns*. Holding the opinion that a great deal can be done by proper regulations in this matter, we heartily endorse Dr. Poore's recommendation of this little volume, which every one may read with interest and instruction. It is a lesson merely to look at the frontispiece and compare the glorious freedom of primitive lake-dwellings with the cramped gloom of the London flats. Life was better for primitive man in a good many ways, and the thought is not very complimentary to modern civilisation.

The great value of Mr. Worthington's book is its practical character. It not merely surveys the errors of past efforts, and notices the different schemes which have been on trial at home and abroad : it lays down practical models and plans for future guidance. "The ideal dwelling for a clerk or labourer . . . is a compact and conveniently arranged detached cottage, with ample space on all sides, situated not far from a suburban station." In this we entirely agree ; unfortunately, even Mr. Worthington has to admit the present necessity of departure from the ideal. But we gather that he agrees in one belief which has been present with us for some years—that there must be a legislative limit to the crowding of population in one area ; in fact, that the growth of large towns beyond a certain point must be arrested in the best interests of the whole community.

We pass to a very different work—a translation of M. Ostrogorski's *La Femme*. We reviewed the original work at some length in February 1892, and do not propose to say much more on this occasion than that the translation has been done under the author's supervision, and appears to us to be a fair representation of the original ; it is quite a pity that Mrs. Yates was not elected mayor of Onehunga in time to appear in a note to this translation as the latest instance of women's emancipation.

*Suicide and Insanity*<sup>2</sup> is a particularly able and instructive book ; it gives a rapid sketch of the history of suicide, it carefully analyses the motives for that crime, and shows almost conclusively that the relation of insanity to suicide is over-estimated. The book is full of suggestive passages. The following is one of the strongest :

"For the rich and the educated who wittingly outrage the laws of Nature there is no excuse. Men who spend thousands of pounds yearly in improving the breed of their horses and dogs, who under-

<sup>1</sup> *The Dwellings of the Poor and Weekly Wage-Earners in and around Towns*. By T. Locke Worthington, A.R.I.B.A. With an Introduction by G. V. Poore, M.D. London ; Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1893.

<sup>2</sup> *Suicide and Insanity: a Physiological and Sociological Study*. By S. A. K. Strahan, M.D., barrister-at-law. London : Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1893.

stand the laws of heredity, and would not breed even a pig from other than a good stock, may be found marrying their children to persons among whose mothers, fathers, sisters, and brothers they are aware of the existence of lunatics, idiots, cripples, and cut-throats. Such outrages are committed almost daily. If the person be socially and financially eligible, it matters not that the mother be a raving lunatic, or the sister an epileptic inebriate—the match goes on.”

We might easily quote page upon page; the manner in which actual instances support the theory of hereditary predisposition is as startling as it is conclusive. But we are still more astonished to find that in 1892 there existed a “Suicide Club” at Crajova in Roumania. The influence of religion, morality, and education, that of sex and age, the bearing of the law of the land, are all carefully discussed. We hardly think it too much to say that this is the most interesting sociological work we have read for several months.

From sociology proper Dr. Strahan makes a short excursus into morals, and discusses the question, “Is suicide justifiable under any circumstances?” with a result that may in some measure shock the orthodox. We recognise the difficulty of some of the cases which are put, and we are ourselves inclined to be latitudinarian on the subject; nevertheless, we have no hesitation in throwing our weight into the scale with the spirit of the existing law of England.

We are quite prepared to see several more treatises on bimetallism before we are converted to the view of Mr. Rothwell.<sup>1</sup> At the very start we take issue with him: what does he mean when he says that of the world’s money the United States holds about 15·93 per cent., France 15·10 per cent., Great Britain 6·82 per cent., &c.? What does he understand by money? on what does he base the statistics in the table on page 6? Again, when we come to the essential conditions of a permanent bimetallism we should like to know how the following proposition can be supported:

“Since the coins or certificates issued for the metals purchased are redeemable in gold, or if in large amounts in gold and silver, a change of ratio will not affect the holder of the coin or certificate therefor. A change of ratio would only require that each country deduct from the value of so much of its money as is in the depreciated metal one-half the amount by which the ratio has been changed, and add to the value of its stock of the appreciating metal in corresponding degree.”

On what principle? It sounds to us very much like begging the question. It is a great pity that the bimetallic theorist does not study the history of currency before he writes on the theories. History of silver production is not the history of currency; yet for

<sup>1</sup> *Universal Bimetalism and an International Monetary Clearing House.* By Richard P. Rothwell. New York: The Scientific Publishing Co. 1893.

us the most interesting part of the work is the chronology of the gold and silver industry 1442-1892.

Now that the Parish Councils Bill of 1893 has virtually become law, Mr. Dodd's explanatory treatise<sup>1</sup> will probably deserve more attention than it has yet received; and if he will adapt it to the law as passed, and issue a revised edition, he will probably have supplied a valuable handbook to all who have to do with local affairs.

We are almost overcome by the completeness of the Australian handbooks. *The New Zealand Official Year-Book*<sup>2</sup> for 1893 is a wonderfully detailed statistical account of the Colony for several years, indeed almost through its half-century of history. For the statesman, the statistician, the sociologist, and the would-be immigrant it provides almost all that can be desired about the Colony, and the description of the various land districts with which it closes is particularly worthy of note. We can so heartily commend the book that we hardly know where to begin to commend it.

*The Art of Living*<sup>3</sup> in Australia appears to us very much like the art of living in many other parts of the world, and we think that Mr. Muskett's book will be found a guide to health and happiness as much in Great Britain as in Greater Britain. It is, however, specially directed against "the extraordinary food-habits at present in vogue" in Australia. "For years past the fact that our people live in direct opposition to their semi-tropical environments has been constantly before me," says the author. One of the most instructive chapters in Buckle's great work is that in which he discusses the influence of climate on the food required by the human frame, and Dr. Muskett's work is based on a recognition of the same law. It is complete from the very elements of what we call "living." The tub, and the care of the skin, even of the hair, clothing, exercise—all come in for notice; and then comes the most important part of the work, the eatables and drinkables, their general principles, and a large number of particular recipes. To this extent the book is an advanced cookery-book, a sort of classical introduction to the housewife's bible, "Mrs. Beeton." It is, moreover, pleasantly written and well printed.

*The tirailleur sénégalais* has lately come into a rather uncomfortable notoriety owing to his share in the blunder in West Africa. Possibly this may add some interest to M. Descoste's little book of reminiscences,<sup>4</sup> a bright, sparkling little volume, hardly more than a tract to look at, full of that enthusiastic idealism and extravagant description which delights us in French writing, often at the expense of truth. Much of the narrative is contained in letters.

<sup>1</sup> *The Parish Councils Bill Explained.* By J. Theodore Dodd, M.A. London: Horace Cox. 1893.

<sup>2</sup> *The New Zealand Official Year-Book, 1893.* London: Eyre & Spottiswoode.

<sup>3</sup> *The Art of Living in Australia.* By Philip E. Muskett. London, &c.: Eyre & Spottiswoode.

<sup>4</sup> *Au Soudan (1890-91): Souvenirs d'un Tirailleur sénégalais.* Par François Descoste. Paris: Librairie Picard. 1893.

We close with a notice of Prince Henri d'Orléans's book about Tonkin,<sup>1</sup> which has been translated by Mr. Pitman, and deserves careful reading. It forms a good companion to Mr. Gray's book on French aggression in the East which we noticed in November last. The translation is a little stiff in parts, but the book on the whole reflects faithfully the vigour of the original. And we think the better of it on nearer acquaintance. It is not only a book of travel; it is an interesting account of French colonisation in Tonkin and Siam; it has material which may be valuable to the historian; it gives new and valuable commercial information, as, for instance, respecting coal-mining in Hong-Hay and Kebao; it is not without suggestive reflections, as in the comparison of French and English building on pp. 50, 51. It contains, moreover, some trenchant criticism of French administration:

"It is too numerous; it is partially composed of incapables and of men with bad antecedents; it is too ignorant and meddling; it endeavours to raise difficulties and to check all means of action. For the most part, born of favouritism, it endeavours to indulge in the same practice, and displeases those who obtain what they apply for as well as those who are passed over."

A few decent illustrations add to the value of the work, which is a worthy addition to the library table.

## HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

WE cannot speak too highly of the excellent abridgment of Mr. John Addington Symonds's *Renaissance in Italy* brought out by Colonel Pearson.<sup>2</sup> The great work of Mr. Symonds, of course, covers the entire subject, while at the same time giving many minute details which are not absolutely essential to a general comprehension of what the Renaissance really meant. As the opening chapter of this shorter history of the great movement denoted by the word "Renaissance" points out, it was Italy that "created a new spiritual atmosphere of culture and intellectual freedom which has been the life-breath of the European races." The reason of this was that Italy possessed a language, political liberty, and commercial prosperity at a time when other nations were in a semi-barbarous condition. The historical portion of the present work is very creditably done. The style is simple and forcible. The account of the Italian

<sup>1</sup> *Around Tonkin and Siam*. By Prince Henri d'Orléans. Translated by C. B. Pitman. London: Chapman & Hall. 1894.

<sup>2</sup> *A Short History of the Renaissance in Italy*, taken from the work of John Addington Symonds. By Lieut.-Col. Alfred Pearson. London: Smith, Elder & Co.

despots, under whom culture flourished, is as interesting as romance. The sketch of the infamous Alexander Borgia is a very vivid and realistic picture. The chapter on Savonarola recalls George Eliot's great historical novel, and will be read with additional interest by all who are familiar with *Romola*. The share taken by Petrarch, Boccaccio, Dante, and Machiavelli in the development of European learning is shown with much clearness and literary skill. Altogether the book will be most useful to all who have not time to read the more elaborate work of Mr. Symonds.

Captain Lugard's book on *The Rise of our African Empire*,<sup>1</sup> though much too crowded with details, has a general interest for English readers at the present time. Captain Lugard has had an exciting and adventurous career. He has "roughed it" in the most thorough-going fashion, fraternising with all classes of men, and his knowledge of the subject he writes about is very extensive. He bears testimony to the generosity of some of the savages whom he met in the course of his travels. Indeed he takes a rather pleasant view of human nature generally. His accounts of African lion and elephant hunting are graphic, though not written by a master in the art of description. According to Captain Lugard, hyenas have a horrible habit of "biting the face off a sleeping man." The portion of the book dealing with the origin and history of the war in Nyassaland will well repay perusal; but space does not permit us to refer to it here at any length. Captain Lugard's view of the African is that "he is a late-born child in the family of nations, and must as yet be schooled in the discipline of the nursery." We cannot share in the author's view (vol. i. p. 171) as to the utility of slavery in a semi-savage country. Under all circumstances the system is hateful, and deserves the most absolute condemnation. Captain Lugard's account of Uganda nearly fills the entire of the second volume. His remark that "whoever controls and administers Uganda will find little trouble in dealing with the surrounding peoples," is worthy of deep consideration.

It is no exaggeration to say that Ireland has never had an impartial historian. Those who have viewed Irish history from a purely English standpoint have made no allowances for the natural resentment felt by a proud and sensitive race at the attempts to subjugate them partly by the sword and partly by coercive legislation. On the other hand, writers imbued with strongly Irish prejudices have ignored the fact that the English only came to Ireland at the solicitation of an Irish prince, and that, but for the stubborn resistance of the natives, much bloodshed and turbulence might have been avoided. The real duty of the historian is to present an actual picture of the country from the earliest times down to the

<sup>1</sup> *The Rise of our East African Empire. Early Efforts in Nyassaland and Uganda.* By Captain D. Lugard. London: Wm. Blackwood & Sons.

present day—a task hard enough to fulfil, in good sooth! Many writers have dealt with isolated periods of Irish history—notably Mr. Froude and Mr. Lecky; and books purporting to be “histories” of Ireland have been produced by the late Mr. D’Arcy Magee, the late Mr. Martin Haverty, and that uncompromising Irish revolutionist, John Mitchel. But a short, clear, and tolerably accurate sketch of Irish history was needed to popularise a subject which has, unfortunately, become unpalatable to many English readers. This want has been supplied by Mr. Standish O’Grady’s delightful little volume, *Ireland: Her Story*.<sup>1</sup> No Irishman can read this book without pleasure. It is sympathetic, intelligent, appreciative. Without any pretentiousness Mr. O’Grady gives us nearly all the facts which are contained in the rather scattered materials of Irish history. The opening chapters dealing with ancient Ireland and the Irish Pagan myths are written in a strain of playfully simulated credulity; but, when the author comes to deal with the realities of the country’s sad and chequered, but not inglorious, story, he displays great judgment and profound knowledge of human nature. The sketch of the social life of Ireland in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries is especially good. It has all the charm of romance and the realism of true history. Take this passage, in which we may trace a vein of truly Celtic shrewdness:

“It is difficult for a person living in this nineteenth century, in the midst of newspapers, politics, policemen, standing armies, judges, and law-courts, open cities, undefended houses, books, pictures, &c., to understand those singular centuries which intervened between the Norman Conquest and the next great epoch in Irish history—viz., the age of the Tudor princes. One might write many books about these centuries, and still they would be dark or ill-understood. There was no government in Ireland to begin with, and men did that which was right in their own eyes. One might imagine that civil war and mutual fratricide would have quite eaten up the people, but they did not. The country got on fairly well without any government, without law-courts, or police. Small lords, such as M’Geoghegan, who waged war with Richard Plantagenet, existed side by side with great ones, and passed on their estates from generation to generation, as if a strong government protected men in their rights. Wild anarchy engendered a certain iron conscience, so that men like the O’Neill, or the Earl of Desmond, no more thought of doing gross injustice to small lords like M’Geoghegan, or the Fox, than a strong man of to-day would think of hurting a little child or a poor cripple.”

Of course, Mr. O’Grady is not quite free from fads and prejudices. He exaggerates the virtues of the Northmen. It may have been true that the Norseman’s word was his bond; but, as the author

<sup>1</sup> *Ireland: Her Story*. By Standish O’Grady. London: Methuen & Co.

naïvely admits, he was frequently a robber and a murderer: Surely lying is scarcely a worse crime than stealing or killing? Apparently Mr. O'Grady thinks it is, for he pours forth the vials of his wrath on the native Irish for their deviations from strict truthfulness, and regrets that the Danes did not completely conquer the country. In the chapters dealing with modern Irish history, some injustice is done to O'Connell; Butt is almost ignored; and Thomas Davis is only alluded to incidentally. Full justice is done to a great Irishman who has only lately passed away—Mr. Parnell. In spite of its faults, this is a genuine contribution to historical literature. It may be read by a schoolboy with delight, and yet it will be sure to enlighten and perhaps surprise many grown-up men who plume themselves on their wide knowledge of European history.

In the *History of the Rochdale Pioneers*<sup>1</sup> we have a very good account of the growth and success of a practical co-operative enterprise. The author, Mr. G. J. Holyoake, is a veteran champion of the labouring class. He writes with much force and a certain picturesqueness of style, and his book well deserves perusal.

The Rev. John Owen, who has written two interesting books, one on *The Sceptics of the Italian Renaissance*, and another on *The Civilisation of the Renaissance in Italy*, has now given us a companion volume, entitled *The Sceptics of the French Renaissance*.<sup>2</sup> The author, by means of dialogues, presents us with admirable portraits of Montaigne, Peter Ramus, Charron, Sanchez, La Mothe-C. Vayer and Pascal. Great research is manifested in these studies, and the epigrammatic style adopted throughout is impressive if not profound. For instance, it is rather ingenious to describe Montaigne as "the Sokrates of French philosophy," and to point out, in discussing the gloomy side of Pascal's mind, that "insanity is often only the extreme and exaggeration of sane conditions, just as certain physical diseases are the morbid excess of physical activity, or as vice is the excess of virtue, and heresy the exaggeration of some truth."

*The Thousand and One Quarters of an Hour*<sup>3</sup> reminds us painfully of *The Arabian Nights*. It is not a work which, strictly speaking, comes under the heading of either History or Biography; but we may not inaccurately regard it as a more or less fanciful picture of Eastern life in the days of Haroun al Raschid. The tales are admittedly the work of Thomas Simon Gueulette, who was born at Paris in 1683, and held the office of substitute of the royal procurator at the Châtelet. Some of the stories are borrowed from novels, while the materials of others are taken from real Oriental fictions. The cleverest but the least moral tale in the volume is "The Story

<sup>1</sup> *Self-Help for the People: The History of the Rochdale Pioneers*. By George Jacob Holyoake. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

<sup>2</sup> *The Sceptics of the French Renaissance*. By John Owen, Rector of East Anstley, Devon. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

<sup>3</sup> *The Thousand and One Quarters of an Hour* (Tartarian Tales). Edited by Leonard C. Smithers. London: Nicholls & Co.



of Al-Kuz, Tahar, and the Miller," in which some extraordinary matrimonial complications are introduced, much to the amusement of Hárún-al-Rashid, who is supposed to have looked on conjugal infidelity amongst his subjects as a very good joke.

Madame de Staël has been justly praised for the great qualities of her intellect and the purity of her heart. This gifted woman occupies a place in French literature which entitles her to take rank beside Rousseau and Lamartine. A very useful biography of Madame de Staël, followed by a number of extracts from her works, has been published by Belin Frères of Paris.<sup>1</sup> The introduction and the biography have been written by M. Jacquinet, who has been long honourably associated with the cause of education in France. Amongst the features in Madame de Staël's career that arrest our attention are Napoleon's ignoble antipathy to her, and her friendship with Goethe, Schiller, and other great German writers. M. Jacquinet says truly that it is as a moralist this celebrated woman deserves to be most revered by posterity. Her exalted views of society, politics, and man's progress and destiny, may be regarded as a protest against expediency and opportunism. Her moral axiom that "the aim of man's life here below should not be happiness but perfection," places her upon a pedestal far above all empirical philosophers and time-serving politicians. No doubt in some of her works—for instance, *Corinne*—there is an excess of sentiment. This we may attribute to the influence of Rousseau, whom she admired to an extravagant extent. That she was not a mere sentimentalist her exceedingly rational observations on connubial happiness and on vanity clearly prove. Though often classed as one of the pioneers of romanticism in fiction, her own opinions on the functions of the novel contained in the preface to *Delphine* appear to show that her tendency was towards what is nowadays called "Naturalism" or "Realism." We recommend M. Jacquinet's book as a most useful one, not only for the purposes of instruction, but of literary reference, containing as it does the best passages that could be selected from the writings of Madame de Staël.

Mr. Edward Jenks, M.A., Professor of Law in University College, Liverpool, has written an admirable little book on Walpole.<sup>2</sup> The character of this statesman has been ably handled by Mr. Morley; but Mr. Jenks adds something to the completeness of the portrait of one of the most remarkable, though by no means the greatest, Englishman of the age in which he lived. Walpole occupied a peculiar position, and, if he laid himself open to charges of corruption, he could, as his son Horace said by way of excuse for him, plead that he only "bought

<sup>1</sup> *Madame de Staël: Selections de ses Œuvres, avec Introduction.* Par M. Jacquinet. Paris: Belin Frères.

<sup>2</sup> *Walpole: A Study in Politics.* By Edward Jenks, M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge; Professor of Law in University College, Liverpool. London: Methuen & Co.

those who were ready for sale, and bought them for good objects." One excellent characteristic of Mr. Jenks's short study is that it is based altogether on the admitted facts of Walpole's career. Men must be judged, to some extent, by the morality of the period to which they belonged. From this point of view, Walpole was a comparatively honest man, and he certainly possessed the rare qualities of firmness and readiness for all emergencies. Though himself not free from blame in connection with the South Sea Bubble, he succeeded in saving England from its worst consequences. To him we practically owe our existing party system, which, according to Mr. Jenks, makes the Prime Minister for the time being the real English monarch. We cannot concur in all the author's conclusions, for Walpole is in many ways a far from respectable type of politician, and it is most unjust to describe Bolingbroke as a "political mountebank." We would refrain from applying such an epithet to a much inferior statesman—the late Lord Beaconsfield.

A very readable volume, entitled *Three Empresses*,<sup>1</sup> from the pen of Miss Caroline Geary, has been published by Messrs. Digby, Long & Co. The account given of the beautiful but ill-fated Empress Joséphine is full of interest, and, though the tone of the sketch is a little too lachrymose, it conveys to the reader a very vivid idea of a charming woman's character and idiosyncrasies. Joséphine was extravagant and perhaps coquettish; but her fidelity to the memory of Napoleon, who treated her so badly, entitles her to our sincere sympathy. The sketch of Marie-Louise is rather disingenuous. The writer takes care to gloss over the weak points of Napoleon's second wife. Nothing more unheroic can be imagined than Marie-Louise'smorganatic marriage to Count Neipperg after her previous alliance with the great French conqueror. We are inclined to think that Joséphine was a more truly queen-like woman than her more high-born rival. The sketch of the ex-Empress Eugénie is rather scrappy, but it is nevertheless very interesting. Here and there the book is painfully adulatory, and the style is sometimes a little ungrammatical; for example: "One of the *chiefest* ornaments" (p. 55) is rather questionable English, to say the least of it.

<sup>1</sup> *Three Empresses: Joséphine, Marie-Louise, Eugénie.* By Caroline Geary. London: Digby, Long & Co.

## BELLES LETTRES.

THE autobiographical papers contained in *The Making of a Novelist*<sup>1</sup> have already appeared in serial form. Mr. D. Christie Murray starts from the theory that an apprenticeship to journalism, with its varied experience of life and affairs, is the best training possible for a novelist, and if this be so it must follow that his own has been an ideal preparation. As private soldier, as special reporter, as amateur tramp, passing for weeks from one workhouse to another, as war correspondent, as actor, he has done his utmost to qualify himself, and his numerous novels and his plays are largely built upon his multiplied experiences. Some telling episodes are now related in the first person with much point and vigour, and taking these as a sample of quality, we hope that Mr. Murray will soon give us a more consecutive account of the events which contributed to his "making," for his pages are eminently amusing, and abound in good stories and graphic incident.

*The Last Day of the Carnival*,<sup>2</sup> translated from the Russian of G. J. Kostromitin, gives a sombre and lurid picture of the spirit of reckless despair abroad in poverty-stricken and terrorised provincial Russia on a day of national rejoicing. The fear of the rod and of an all-powerful police pervades everything, affording subject for grim humour, and adding a savage zest to pleasures which may at any moment be brutally cut short, the dark shadow of a Siberian mine rendering even the hardest lot enviable by comparison. This sketch of a single day is one of coarse debauch and of pitiless bureaucratic oppression, and unhappily the author claims that his tale is something more than a bad nightmare, and concludes with the solemn words: "It is so, I cannot say otherwise. God help me!"

*Mimi's Marriage*<sup>3</sup> is a study of the essential emptiness of the life of a fashionable woman who has married for money, and of the state of mind which induces that unwholesome craving for *excitations poivrés* in which so many find their ruin. It is a translation of a tale which, we are told, has had considerable success in Russia, the authoress being a lady who wisely preserves the secret of her identity, seeing that her delineations are extremely cynical, and her characters and scenes taken from life. Altogether it is a clever story, the lines of Mimotchka's education and the atmosphere of her family circle being admirably indicated. Another volume of

<sup>1</sup> *The Making of a Novelist*. An Experiment in Autobiography. By David Christie Murray. London: Chatto & Windus.

<sup>2</sup> *The Last Day of the Carnival*. Translated from the Russian. By G. J. Kostromitin. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

<sup>3</sup> *Mimi's Marriage*. A Sketch translated from the Russian. By V. Mikoultob. London: T. Fisher Unwin. Pseudonym Library.

the same "Pseudonym" series, *The Home of the Dragon*,<sup>1</sup> contains seven little tales illustrative of life in Tonquin, for the most part prettily handled.

In *Lisbeth*<sup>2</sup> there is some careful, quiet work, and close study from life. Taken as a whole the book is monotonous and long drawn out, but the portraits of the Mitchell sisters, though sometimes a little overcharged, are touched in with humour and perception. These five elderly middle-class Scotchwomen, who have drifted to London with the tide which sets southwards, and have passed through life with varying fortunes, are yet held together by the instinct of kinship. Their relations form a lifelike if unpleasing study of family idiosyncrasy, and their jealousies and bickerings, their rasping speech, their quarrels, and their testamentary dispositions are cleverly given. Much of the story is commonplace enough, but if the reader will have patience he will also find much that is pathetic and finely observed.

The scene of *A Third Person*<sup>3</sup> is laid in a provincial town, and the tale is that of a handsome young officer, home on leave, his love for the fair Rose Yaldwin, and the crossing of their path by a designing widow, Mrs. Clara Skyler. By far the most amusing character in the story is, however, the delightful and evergreen Mrs. Baggott, who, at sixty, stoutly refuses to lay down her arms, insists on enjoying life, rides, sings, dresses and flirts, talks excellently well, and has more spirit and sense to her own share than all the rather milk-and-waterish young people in the book can muster amongst them.

In *A Hunting Girl*<sup>4</sup> we have the portrait of Miss Rose Darlington, a beautiful and fast young woman, sound at heart, but badly brought up by a disreputable uncle, who lives by his wits and his card-table. This interesting pair are followed in their migration from Green Street, Mayfair, to the hunting centre of Grassborough in pursuit of a wealthy husband, for it is a mistake to suppose that the hunting-girl pursues only one kind of prey. Although known in town as "that dreadful Darlington girl," Rose has nothing on her conscience but some youthful indiscretions, and, to use her own words, "only needs prosperity and a comfortable home to become at once respectable." There are, of course, some exciting hunting scenes, and one long run out cubbing in which the heroine (who, by the way, has just received her first riding lesson) shows the way, winding up her gallop with a legendary water-jump. As a purveyor of sporting novels, Mrs. Edward Kennard now takes a leading place, and her power of drawing character is certainly above the average.

<sup>1</sup> *The Home of the Dragon*. A Tonquinese Idyll. By Anna Catherina. London: T. Fisher Unwin. Pseudonym Library.

<sup>2</sup> *Lisbeth*. By Leslie Keith. London: Cassell & Co.

<sup>3</sup> *A Third Person*. By B. M. Croker. London: F. V. White & Co.

<sup>4</sup> *The Hunting Girl*. By Mrs. Edward Kennard. London: F. V. White & Co.

*L'Abbé Florentin*<sup>1</sup> is a study of clerical life from the clerical point of view. *Voici ma thèse—le bon curé*, says the author, and he presents a rather difficult subject with considerable skill. This sketch of professional character has not the literary quality of *Les Courbezons*, nor is it as amusing as *L'Abbé Constantin*; in some sense it is rather an *apologia* setting forth the difficulties and sacrifices of the priestly vocation, and defining what the life and ministry of the good priest are meant to be by the Church. The most sensational moment in the book is that in which the Abbé recognises the voice of his first penitent as that of the only woman for whom his heart has ever been stirred, and learns that, now all hope is over, she has come to tell of her own love for him in the secret of the confessional. She makes known her wish and intention to take the veil, and henceforth, though they but rarely meet, a curious and transcendental relation is established, and forms the romance of these two holy and pious lives.

*A Seaside Romance*,<sup>2</sup> by Mr. C. Carlyon Jenkins, has the peculiarity of showing one title on its boards and another that of *Stella* as a heading to the story itself. It is explained that this is "in consequence of a book named *Stella* being published a week previous to the appearance of this volume," but on the whole it is an awkward way out of the difficulty. The tale is essentially a reminiscence of some of the situations and characters in *Richard Feverel*: the stern grandfather, the beautiful boy, the idyllic simple-minded maiden, even a parody of the charming "penny-whistle" love-passages are all here. Further, we object that it seems hardly possible for a child to be brought up secretly in the "deserted wing" of an English country-house, inhabited by the baronet his grandfather, without discovery until the said child was six years old.

An attempt is made in *Raymond's Folly*<sup>3</sup> to expound a scheme for the formation of educational and recreative clubs for boys on a philanthropic and quasi-religious basis. A boy would be invited to become a member on leaving the Board schools, and required to pledge himself to attend the classes and other means of improvement. The inducements held out are the club gymnasium, swimming bath, cricket and football clubs, indoor games, reading-room, &c., all of which are to be made as attractive as possible, while the subscription is to be fixed at a penny a week. The idea has much to recommend it and might well be fruitful, as it would offer help and counsel to boys at a most critical time in their life.

*Alice Lauder*<sup>4</sup> is a simple story of an Australian girl of

<sup>1</sup> *L'Abbé Florentin*. Par M. l'Abbé G. Rouquette. Paris: Téqui, Libraire-Éditeur.

<sup>2</sup> *A Seaside Romance*. By C. Carlyon Jenkins. London: Remington & Co.

<sup>3</sup> *Raymond's Folly*. The Story of an Experiment in Utopia. By Paul Neumann. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

<sup>4</sup> *Alice Lauder*. A Sketch. By Mrs. J. Glenny Wilson. London: Osgood, McIlvaine & Co.

marvellous musical talent, who, in her chrysalis state of badly fitting flannel frocks and awkward manners, loves, and refuses to marry, a well-born Englishman, whose fastidious taste she is conscious she cannot entirely satisfy. After ten years they meet again, and Alice having then reached the point of development represented by Bond-street tea-gowns and an effective carriage of the head, there is no further obstacle between the lovers, and they marry with but little delay.

*Pomona*<sup>1</sup> is a rather pretty story for girls, containing, it is true, some startling improbabilities, but on the whole pleasantly written. Pomona, by the way, is a young English girl, and not a heathen deity.

We have had the *Art of Pluck*<sup>2</sup> before us for some little time, and been unable to make up our minds about it—we too are “plucked.” It has a good reputation, and we do not wish, after fifty years, when the eighth edition is reprinted, to turn the cold shoulder. Yet it seems to us nowadays, in our grave maturity, to lack brisk humour. It is undoubtedly clever; it is wonderfully well sustained; but so elaborate a joke is apt to pall. One chapter indeed will always be fresh: it was the *Art of Pluck* that gave the three wrong ways of translating “Hannibal transivit Alpes summa diligentia.” Similarly we welcome again:

“Tres fratres cœli navigabant roundabout Ely,  
Omnes drounderunt qui swimmere non potuerunt.”

But the examination papers do not by any means come up to Verdant Green: there is nothing to equal “Draw a parallel between Annibal and Annie Laurie.”

<sup>1</sup> *Pomona*. By the Author of *Laddie, Tipcat, &c.* London: W. & R. Chambers.

<sup>2</sup> *The Art of Pluck*. Being a treatise after the fashion of Aristotle, &c., &c. By Scriblerus Redivivus (Edward Caswell). New edition. London: Bliss, Sands, & Foster. 1893.

## THE DRAMA.

YES, the German poet is quite right: "it is blissful to be a child now and again," and one never realises that so keenly as at Christmas time, when so much is done to gladden children, to instil into their little hearts lessons of kindness and goodwill towards all men, and to fill their little heads with those beautiful illusions of life and the world which, alas! in riper days fleet like smoke chased by the wind.

We have seen many pantomimes—many pretty ones, many gorgeous ones, many which have made us feel cheerful. But rarely have we felt during a whole night so happy, so pleased, so young, as on Boxing Eve when we saw *Cinderella* at the Lyceum. Of all the displays of taste of which London may boast, this is the most tasteful; of all the clever stage managers we have, Oscar Barrett is the most artistic. Here is a man who owns the sixth, and perhaps most enviable of all senses, that of beauty. Barrett has an eye for colour, he has an ear for music, and blending the two he perceives that true splendour does not consist in overloading; that it consists in tempering magnificence with discretion.

And *Cinderella* is a pantomime magnificent and discreet; it is also a pantomime with a clearly defined story—the venerable fairy-tale—and a clever book by Mr. Horace Lennard.

There are at least three scenes of unforgettable beauty: the glade in the forest, where all the flowers and the leaves come and enchant Cinderella in her dream; there is the fairy boudoir, with its rich assortment of toilet articles, all living, all represented by pretty little minxes from Katti Lanner's excellent school, or by good looking damsels selected by Oscar Barrett with the eye of a connoisseur; but the great *ball champêtre* takes the palm. So overwhelming is this spectacle in itself that one of our colleagues called it rightly "a whole Empire ballet" switched on to a pantomime.

In this grand tableau Mr. Barrett introduces a series of picturesque groups, beginning in the stern style of Roman antiquity and graduating through the classical period of mediæval Italian grace to the charm of the Tudor era. Of course, as soon as the English dames and cavaliers appear on the stage, they indulge in a bewitching minuet to the strains of music partly culled from the work of

Edward German." All this is charming, and the stage, filled as it is with a bevy of comely girls arrayed in mellow-coloured garments, reminds one forcibly of the page of the celebrated fairy-tale in which Cinderella's ball is so graphically described. Nor were our illusions dispelled when Cinderella herself appeared in a glittering gown of white silk and silver brocade. Miss Ellaline Terriss is—and was during the whole of the evening—the ideal Cinderella, fair and simple, sweet and beautiful. Miss Terriss has not a strong voice, but it is melodious, and melodious is perhaps the only word with which we can adequately describe the impression her impersonation has made on us.

Miss Kate Chard was somewhat heavy, but very pleasant, as the prince, and Miss Alice Brookes, a very sprightly, nimble, spirited little lady, delighted everybody with her saucy gaiety. The two "plain but wicked" sisters found extremely funny, but by no means vulgar, interpreters in Messrs. Victor Stevens and Fred Emney. Miss Clara Jecks was a youthful and lively baroness; Miss Susie Vaughan is not yet quite at home in the part of the benevolent fay; and little Miss Minnie Terry, who was once the best child-actress in England, will have to study very, very hard—notably elocution—before she can pass muster as a full-grown actress.

At present she is hardly audible, and her delivery is painfully monotonous. It is to be hoped that her aunts will see her performance and take her in hand. The two principal dancers, Miss Louie Loveday and Mdlle. Zanfretta, are both very handsome, but the former is as solid as the latter (the charming wife of Charles Lauri) is lissom and supple. This reminds us not to forget Charles Lauri's exquisite imitation (we would fain say physiological study) of a cat. It is perfectly wonderful, and as nearly "taken from life" as Nature will allow a two-legged mortal to metamorphose himself into a quadruped.

Reviewing the whole evening rapidly in our mind's eye, we come to the conclusion that *Cinderella* is an enormous success for every one concerned, and a personal triumph for Oscar Barrett, who has so harmoniously blended exuberant and melodious gaiety to the most fascinating poetry of motion.

But if we have nothing but praise for the pantomime at the Lyceum, we have scarcely anything favourable to say upon the pretentious spectacle which the manager of Drury Lane has provided for his patrons; and it is very doubtful indeed whether a dramatic performance, avowedly organised for our little ones, can be recommended, when a male artist is presented to us in not irreproachable undergarments, and a lady is shown in the process of divesting herself of her dress. Such incidents may please the man in the gallery—he will laugh at anything that is vulgar—but to our mind it betrays a deplorable lack of taste, and it grieves us that the



manager who vaunts that he rules the National Theatre of England should prompt such blots on the 'scutcheon. Want of taste, that is the great defect of the Drury Lane pantomime; there is plenty of noise and plenty of patter, plenty of pomp and plenty of colour, but there is no harmony at all, and if the stage setting harrows us on account of its loudness, the music hall artists no less harrow us because they are unaccustomed to act, and take noise and artificial gaiety for real comicality.

It is scarcely necessary to waste many words on this pantomime of Robinson Crusoe, which pleases the crowd and therefore seems to fulfil its purpose.

It was a capital idea of Mr. Charles Wyndham to revive Mr. F. C. Burnand's amusing farce, *The Headless Man*. Some years ago, when the play was produced in a somewhat rough and ready way for a very brief run, and in mere fulfilment of a contract we believe, it was received with some disfavour, and Mr. Wyndham's altercation with the "man in the gallery with a white hat" is still vivid in our recollection as an historical first-night incident.

This time the *première* of the play elicited nothing but boundless approval. Rightly so. For *The Headless Man* shows Mr. Burnand at his best—the Burnand of the good old days. The *donnée* is extremely funny. Imagine what a solicitor must come to whose head is so full with this, that, and the other business that he has to resort to mnemotechnics in order to attempt to keep order in his reeling headpiece. Our solicitor thinks that he has hit upon the right plan when he indicates every question to be dealt with by single letters in his notebook. D stands for divorce, L for letter, W B for his wife's travelling-bag, M B for his own ("My") bag. Of course, far from improving matters by this alphabetic device, the headless hero gets himself and everybody else into endless trouble, which culminates in the most absurd situations. Nor does the author and his chief interpreter, Mr. Charles Wyndham, allow the fun to flag. Apparently rhymeless and reasonless, the action, well knitted as it is, keeps the public in one continuous roar of laughter, and there are some scenes which for comic fun are almost unique in our modern repertoire.

Charles Wyndham is the heart and the soul of the funny business; he makes gigantic efforts with his tongue, his face, his limbs, and his body, and whenever he is on the stage it seems almost as if it were filled with a crowd of merry, frolicking people. In *The Headless Man* one may see Charles Wyndham, the comic actor, at his best. He is valiantly assisted by Mr. Blakeley, whose amusing personality and peculiar diction are irresistible. The female interest in the play is but slender, and we cannot honestly say that the three pretty ladies, Miss Blayney, Miss Ethel Matthews, and Miss Ellis Jeffreys, displayed any marked ability. Mr. J. G. Taylor gave an

exquisite type of a little old-fashioned gentleman stepped out of a picture of the early fifties.

A very important production was Mr. Sydney Grundy's *Old Jew* at the Garrick. As a drama it may be called unsatisfactory, because what should have been the mainspring of interest has only become of secondary importance—in other words, the characters have been merged into the author's purpose and thus become mere tools in his hands. True, the central figure is the Old Jew, the most interesting picture, in which all the qualities of the chosen people are united and some exaggerated, while their weaknesses are only lightly touched upon. The Old Jew, in whom there is something of Father Abraham, of Mendelssohn the philosopher, and of a prince of finance, is drawn with such completeness that all the other personages, to whom the author could not allot so much room, dwindled into mere shadows; some of them we would call mere walking epigrams, some the illustration of a principle, some the faint copy of a type, and some a thumb-nail sketch of a human character.

Clearly what Mr. Grundy wanted to do was not so much to write a play as a pungent satire, amplified into an instrument of castigation and revenge. We may mistake Mr. Grundy's intentions, but we cannot get away from the impression that the "Moonlight Club," with its population of venal, despicable and loathsome journalists, is a fiction invented for a purpose. We feel that Mr. Grundy in this play endeavours to pay off an old debt which he owes to many of the critical fraternity. He has ever been ready for a bout with them, he has never disguised his opinion, but while he was a rising man, he did not consider himself strong enough to use his dramatic talent as a vehicle for his vengeance; but now that he has risen, now that any play of his will pass muster with the managers, he has at last allowed the flame, which had been smouldering for years, to break out in a lurid hue. Whether it is right to make the drama subservient towards personal feelings of a vindictive nature is an open question; but we confess that the play has not only amused us, but that it has vastly interested us. It contains lines of masterly force, and the writing throughout is of an excellence which is but all too rare on our stage. It is not a pleasant play, it is not a play that will very much exhilarate the hearer, nor will it appeal to the general public, which knows and troubles but little about lower grades of Bohemian life in London.

In fact it would not astonish us at all if the days of the *Old Jew* were numbered, in spite of its cleverness, in spite of the masterly acting of Mr. John Hare, who, in the character of the Old Jew, reveals a wealth of feeling, of emotional power, which hitherto we believed to be the one thing wanting in him, and now in our opinion places him on a plane in our dramatic world on which he is second to none and nobody is his superior.

The acting withal of the play was remarkable, and it would be invidious to single one out where all the impersonators are worthy of praise; but if a stranger should yet entertain doubt of the merits of English actors, he may be advised to go to the Garrick Theatre to see this play; he will leave the playhouse a converted man.

Mr. Henry Pettitt, who has just died at the early age of forty-five, was beyond dispute the most skilful melodramatist in the English-speaking world. His work was stupendous in quantity, for either alone or in collaboration he has produced dramas to the number of about two score and ten; in quality, much that Mr. Pettitt wrote was forcible, powerful, stirring, but it was crude and rough: artisan's, not artistic work. Mr. Pettitt was a most skilful dramatic constructor, he had a wonderful gift of evolving capital scenes from the most commonplace situations. It has been said—and not without justification—that if Pettitt could have his way, a melodrama would consist of nothing but scenes—no plot, no characterisation, no humour, but scene upon scene: a veritable Eiffel tower.

What Pettitt lacked was refinement, education, imagination. Three graces, for the absence of which he could not be blamed, although the critic has to take it into account

It is rather curious that a man, with such an abundant dexterity, with such an extraordinary knowledge of stagecraft, should have been entirely denied the divine gift of fancy.

For all that, we confess to a certain amount of admiration for Mr. Pettitt. His fertility, his skill, his ceaseless activity, and his almost proverbial good fortune, coupled with his jovial unassuming personality, stamped him a powerful factor in our little dramatic world. He was, in fact, an interesting man, for he had built up his position unaided, and when, in his particular line, he had risen to the summit of melodramatic glory, he never gave way to pretention or "pose." He lived and died a simple, kind-hearted, good fellow, and if his work has no claims upon posthumous homage, the memory of the man will survive, for he had few, if any, enemies, and he counted friends by the thousand.

March 1894

## WORK FOR THE WORKLESS.

The soil lies fallow, the woods grow rank,  
Yet idle the poor man stands !  
Oh ! millions of hands want acres,  
And millions of acres want hands !

THE existence of an unemployed class—"free labourers" as the capitalist euphemistically, perchance sarcastically, terms them; "black-legs" as they are stigmatised by the trades unionist—is without exception the strangest paradox of modern civilisation, and constitutes, moreover, a standing menace to organised labour. So long as there exists outside the ranks of unionism a large and ever-increasing body of men, willing and able to work yet unable to find employment, and always forced by the pressure of dire necessity to take the place of the unionists when they come out on strike or are locked out to force a reduction of wages, the tenure by which the Trades Unionist holds his present position is necessarily most uncertain. The means to do ill deeds makes ill deeds done, and the weakness of the workers being the employers' opportunity, the latter, who are themselves forced by present industrial conditions to fight tooth and nail for a footing, are only too sorely tempted whenever a period of depression sets in to take advantage of that weakness. It is to this cause that we may trace the oft-recurring conflicts between labour and capital, such as the recent lock-out in the coal trade, a dispute which so rapidly assumed the dimensions of a great industrial war directly involving close upon half a million of men, with their wives and children, and indirectly causing loss of work and untold privation to perhaps as many more in our cotton mills, iron foundries, great engineering works, and other trades; besides leading to riot and disturbance, to the calling out of the military, and to the slaughter by British soldiers of British working men. The masters, by their demand that wages should be reduced by 25 per cent.—though they have since endeavoured to explain that their demand involved a reduction not of 25 per cent. but of  $17\frac{3}{4}$  per cent.—undoubtedly struck the first blow. Their action was, therefore, the immediate cause of the coal war, and of all that it has brought in its train. The immediate cause—but we must look beyond and behind immediate causes; we must probe the matter to the bottom.

This coal war does not stand alone. It is by no means the only

portent of recent years to warn the British public that in existing industrial conditions there is something fundamentally wrong. The great Hull strike, the railway strike in Scotland, the great dock strike in London, and many minor disturbances, all enforce the same lesson. I do not desire to pose as a mere alarmist; but how narrow is the bound that divides passive industrial warfare from actual civil strife who shall determine. Starvation is the stuff that revolutions are made of. Let a strike once become general, so as to paralyse the means of communication and reduce London and other great centres of population to starvation-point—what then could avert an outbreak? Who that has followed with careful eye the signs of the times can deny that such a strike, involving utter paralysis of the railway traffic, has once or twice within recent years been imminent?

The British public demands, and rightly so, that a searching inquiry shall be made into the circumstances attending the deaths of the men killed at the Acton Colliery, but whether that lamentable occurrence and the widespread privation and suffering entailed by the lock-out, to say nothing of the fact that such conflicts are a constant source of danger to the community, will rouse the British public from their lethargy, rouse them to a thorough realisation of the vital importance of the economic problems involved, and cause them to grapple with the question with a grim determination not to be thrown off by its inherent difficulties, yet remains to be seen.

John Bull is, on the whole, a kind-hearted, well-meaning personage, and a lover of fair-play and justice; but he is woefully brain-lazy, and the prospect of a hard think-out is to him by no means alluring. However, the realisation of the fact that industrial problems must be either thought out or fought out may, perhaps, serve to nerve him to the task. John Bull prides himself, also, on being a shrewd business man, and, as an honest man should, has a great respect for the rights of property, though, unfortunately, thanks to the brain-laziness above mentioned, his ideas as to what rightfully constitutes property are somewhat vague and require to undergo considerable modification.

Let John Bull study present industrial conditions, whether as a kind-hearted, humane investigator; as a shrewd man of business; as a lover of right, freedom and justice; or as one who respects the rights of property—and from every point of view he will find that they stand condemned.

Ask the orthodox political economist of the good old school how it is that men willing and able to work are unable to find employment, and he will tell you that it is because there is no demand for their labour. Could anything be more absurd, more at variance with the true facts of the case? These out-of-works—are not they, their wives, and their children in a chronic state of semi-starvation?

Are they not all poorly clad and badly housed, if housed at all? Surely in the providing of proper food, clothing, and house accommodation for themselves and their dear ones there is ample employment for them, ample demand for the labour of idle though willing hands! Labour is here in plenty. What, then, is lacking? The labourer is no conjurer: he cannot produce food, clothes, and shelter out of nothingness. Before he can set to work he must have the wherewithal to work upon. Now, reduce all our complex industrial processes to their lowest terms, resolve into their component parts all forms of wealth and capital, and what do we find? Why, this—that the land is the only raw material, the sole source of wealth and capital, the only basis of industry, and that by the application of labour to the land all forms of wealth and capital are, in the ultimate analysis, produced. What the labourer requires, therefore, to enable him to set to work to procure shelter, food, and clothing for himself and his loved ones is access to the land—access to the only food-store, to the only raw material provided by Nature.

All questions affecting the tenure of the land are, therefore, fraught with the gravest consequences to the freedom and happiness of the nation, and are of the utmost importance to the worker and to the business man. Yet how little attention they receive from either! How few have devoted even five minutes' consecutive thought to the subject!

The facts with regard to land tenure in the United Kingdom are such, one would fancy, as should rivet the attention of every thinking man. "Of the 72,000,000 acres in this country," says the *Financial Reform Almanack* for 1892, "50,000,000 are 'owned' by less than 15,000 persons, and of these 50,000,000 *no less than* 30,000,000 are owned by 1000 persons." It is estimated that, leaving out blocks of under an acre in extent, some 180,524 persons practically "own" the whole of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales; that 10,000 persons "own" two-thirds of England and Wales; 300 two-thirds of Scotland; and 1900 two-thirds of Ireland.

Now it cannot be seriously maintained that the landlords by merely "owning" the land in anywise assist the production of wealth, yet monopolising in this manner the only raw material the landlords are enabled to levy upon the labour and capital at work in the United Kingdom an annual tribute of upwards of £160,000,000, while the rates and taxes levied by the State and municipality for all purposes, both general and local, amount only to some £128,000,000 per annum. This sum the landlords receive as rent for the land alone. It is the premium that they receive merely because they "own" the land. Of this sum the royalties levied upon our mineral products absorb at the lowest computation some £5,000,000; the tribute levied on the agricultural industry accounts for £57,000,000; and the balance is borne by the manufacturers and workers in our towns

and cities. What has John Bull, the shrewd business man, got to say to this state of affairs? Is it surprising that with the land so monopolised many should be unable to get work, and that with so heavy a tribute levied by idle parasites upon the labour and capital of the country trade should be bad and wages low? It is hard indeed that the vast unearned incomes of these noxious parasites should be left untouched, while a demand is made that the hard-earned wages of the miner, which at the best of times allow but a narrow margin above a bare subsistence, shall be reduced by 25 per cent.

John Bull often boasts that England is a free country; but is John Bull sure of his facts? In a free country the equal rights of all men to life and liberty should be secured, and each man should be free to exercise his powers and to seek happiness in the way that pleases him best, provided only that in so doing he does not trespass upon the equal rights of others. In England, so far from the equal rights of all to life and liberty being secured, the land, which is absolutely essential to the life of every man is, as we have seen, a close monopoly, and before he can exercise the powers with which Nature has endowed him, the worker is by law (made by the landlords) compelled to pay toll to the monopolists for permission to live and work upon the land. As for the pursuit of happiness, the weary search for work, or the lifelong round of toil, leaves but little time for that. Nor, despite all our laws and regulations ostensibly designed for that purpose, are the rights of property secure. Under cover of the law they are fundamentally violated every day, owing to the fact that John Bull for want of thought has adopted a false standard.

The true right of property may be deduced from the equal rights of all men to life and liberty with a logic as clear and inexorable as that of Euclid himself. Granted that all men have equal rights to life; then, since the use of the earth is absolutely essential to the life of all men, all must have equal rights to use the earth. But all men have also equal rights to liberty. It follows, therefore, that whatever each man makes by the application of his labour to the land is his as against the world, for to compel him to yield up to another without return a portion of the fruits of his labour would be to render him to that extent a slave. *That is precisely the effect of the land laws of this country.* For no wealth is produced without labour; therefore, to whatever extent the landlords, who as such do no work, receive what they have not earned, those who do work must be deprived of that which they have earned.

Now though not earned by the landlords, the rental value of the land is created by—in other words, earned by—the whole community, but for whose presence and collective enterprise and industry land values would have no existence. Land values, therefore, form the natural

source of public revenue and should rightfully be taken by the State for public purposes. At present, this fund, created by the public, is supinely allowed to flow into the pockets of the landlords; and the State, in order to meet the expenses of government, is forced to levy rates and taxes on labour and labour products, thereby hampering and penalising trade and industry and lowering both wages and profits. In the appropriation to public purposes of the fund created by the public lies the solution of the bulk of the labour problems of the day. For if the £160,000,000 of ground rent now appropriated by the landlord to his own use and benefit were appropriated by the State for the public use and benefit by means of a tax on land values—a tax that should be levied whether the land were put to use or not—then, not only could the present £128,000,000 of rates and taxes be abolished, but the barriers of land monopoly would be broken down, and labour would obtain free access to the resources of the country.

Many persons are accustomed to regard labour and capital as natural enemies, just as at one time England and France were regarded as such; but, as a matter of fact, the interests of labour and capital are identical, capital being only labour in a more concrete form. I am not a thick-and-thin supporter of capital, nor do I assert that capital does not oppress, and at times most grievously oppress, labour; but I contend that wherever this is the case the *power* to do so is derived from monopoly, and that of all monopolies land monopoly—the monopoly of the sole source of wealth and capital, the only basis of industry—is chief, and fruitful parent of all the rest. For, granted free access to the land, the labourer would be able, if necessary, to produce for himself all the capital he required, and thus, unless he wished to see his capital waste and deteriorate before his eyes, the capitalist would be forced to allow the labourer to have the use of it on terms advantageous to both. Under such conditions the idle capitalist, the mere “sleeping partner,” would quickly be eliminated, for no industrial concern so handicapped could hope to compete successfully against those free from such an incubus.

Land and labour are the only two factors that are absolutely essential to the production of wealth. Without them no wealth can be produced. Capital is a secondary factor in wealth production. It is in fact a form of wealth, and is defined by economists as that form of wealth which is used *to assist labour* in the production of further wealth. Capital, like all other wealth, is produced by the application of labour to land, and can be produced in no other way. Iron, wood, stone, and all other metals, minerals, raw materials, and opportunities supplied by Nature, are classed by the economist under the term “land.” They are not wealth until labour has been applied to them in such a way as to fit them for the satisfaction of human



needs, and cannot be classed as capital until embodied in such forms as are suited to assist labour in the production of further wealth. Ploughs, steam-engines, looms, and the thousand and one mechanical contrivances by which the efficiency of labour has been so enormously increased during the past fifty years, are all capital. That assisted by such capital a given expenditure of labour will produce far more wealth than if not so assisted, none can doubt. Were it otherwise, no intelligent business man, no worker, would be found willing to pay interest for that from which he derived no benefit. In that case also it is obvious that the worker would be quite independent of capital—that, granted freedom of access to the land, capital would be a negligible quantity.

Capital has been spoken of as "stored-up labour." Interest may as fitly be termed "stored-up wages." Now, labour may be stored up in two very different forms. It may be stored up in the shape of grand mansions, richly furnished, in noble statues, and beautiful pictures, in a fine carriage and a stud of horses, or in any of the other forms in which it will directly minister to taste, luxury, or ostentation. Or, it may be stored up in the form of well-appointed factories, in machinery, in agricultural implements, or in the many other forms in which it will assist labour in the task of supplying us all with the good things of life. Now, it is probable that most men would, if left to themselves, store up their labour in those forms of wealth which minister directly to human wants and aspirations. Here it is that the function of interest comes in. Interest is that inducement which leads to the accumulation of wealth in such forms as are suited to aid labour in its task. If the supply of capital is not equal to the demand, interest rises. If the supply exceeds the demand, interest falls. Thus, by its rise and fall, interest automatically determines the flow of capital into industrial enterprises, and serves in this way as a great labour-saving (or, as I prefer to phrase it, *labour-assisting*) contrivance.

It is often said that the labourer gets so little because the capitalist gets so much. Were this the case one would expect to find wages low in those countries where interest is high, and to find wages high in those countries where interest is low. But, on the contrary, it is a matter of common experience that where interest is high wages also are high, and that where interest is low wages also are low. *This is just what one would expect to find if one looked upon interest as "stored-up wages."*

It is important that a clear distinction should be drawn between *interest* and two other items which often swell the returns of the capitalist, and the confusion of which with interest often leads to much ignorant denunciation of capital. These items are *insurance for risk* and *the profits of monopoly*. *These two items account for every case where the rate of interest appears to be usurious.* In such cases either

unusual risk is involved, or the undertaking enables the investors to secure the profits of monopoly. Against fair insurance for risk no reasonable man can inveigh. That it is fair to allow a privileged few to reap the profits of a monopoly, and thus to gain an advantage over their fellows, no fair-minded man can maintain. For, as pointed out above, no wealth is produced without labour, and if some get more it inevitably follows that others must get less than their fair share. Capital and labour, therefore, should unite their forces against the common enemy.

With the exception of patent monopolies, I can think of no form of monopoly that would not be abolished, or the profits of which would not be secured by the State for the benefit of all, by the abolition of all the present taxes now levied on labour and labour products, and by the imposition in their stead of a single tax on land values such as would appropriate to State purposes the whole of the rental value of the land. Monopolies secured by patent rights serve a useful purpose, that of encouraging invention; but whether that purpose would not be better served by a direct bonus to the inventor is an open question. The United States is the great country of monopolists and millionaires, but there is not one of them whose millions would not melt into thin air upon the application of the proposed principle. The millions "owned" by Andrew Carnegie and the other great "coal and iron kings," have no objective existence. They simply represent the capitalised value of that power of confiscation, conferred by monopolies based upon the protective tariff and upon unjust land laws, by means of which these men are enabled every year to extort vast sums from the earnings of labour. The millions of the Astors in the same way represent merely the capitalised value of those taxing charters—or "title deeds," as they are commonly called—by virtue of which they claim the "right" to levy a heavy toll upon the New Yorkers who inhabit a certain area of Manhattan Island—an area which was bought by the original John Jacob Astor for a sum which compared with present values was a mere song.

The millions "owned" by Rockefeller and other members of the gigantic Standard Oil Trust represent merely the capitalised value of the power of confiscating the earnings of others conferred by their "ownership" of a great natural opportunity. And the same applies to the millions "owned" by the great "railway kings," and to the high dividends paid by water companies, gas companies, telegraph, telephone, and tramway companies, and all such monopolies. Their power comes from the fact either that they have obtained control of valuable natural opportunities, or that the State or the municipality has supinely granted them valuable franchises or privileges without requiring that they should render an equivalent for the same to the public. Abolish protective tariffs; break down the barriers of land

monopoly; tax all natural opportunities at their full value; tax at its full value the land on which the railroads run and the land on which the railway stations are built; appropriate in a similar manner the full rental value of the land occupied by the pipes of the gas and water companies, &c., and by the lines of the tramway companies, and by the wires of the telegraph and telephone companies. Then such monopolies as I have named will either be abolished, or the State will secure for the benefit of all those profits of monopoly which it would be unfair to allow individuals or private companies to enjoy to the detriment of the rest of the community; and the dividends of all such companies will then be fairly proportioned to the actual service rendered by them to the community.

The application of this principle of taxation would quickly revolutionise and humanise the whole of the conditions of industry. As we have already seen, it would involve the abolition of the whole of the £128,000,000 of rates and taxes now levied on labour and labour products. But great as that relief would be, the throwing open to labour of the natural resources of the country would be a far greater boon. Where the land is the subject of a close monopoly the wages of the labourer are determined by the law of supply and demand, which, operating by what is known as "the iron law of wages," tends always to force down the return to labour to the minimum on which the labourer will consent to live and reproduce his species. "The iron law of wages" is not, however, the natural law of wages. It is only the law that governs the rise and fall of wages under present unjust and unnatural conditions. "The produce of labour," said Adam Smith, "constitutes the natural recompense or wages of labour. In that original state of things which precedes both the appropriation of land and the accumulation of stock, the whole produce of labour belongs to the labourer." To secure to the labourer the full product of his labour it is only necessary, however, to secure freedom of access to the land; for, as we have seen, interest on capital is not a deduction from wages, but represents that portion of the joint product of labour and capital which is due to the assistance rendered by capital. Free the land and you free the people. For with freedom of access to the land no man would work for another for longer hours, or under harsher conditions, or for a less return than he need work for himself on the land. That the return so obtained would be no mean wage, the results of the allotment system, even under present adverse conditions, abundantly testify. Witness the following extract from one of the leaflets issued by the Scottish Small Holdings and Allotment Association, comparing the results obtained on crofts at Collace (near Perth) aggregating 360 acres, with those obtained on a larger farm of that area in the same district:

On crofts at Collace extending to  
360 acres.  
" Good homes for 56 families.  
" 2 ) horses.  
" 75 cows.  
" 150 pigs sent annually to market.  
" Annual rent £840, with almost  
no cost for buildings to proprietor.

On large farm of 360 acres.  
Home for one farmer and tempo-  
rary residence for 6 ploughmen  
and one boy, with outdoor labour  
to 3 females.  
8 work horses and one gig horse.  
3 or 4 cows; some feeding cattle  
and sheep.  
2 or 3 pigs for private use.  
Annual rent, say from £360 to  
£500, with all buildings erected  
by the proprietor."

The report adds that "in the district of Collace the assessment for poor-rates is only 1½*d.* per £, with no pauper on the roll. In the neighbouring parish it stands at 7*d.* per £."

As indicating the possibilities of extension which lie before the allotment system and the hopefulness of this method of finding work for the out-of-works, and thus removing one of the gravest dangers from the path of organised labour, I may quote the following conclusions come to by the special committee of the English Land Colonisation Society as given on p. 13 of their report upon "Farm Labour Colonies":—" (1) That in the present condition of agriculture there are large tracts of land of inherently good quality and principally in the past used for wheat-growing, which are now either going out of cultivation or being but poorly farmed. (2) That such area of this land as is now being worked is rarely employing, and thereby maintaining, more than one labourer and his family for every forty acres; whereas in Ireland, the Channel Isles, and in parts of the Continent where the results of intensive cultivation of small areas by individual occupiers have been placed before the committee, a man and his family seemed to be maintained on areas averaging from four to ten acres."

How strongly the operation of such a tax as would force into use and thorough cultivation land now held idle or only partially cultivated, would tend to relieve the present cut-throat competition of labourers for employment, the following extract from Prince Kropotkin's article on "The Coming Reign of Plenty" (*Nineteenth Century*, June 1888) will show:

"If the soil of the United Kingdom were cultivated only as it was thirty years ago, 24,000,000 people, instead of 17,000,000, could live on home-grown food; and that culture, while giving occupation to at least 750,000 men, would give nearly 3,000,000 wealthy home-customers to the British manufacturers. If the 1,590,000 acres on which wheat was grown thirty years ago—only these and not more—were cultivated as the fields are cultivated now in England under the allotment system, which gives on the average forty bushels per acre, the United Kingdom would grow food for

27,000,000 inhabitants out of 35,000,000. If the now cultivated area of the United Kingdom (80,000 square miles) were cultivated as the soil is cultivated *on the average* in Belgium, the United Kingdom would have food for 37,000,000 inhabitants; and it might export agricultural produce without ceasing to manufacture so as freely to supply all the needs of a wealthy population. And finally, if the population of this country came to be doubled, all that would be required for producing the food for 70,000,000 inhabitants would be to cultivate the soil as it is cultivated in the best farms of this country, in Lombardy, and in Flanders, and to cultivate the meadows, which at present lie almost unproductive around the big cities, in the same way as the neighbourhoods of Paris are cultivated by the Paris *maraisiers*. All these are not fancy dreams, but mere realities; nothing but modest conclusions from what we see round about us, without any allusion to the agriculture of the future."

The fundamental wrong in existing social and industrial conditions is the fact that a few monopolists are permitted to hold valuable land out of use and to levy a heavy toll upon labour for the right of access to the opportunities supplied by Nature. The ballot gives the people the power to right that wrong; justice is on their side; it only remains for them to study the question with the care that it demands, to find out what ought to be done, and then to send to Parliament men whom they can trust to carry out their behests. Having in their own hands the power to remedy the evil, on the people must rest the responsibility—the blood-guiltiness—if they fail to exercise that power.

ARTHUR WITTHY.

## PICTURESQUE VILLAGE HOMES.

IN many a half-deserted English village one may observe picturesque little cottages falling into decay, the rent being so low that the landlord does not care to keep them in repair, nor does he attempt to build new ones (unless he be a nobleman or rich landed proprietor whose dependents are for the most part comfortably and almost sumptuously housed), as the law demands so much in the way of sanitary arrangements and water supply, that were he to do so the rent would place the perfect little dwelling far out of the reach of a farm-labourer whose wages average 12s. per week.

In this part of the country the building of a labourer's cottage is a rare event. Should there be works connected with mines, tunnelling, railways, &c., rows of unattractive jerry-built dwellings spring into existence, the work of some enterprising speculator, but the pretty village cot, with its sheltering eaves, its shady trees, its bench, its honeysuckled porch, is becoming a relic of the past.

The sturdy children of the sturdy peasant are deserting their village homes, and crowding into the towns: farm labour is hard and brings in little pay, and when the evening comes after the long day of labour there is only the workhouse to look forward to—no *home*, only a "house" in which to die. No wonder then that the villages are depopulating; wiser heads than mine must devise the remedy; in the meantime, until better days come, the idea has occurred to me to turn this evil to good account for the benefit of a large portion of the middle class, to whose comfort and pleasure we might add considerably by utilising the relics of a pre-Georgian age, these same quaint cottages now lapsing into decay.

There are thousands of women of gentle birth with small incomes, and endowed with no special training for any profession or business pursuit, by means of which they can increase them. With an annuity of perhaps £30 to £50, some of them live a lonely life in dreary lodgings, or in boarding-houses, others a still more uncomfortable one, with more fortunate relatives. This class is composed chiefly of the widows and daughters of clergymen, officers and professional men, the descendants of old and noble families, governesses, and others past hard work and very often past middle age. I have been assured by a lady who spends her life in forwarding the interests of this class, that it is useless for a woman to apply for an

appointment after thirty-five. There are certainly comfortable homes where such as these can be received for a trifling payment, in some cases of only £20 per annum, and where they are maintained in ease and comfort for the rest of their natural life; but the question suggests itself, why should a woman, because her youth is past, be shut out from a pleasant, active, independent life? Some of the hardest workers in politics and finance are men over forty, to say nothing of the "Grand Old Man," at the helm of the State-ship, who can add more than forty years to the supposed limit of an ordinary woman's work. We should not dare to propose a Home of Rest for men of forty or even fifty, where they could sit by the fire-side, or in the sunshine, fold their weary hands, and sink gradually into a living death, as we do for middle-aged women.

Of course this difference arises, not only from a neglect of special training, but from the false position a woman has held for the last century or more. The times are changing, and any one who was present at that grand conference of women-workers held not long ago in Bristol, must have felt, as I did, that a woman, when her youth has gone with all its bewildering distractions, wakes up to the important mission she is bound by her training and culture to fulfil in the coming kingdom, that kingdom for which the Church has prayed for ages, and which I felt must really be at hand when I heard from those splendid women how much loving work is being done by women.

But the cottages—it is for those women who may be no longer young but who are healthy and helpful that I propose to adapt them. Let us find some of these tiny, cosy, sunny, picturesque places, let us be sure they face south or south-west, and in these humble dwellings let them turn their woman's training to account. Most of them at one time or another have tried their hand at house-keeping or house-tending; let these begin again on a small scale, and the bright active life will bring back a lost youth and keep at bay the old age which creeps on so steadily when the life is without interests and the hands without work.

With this object in view, about eighteen months ago I started my first cottage. It took my fancy because it was detached and picturesque, with roses, honeysuckle and jasmine clambering over the rustic porch and round its dormer windows, grass plots in front and a gay border of flowers.

This tiny nest contains only two rooms, the sitting-room being supplemented by a small scullery, in which a capital Rippingille stove is placed which will cook anything from a rasher of bacon to a cake or sirloin. This little kitchen-place has a window looking into a field, and the cows come and peep in with their quiet eyes, and you can smell their fragrant breath.

I have furnished the cottage comfortably, prettily, and artistically.

The door opens into the little sitting-room, which a high folding screen protects; the paper is pale-blue, the hangings terra-cotta. The long low window seat is cushioned, and a cosy corner fills the space by the fireside, a few dark wood shelves and brackets relieve the bareness of the walls, portières are hung over the doors; the floor, which is stone, is covered with linoleum, upon which are laid Khyber and skin rugs. A kind of dresser-sideboard of dark polished wood, in early English style, designed by myself, does duty for both purposes. When finished the room made a charming little snugger, with its writing-table and other accessories, as comfortable and refined as any fastidious lady could wish.

The bedroom is large and airy, the paper yellow, the hangings peacock blue with scraps of red to relieve the cold tone; a curtain hangs at the head of the stairs, and another divides the room if required to be shared by two friends or sisters. Here, too, the window-seats are cushioned, the beds are comfortable with wire mattresses, and the furniture, which is plain deal stained and polished, was made from designs of my own by the village carpenter. Everything is arranged in such a manner that there shall not be too much work for one pair of hands, and that assistance should be hired for only the roughest daily labour.

The rent of this cottage is five shillings weekly. It is so conveniently situated that the town and church are both within five minutes' walk, and a farmhouse stands nearly opposite where all farm produce can be obtained, as well as white and brown bread and other necessaries. The country is very beautiful, the scenery romantic; the town is endowed with a free library, where the daily papers can be seen. Of course, hot and cold water is not laid on, as some of my applicants seem to expect, forgetting that this is no more than a labourer's cottage nicely done up as a home for a lady. There is no water laid on at all, but there is a plentiful supply of sparkling water fresh from the hills at the spring close by, whence some girl or woman from the village fetches it in true rural fashion in pitchers once or twice per day. This plan will surprise the London or suburban poor lady, but it is not reckoned a hardship in country villages; in one place near here the inhabitants have to fetch their water from a spring a mile distant, but this stream is close at hand and never fails, winter or summer. The tenant of such a cottage must be domesticated; and it is necessary that she should understand at least simple cookery, besides having resources for dull days and long evenings, such as a taste for music, needlework, books, and if possible a facility for making friends among and ministering to the wants of the simple folk around her. Two ladies living together in such a house could easily manage on £60 or £70 between them, yet live in comfort, independence and refinement. If inclined, they might add to their income by needlework, basket-making, spinning, shall I



say?—for I hear that hand-spun yarn always commands a price in the market (this seems a step backwards, but if so, it is a step towards the useful and picturesque)—or any other indoor occupation; but I strongly advise that living within the income should be the first consideration, and adding to it merely secondary, on the principle that it is easier to save a penny than to earn one, particularly if one has not so much training as a domestic servant. There is just now a great deal being said and written about the deadly dulness of village life, its narrowness of interests, its intellectual torpor: May we not hope that the presence and influence of gentle and cultured women may do something to amend this?

If it be true that goodness and culture shed around them even imperceptibly an influence of "sweetness and light," it is surely probable that this may be the case.

My first cottage has been inhabited, enjoyed, and very much admired; and I shall not think myself hardly used, should it be my fate to pass the last years of my life in that sunny little nook.

But to pass on to my second venture, which is rather more ambitious. It is very old, and thatched like the other; indeed, it is built in the same Ann Hathaway style, and must belong to the same period—that is, the Shakespearean. It is much larger, and might be called a five-roomed cottage, with three-quarters of an acre of ground attached. This garden I have laid out in "Queen Anne walks" near the house, and have planted all kinds of creepers to run over the arches and against the walls, which were quite innocent of this necessary adornment. I have also planted good fruit-trees and quantities of early strawberries in order to provide some produce for the market. There are shady seats under the trees—it faces south—flowers thrive in the borders near the house.

The sitting-room is an antique little oak-room with oak rafters, mantelpiece, and furniture; the kitchen is roomy and comfortable, and there is sleeping accommodation for three or four persons. This cottage has also a rustic porch with outhouses, pigsty, &c. Here poultry and bee-keeping as well as the garden would be sources of income with careful management. The cottage stands high and detached, a farmhouse opposite and cottages within a short distance. It is situated in a lovely village, ten miles from Bristol, with which communication is easy and frequent by omnibuses, market and carriers' carts. It is only two miles from the village of Aust and its cliff, famous historically and geologically.

The rent of this cottage is 7s. 6d. weekly. It would suit a mother with quite young children, or two or three ladies, sisters or friends, who could club together on co-operative principles, dividing the rent and general expenses, and sharing the work in house and garden.

I must now come to the Rock House Ladies' Club, which, though the house cannot boast a thatch and antiquity like the cottages, can

still claim to be a picturesque village home. It is at present full, but as it only accommodates four or five ladies, that does not mean much. The house is well built, and has been put into perfect repair. Each lady has a comfortable furnished bedroom, for which she pays a stated weekly sum, at the present time varying from 3s. 6d. to 5s. For this she has besides the run of the house and garden; indeed, she can appropriate a piece of the ground for her own industrial purposes. The situation is high and bracing, the aspect south, and a pine wood which forms the boundary of the garden adds to the healthiness of the position. On the north and east it is sheltered. The tenants, under a clever manageress, are testing the experiment of co-operation, which means that no one of them profits by the living expenses of the others, and that their general expenses, such as necessary service, fuel, lights, &c., are equally shared.

These lady residents are bright and active: one of them is very musical, two are fortunately experienced in cooking, and they are all clever at making the best of an already pretty place. Every time I visit the Club I observe some fresh addition in the way of comfort or adornment, the work of their own deft fingers. They have a good supply of books and papers, so contrive to keep pace with the times. They are all busy, all interested in their work, yet still find time for intellectual pursuits. There is a village club and reading-room held in a large room downstairs; the ladies kindly patronise it, which is almost as much as they can attempt during the short busy days of the winter months.

There is a piece of ground attached to this house, nearly an acre in extent, consisting partly of disused quarries. It is at present very much in the rough, but it lends itself all the better for that to the starting of new industries, such as roses, violets, &c. The lady gardener has already planted hundreds of wallflowers, which, it is hoped, will blossom early and produce flowers for market. Strawberries of the earliest kinds are planted; tomatoes were profitably grown last summer; bees are established in bar-frame hives; poultry has not been attempted yet, but will be started in the early spring. Mushrooms are being forced in boxes, and we are doing the same with rhubarb and seakale, endive, &c.

There is a pretty little donkey carriage for the use of the tenants.

Such, in brief outline, is a sketch of the picturesque homes I have prepared for that class of women in which I am most interested, and which I believe to be the most overlooked or neglected, composed, as it is, of the fatherless, brotherless, husbandless women, who have been brought up to depend upon others, and after all have been compelled to stand alone. A dull life in a dull lodging is too often considered good enough for the elderly aunt or cousin

when her home is broken up, and her relatives have no need of her services; and in that lodging she pays, out of her scanty pittance, an overworked landlady to do for her what she is still quite able to do for herself. It is hard for middle-aged women to begin work again after a life spent in teaching or other sedentary pursuits, and it is painful to find they are rarely fitted for the ideal cottage life. The lady cottager must be domesticated, and the member of the Club must be willing to make herself useful, to bear and to forbear, to give and to take. I do not propose that the rough work at either place should be undertaken by the lady herself, unless she is quite unable to pay a trifling sum for the service, which is always easily obtainable in a country village.

Since my scheme became known I have been overwhelmed with applications, but I am convinced that a very small percentage of the writers are fit for cottage life. The fact is, capable women are required to make it a success; in the cottages *outré* at least must be capable, or the dainty little home will quickly degenerate into an almost squalid hovel.

Before closing my paper I must add that there is no charity connected with this scheme. No donations or subscriptions are required. I offer my pretty homes, supplied with every necessary for use and comfort, and all I ask is rent. The domestic management is left entirely in the hands of the tenants themselves. They can live with as much economy as they choose. My part is to put them in the way of adding to their insufficient income by the care of industries established by myself. Of some of these they can undertake the charge and receive the profits, after paying me a percentage upon my initial expenses; or, should they prefer to do so, they can invest a small portion of their capital in an industry such as the stocks of bees and relieve me of all further responsibility.

While I write both my pretty cottages are standing vacant, though both have been let during the summer, and the smaller one the winter before, the would-be tenants preferring to wait till spring; they forget that to the true lover of Nature winter is really a *sleeping* spring, and that those only who are brave and patient enough to watch and tend her while she sleeps under her coverlet of snow will share the glad surprise of her awaking when she rises to scatter her snowdrops, violets, primroses and daffodils in bright and quick succession over the smiling land.

MARY CAMPBELL SMITH.

## THE NEW EIRENIKON.

"Those who find it more congenial to pass behind the whole field of theological divergency, and linger near the common springs of all human piety and hope, may perhaps be preparing some first lines of a true Eirenikon."

DR. MARLINEAL.

ACCORDING to the late Canon Liddon, "it is said that this is an age which desires to be religious";<sup>1</sup> and, according to Mr. Spencer, the "religious need" is "indestructible." It is impossible to take up the monthly Reviews published in this country and America without finding two or three articles directly bearing on the question of belief. If Mrs. Humphrey Ward breaks new ground by introducing the all-important matter into a novel, Mr. Gladstone must follow up with a magazine article on "The Battle of Belief." Like Edgar Quinet, men seem to be *tourmentés des choses divines*, however far they may be from definite religious faith or Church. Professor Huxley admits the fascination of the subject is so strong as to seriously distract him from his allegiance to "his liege-lady, Science." Whatever we may be, we are not indifferent, and still less irreligious. At the very worst we may be described as non-religious, indicating the negative attitude assumed by most thinking men of the day.

On the other hand, we hear something like a chorus of lamentation over the irreligiosity of the "masses." Clergymen of every denomination tell us that working men do not go to church. The same, I doubt not, is true of their betters; but non-attendance at Divine Service is not conclusive evidence, in every case, of non-religious, still less of anti religious, feeling. The Iconoclasts, who have never done with the Noachian Deluge or the Gadarene pigs, have not written an anti-religious line in their lives. Dogma is their abomination, but for religion we have every reason to believe they entertain a profound respect, and yet they never go to church. But what are we to say of the churchless masses? In the first place, I think the clergy are obviously right in their belief (more right than many of them may know) that the masses go to no church. The late Cardinal Manning used to say that if all the churches and chapels of London were filled, two millions would be left outside.

<sup>1</sup> *Some Elements of Religion*, Sermons at St. James's, Piccadilly, 1871.

Add to this, the churches are notoriously not filled. City churches, of some dimensions, never attract a score of worshippers to their ordinary services. Fashionable churches in Kensington or Knightsbridge may be fairly well filled on Sunday morning, but the average attendance at Anglican churches, with a partial exception in favour of Ritualistic services, is distinctly low. The Wesleyans have organised an attractive social gathering at St. James's Hall, the chief result of which has been to deplete their smaller chapels. At Catholic churches, men are conspicuously absent, and the slender congregations that gather in the ordinary church are composed largely of women and children. I need not linger on this topic, when we have ministers of every denomination deploring the unfortunate fact that men (particularly men) cannot be got to come to church, unless a Spurgeon or Farrar occupy the pulpit. Men "draw" as much as ever. How is it that religion seems to "draw" no more?

I will now venture to point out some of the causes of this decline, and afterwards to indicate the lines on which we should proceed if the religious sentiment is not to be hopelessly crushed in the uneducated heart.

In the first place, I think it is indisputable that religion has been discredited by the dogmatical vagaries of its professed defenders. Church after Church, from Roman Catholicism downwards, has nailed its colours to the dogmatic mast, which have been blown hither and thither by every wind of doctrine from the four quarters of the globe. From that "theological kaleidoscope," the University pulpit of St. Mary's, Oxford, down to village churches, the disintegrating influence has been at work. Six days of the week men have been accustomed to handle the hard and indisputable facts of daily life, and deal with the dicta of ordinary common sense. Sunday, the one day which they snatch from the seven for communion with the Unseen World, is spent in listening to Protean presentations of dogmas, *alias* religion, which at last have succeeded in making numbers think that after all there is as little to be said for religion (they really mean dogmas) as for palmistry or astrology. If Aristotle is right when he says that "Unity is the test of truth," what on earth can be said for a number of disputatious systems which inspired the emphatic lines:

"You shall and you shan't; you will and you won't;  
You'll be damned if you do, and damned if you don't."

Of course, the effect is first felt amongst the educated, who may be readily pardoned for refusing to accept as a heavenly sent religion a series of creeds and elaborate dogmas, about which theological experts cannot, by any conceivable means, be got to agree. Then, Protestantism is peculiarly unfortunate owing to the corrosive action of Teutonic criticism on that Hebrew and Christian literature which

together constitute the basis of its faith. In the year 1856 the late Canon Rawlinson soberly defended in his Bampton Lectures the historical character of the Creation and Flood narratives, because Moses, owing to the phenomenal longevity of the Antediluvians, could have almost got the facts at first hand in either case. In the space of thirty years the highest of the High Churchmen have got miles beyond the Apologist of 1856, and a Bampton Lecturer of to-day could scarcely stand up for Methusaleh or the Noachian déluge without risking his reputation for scholarship, if not for sanity. Then, the whole traditional theory as to date and authorship of the Old Testament has been completely overthrown. Evolution in Hebrew religion is as obvious to Canon Farrar, as in organic life to Mr. Huxley. Prophecy has been reduced to natural foresight, and Dr. Jowett has told us that we shall get over our belief in miracles as we have overcome our faith in witchcraft. Paley and his evidences have gone under, and no one seems inclined to reopen the dogmatic side of Christian Apologetics. Books are written here and there to show the moral superiority of our ethical system, but that is only demonstrating what Mill, Darwin, and Mr. Huxley have admitted times out of mind. These men are as ready to subscribe to the incontestable moral supremacy of Christ as to the universality of the law of Evolution, and, perhaps, even more so; for while the first has been experimentally proved beyond possibility of doubt, the most ardent Darwinian is constrained to admit that his conclusion is not yet beyond the limits of hypothesis, however probable. But to return; the discredit thrown upon the Bible as a dogmatic basis, coupled with the irreconcilable divergences manifest among Bibliolaters has sealed the doom of dogma as a system. The Catholic Church suffers no less than the Protestant. She is confessedly losing ground on the Continent, and I have heard representative men candidly admit that the manhood of the Latin races is practically estranged from her. Converts in England of any mental attainments she makes none; the springs of conversion opened up by the Tractarian movement, and at first supplied by Puseyism, have dried up long since. Theoretically speaking, the Roman Catholic body thinks itself as strong as ever after all that Leyden and Tübingen have done. Poor stuff like Protestantism may go down before Wellhausen and Kuenen, but the Council of Trent, never. As though an intrinsically discredited doctrine could be rehabilitated by changing the ground on which it was held to stand! Protestantism teaches the inspiration of the Bible, because the Bible is its own witness. When a fuller critical knowledge of the way the various Biblical books and their component parts arose, makes it impossible to believe in their infallibility or inspiration, Catholicism thinks that all is as it was if only you accept the said inspiration on the authority of the Church instead of the Bible. How on earth is a corporation trustworthy which does not know the

human character of the documents which it is so ready to recommend as the composition of the Almighty? What should we say of Mr. George Smith if his Assyriology was as much at fault about the records of the Land of Asshur, as the Catholic Church about the Hexateuch or the Book of Daniel? And supposing he had declared the Assyrian records 'inspired'? When two people have been proved untrustworthy in one and the same contention, it won't do for one of the inculcated parties to attempt a ride off on the plea that he defended the insupportable proposition on different grounds from his neighbour. The critical arguments that are fatal to Protestant inspiration are equally so to the Catholic dogma.

Now, from the Common Rooms at Oxford or the pages of the monthly Reviews the new gospel filters steadily downwards. *Facilis descensus Averni*. It gets into popular treatises or Broad Church newspapers, till finally a penny weekly will notice it, and lecturers in the East End think it good enough to introduce to their Sunday evening audiences. It goes to swell the torrent of argument against the Bible to which Paine and the late Mr. Bradlaugh so liberally contributed. To the coarse invective of the Radical ranter we have added the refined but far more deadly criticism of the scholar, which has reduced the sacred literature of the Hebrews to a common denominator with the corresponding writings of other peoples. How inconceivable that we should expect our artisans or even labourers to accept incomprehensible propositions on the authority of a book which even clergymen admit to be purely human in its origin, and full of imperfections, scientific, historical, and even moral! One thing is absolutely certain, that Bible religion is doomed. The world never goes back to its discarded ideals. If the Bible cannot be proved to be "every book, every chapter, every line, every letter, the Word of God," as Dean Burgon believed with many a peasant of the present day, its value as the ultimate standard of belief is hopelessly depreciated. And if the Bible comes to be taken for what it is intrinsically worth, can we expect that the doctrines peculiarly associated with Bible teaching will survive in unimpaired vigour? It seems to me irresistibly proved that the dogmas of the Trinity, Atonement, Original Sin, and Baptismal Regeneration must become extinct as the dogma of a never-ending Hell as Jonathan Edwards or Father Furniss saw it. The chaotic condition of religions, or rather dogmatic thought, in England shows it. Dogma is like a pill: you must swallow it whole or let it alone. Since the Reformation men have tried to come to terms with it, and accept, in part, the tangled growth of antiquity and mediæval lore, while rejecting what looked like superstition and human invention. The result has been to justify the Papal contention that the world would go infidel, that is, would disbelieve in dogmas altogether. It is because we are now in the last passes which lead to that desirable consummation that the turmoil and confusion is at its worst, that

religion, instead of being a help in the solution of our political and social difficulties, a consolation to the individual, and, as it was designed by the Christian founder, a bond of union in the community, is a positive hindrance to the accomplishment of those reforms which statesmanship sees to be indispensably necessary. Half our difficulties with Ireland are religious, and, if the hare-brained scheme recently before the country ever became law, would probably lead us into civil war. The Hindoos and Mahomedans in India are scarcely more estranged than the Catholic peasantry of the South and the Ulster Protestants. Agitations for the overthrow of Establishments are another indication of the *odiuin theologium*. The distrust of the working man for his employer, whether he be the successful capitalist or the county squire, is intensified instead of diminished by religion. Christianity means Bible and dogmas to the popular lecturers and their East End audiences, and when they have found out that the Bible and its dogmas are groundless—only they put it in more forcible terms—they not unnaturally take to denouncing all religion as an organised hypocrisy and a cloak designed to hide the hideous oppression of the starving poor from the guilty consciences of their rich employers. Mr. Mann devoted a lengthy “sermon” to the establishment of this edifying thesis a Sunday or two ago, and his sacred oration was loudly cheered, according to the *Daily Chronicle*. It may be grossly illogical from our point of view, but no one acquainted with the facts has any doubt that a desperate hate for the religion that allows such things to be, or, at any rate, makes such little headway in their reformation, is springing up in many a man’s heart. A man out of work has plenty of time to think, if not to brood, and when they are not afraid to paint on their banners, “Give us work or bread, or by God we’ll take it,” it is not difficult to foresee results if the present depression continues.

I am no believer in the omnipotence of religion to alter economic conditions. The most enlightened Theism is incapable of creating trade when it does not exist, or rectifying a faulty currency; but it is a desperate condition of things which allows these men, who look upon themselves as God-forsaken, to think that our religion is nothing better than a book in which they have been taught by their betters to disbelieve, and a bundle of dogmas which make the devout wrangle and the sceptics sneer. We have every confidence in the stability of our national character—and rightly so, after the experience of the past—but no one can say now where this social agitation is going to end. Abroad it may involve the denial of property and become identified with downright Communism, and how are we sure that we shall escape the contagion? With absolutely nothing to appeal to but a religion which they have got to hate as much as their masters, we shall have nothing standing between us and anarchy but a handful of soldiers, who may be won away from us by bribes or threats. This may



sound alarmist, but when we hear the Duke of Argyll and Sir Charles Russell, frankly confessing they see no way out of the *impasse* to which social matters have come, it does not seem to be supererogatory to speculate as to the further development of the dark movement already afoot. At any rate, this much is obvious. It is a time when society can afford to dispense with none of those forces which make for order and civilisation, and of these religion is the chiefest. If I am asked for a proof of this statement I will refer to that magnificent piece of oratory—the speech of Victor Hugo on the De Falloux law, in which the statesman, the philosopher, and the poet meet to frame the most vigorous indictment against a selfish and worldly creed which would limit man and all things to this present sphere, and leave out of account that fundamental truth of all religion—the immortality of the soul. “Preach it,” cries the majestic voice from on high: “tell them that no one shall have suffered unjustly, or toiled without his reward. Death is but a restitution. The law of the physical world is equilibrium; of the moral world, justice. *Dieu se retrouve à la fin de tout.*” I long to believe that England, which has taught the world the inestimable advantages of free institutions, which has allied herself against every tyranny, which hates injustice and the thing that is a lie, will once more show the way to an ampler and diviner faith which shall gather her own scattered children into one brotherhood as no political federation can ever do. I long to believe that the spirit of the Hebrew race which first discovered the all-embracing truth of the universal empire of One Supreme Being may fall upon our race in these latter days, that we may be, under God, the means of realising, first at home, and afterwards throughout the world, the unspeakably grand ideal which thrilled the soul of the greatest of the sons of men, when he saw in his moments of loftiest inspiration his Father, God, adored to the uttermost ends of the earth, and all men brethren. I long to believe that this nation, so strong and self-reliant, so determined to do the thing which is right once it knows it, no matter what the sacrifice may cost, will break with a past, from which it more than half parted in the sixteenth century, and proclaim aloud through its prophets and priests the only religion the mind and heart of man can ever receive—the religion which was the inspiration of its Founder’s life. I shall be asked, how is this to be accomplished? The answer is obvious. Trust to reason, for “God is for ever reason.” Reason is the light of Heaven shining upon us and within us; it is the very image of the God after whom we are made. Of this there can be no doubt. But there is doubt; ay, and a seriously growing doubt in the minds of the very best men whether the faith which commands us to believe what reason can neither demonstrate nor understand, is what it claims to be, the gift of God. If reason, which we can indisputably trust, does not countenance these incomprehen-

bilities, then why cumber they the ground? It is a pitiâble, ay, a heartrending sight, to see men at one about the fundamental truths of the majestic religion of reason, and divided and distracted by a diversity of doctrines which have their origin in a dead past, and in ages that are none of the best in the world's long course. Why have we left the mountain-top and its pure and invigorating air for the swamps and miasma of the villages below? Is the sermon preached on the Galilean hill-side so poor that men should meet in after days and industriously elaborate a system of dogmas and creeds by the interposition of the subtleties of Hellenic thought with the simple yet stately message of Jesus of Nazareth? What are the council halls of emperors at Nicæa and Chalcedon, and all their eight-and-twenty metaphysical canons, compared with the heavenly music that fell on peasant ears in far-off Palestine? Does not Gregory of Nyssa tell us that he never "knew a council of bishops to turn out well," that pride and party-spirit, not love of truth, carried the day? Is it not a fact that of the three hundred and eighteen bishops at Nicæa, many were illiterates, unable to write their names? Does not Milman avow that under no circumstances does the Church appear so discreditably as in the history of her councils? Was even the Council of the Vatican above reproach? And it is at the bidding of the men who ruled and sat at these assemblages that Christians have bartered their birthright of truth for a hybrid compound of theology and metaphysics, which has kept the world stagnant for ages, deluged it with bloodshed, filled it with the agonising groans of the racked and tortured creatures that could not say the shibboleth that was asked of them, divided man from man, created infidelity and atheism, and now leaves us impotent where our arms need strengthening to resist the waterflood that seems ready to burst upon us.

What remedy is there left to us? There is one, and one only. In religion as in art, progress means regress. We must go back to antiquity, not of the third or fourth century, when the mischief had already begun to brew, but to the very teachings of the Master himself, and suffer no teacher or expositor, however erudite, to stand between us and the message which the enlightened reason of man can gather from the imperfect reports which men, so immeasurably his inferiors, have given of his teaching. Reason and reason only must be our Pope and Council and Church. We must no more bow down before a dogma which does not justify its claims at the bar of Reason than respect an ambassador who cannot produce his credentials. "Reason is the only faculty whereby we may judge of Revelation itself," says Butler, and we must stand by that inflexibly. We must trust to that wise and beneficent spirit, whose progress through the ages has been traced with so scholarly a hand by Mr. Lecky, to be our guide here, as in every department of life. We must, in a word, *rationalise* religion. We must obey to the very letter the precept of

the Imitation of Christ: *Ne attendas quis dixerit, sed ad quid dicatur attende.*<sup>1</sup> If we find the Reign of Law increasing and strengthening on every side, excluding more and more the probability of external and capricious intervention, we must be prepared to bid farewell to a belief in all such occurrences as miracles. They will vanish, like witchcraft and devilry, into the darkness from which they originally emerged. If we find that its professed upholders can give no better account of "inspiration" than that the books called after it contain lofty thoughts and portray ennobling examples, we must place them on the same human level with kindred literature in all quarters and ages of the world, and not presume to construct a mythological history of any individual because his sayings and doings are therein reported, unless we are prepared to adopt similar results based on other sacred writings. If books are responsible for the circulation of unhistorical matter such as the transference of demons from a man's body to those of a herd of pigs, or the cursing of a tree for not bearing fruit in mid-winter, we must discount the authority of the books by so much, and hold these and similar narratives in suspicion. If men who have given years of patient and self-sacrificing study to an ancient literature offer irrefutable proof that the believers in its super-human origin have been for eighteen hundred years and more hopelessly wrong about its natural character, we must listen to them, and believe accordingly, no matter how violent the change may seem, or what the consequences. The truth must out completely, and woe if we are unprepared for the shock its revelation will produce. If a number of highly abstract teachings are based upon books now confessedly human, we must discard them unless they are their own justification like any other objectively true thing. In a word, we must be guided by the spirit of rationalism if we are to frame any Eirenikon to satisfy the dissentient minds and hearts of religious men. We must believe in the truth of the moral perceptions in man—not in their pravity and blindness. We must believe in the moral perception of the character of God, and in the Unity of His Person and Nature. We must believe in the natural awakening of the Divine Spirit within us, rather than its preternatural communication from without. We must believe in Christ, not as God's victim, but as His revelation, in company with all the radiant lives that have now been shown to this world. We must, finally, believe in a universal immortality, not of capricious or select salvation, with unimaginable torment as the general lot, but, for all, a life of spiritual development, of retribution, of restoration.<sup>1</sup> Such is the creed and religion of reason, which, if a man shall keep pure and undefiled, he shall have a faith of which neither his head nor his heart need be ashamed.

And this is the vital need of our age, so justly proud of the

<sup>1</sup> *Five Points of Christian Faith.* By Dr. Martineau.

intellectual achievements which put it far and away above even the golden days of the Renascimento. It is an age which has set the scientific house in order, which has popularised learning, softened manners, lifted the standard of comfort and increased the value of all that makes life worth living. It now desires to set in order the house of Religion, by the application of those identical principles which have been so pre-eminently successful in every other department of human existence. Recognising the religious need, the Time-Spirit would fain provide its votaries with a faith that shall be as completely in harmony with the facts of nature and of life as physiological or biological science. It is endeavouring to provide a belief which, while in intimate accord with physical science, shall yet transcend it from the nobility of its object. In a word, it wishes to frame its articles and creeds on the very same grounds and with the identical methods it applies to the systematic exposition of a science. It is prepared to show us that there is as much evidence to show that man is "a living spirit" as an animal; that the evidence that proves order in scientific knowledge proves order in that of which science treats, and that, therefore, there must be order, otherwise intelligence, in the source from which it sprang. If man can know this, he can put himself into communication with that super-mundane mind by conforming in all things to those laws stamped inexorably on nature and the conscience of man, and which he recognises as the best possible standard whereby to live, as the painter discerns in the glorious model of the past the highest exemplar of his art. It sets before us as a God to satisfy the inevitable question, Whence? It reveals to us a spirit in answer to man's self-inquiring, What? It discovers the majesty of physical and moral law in response to the query, How? It lifts the veil of the after-life, showing it all-enduring, all-divine, to satisfy the demand, And Whither?

All else it sweeps away with an unsparing hand, or if it leaves them, it confounds the tongues of those who attempt to think the unthinkable, or speak the things which no tongue can alter. Into its glorious temple it suffers none to enter save those whose "service of faith" is "reasonable." Mysticism it abhors; the unreasonable it will not endure. It takes its stand on one truth, luminous as the noontide sun; "God is for ever Reason." It is content with one simple though majestic prayer which it has learnt from its chief Teacher. In obedience to the great Zeitgeist, the prophets are abroad, lifting up their voices, in calm but inflexible confidence that the age is at hand in which the New Reformation shall usher in the "Gospel of the Kingdom," and set up an ensign to the children of men dispersed amidst strife and contradiction.

## REPUBLICANISM *v.* SOCIALISM.<sup>1</sup>

As there are still some people who, for want of knowing better, have a vague notion that Republicanism and Socialism are identical, it seems to us that it may be useful to call attention to an important work by M. Yves Guyot, published quite recently, in which he demonstrates by a series of incontrovertible arguments that the principles of the Republic and those of Socialism are diametrically opposed to each other, and that it is only by a total obliviousness to the real aims of the Republic that legislators allow themselves to make any concessions to the Socialists. As the work is one of nearly three hundred pages and is crammed full of matter of vital interest to all classes, we regret that we can do it but scant justice in the limited time and space at our disposal. The principles contended for, and the conclusions arrived at, are in complete accord with those which have been advocated in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW during the whole of its career, this at least will render our task easy and agreeable. M. Guyot takes as his point of departure the principles of 1789, or the Declaration of the Rights of Man, the doctrines of which are openly or tacitly accepted as the basis of all legislation in France, England and America. This may appear a bold statement to those who imagine that the Revolution was a failure, or to those who with M. Taine choose to regard the "principles" as sterile metaphysical abstractions. If the language of the Declaration is in some places a little abstract, the application of the principle was eminently practical and of immeasurable benefit not only to the people of France but so far as they have spread to the human race. M. Guyot thus summarises the principles drawn from the Declaration of the Rights of Man :

"Liberty, property, security, equality before the law—accessibility of all to all functions, according to their capacity; guarantees of individual liberty, liberty of opinion, even religious; liberty of labour; real and proportional taxation exclusively for the use of the State without privilege; consent to taxation and control of finances; control of the public administration, separation of powers."

To realise the full bearing of these principles, it is necessary to call to mind the system which they were intended to supersede, and which they have superseded.

<sup>1</sup> *Les Principes de '89 et le Socialisme.* Par Yves Guyot. Paris: Ch. Delagrave.

“The abuses, the injustices, the barbarities of which they are the opposite were such that many who profited by them were compelled to condemn them. The Declaration of Rights dug the ditch between *l’ancien régime* and modern public law.”

“What the king wills, that is law,” was the principle, if it can be called one, of the old system. The Revolution opposed to the rights of the king the rights of man. The taxes instead of being collected from all who ought to have been liable fell principally upon the commoners, the rich and the noble were generally exempted. The king recognised no other limit to the imposition of taxes than the inability of his subjects to pay more. The greater part of the imposts, far from being used in the general interest of the country were employed in gifts, pensions, presents of all sorts to courtesans and favourites. It is only necessary to mention this situation in order to understand the principles of the Declaration: “These principles did not germinate spontaneously in the head of political metaphysicians, they were the accumulated results of universal and disastrous experience.” As to the practical importance of the declaration of freedom of opinion, heresy was always under the ancient *régime* considered as the greatest of crimes. This, as everybody knows, was the source of the most widespread oppression and cruelty, and the affirmation of the principle of individual liberty was the destruction of these detestable practices.

Nearly the whole of France belonged to the *seigneurs*, and to the higher ecclesiastics. Justice was *personal*. The different classes were not equal before the law, nobles, ecclesiastics, privileged persons were not dealt with as commoners were. When the Declaration of the Rights of Man proclaimed that the law is the same for all, it laid down a principle which, says M. Guyot, we ought to-day recall more than ever.

It was not only the king and the nobles and the ecclesiastics who had special privileges, but there were the monopolies known as corporations, freedoms, &c., and as many social reformers in these days advocate the reconstitution of the corporations of the ancient *régime*, with their “good masters,” their “companions and their apprentices” who “made part of the family,” M. Guyot exposes the organisation of industry and of commerce before the Revolution, which many Christian Socialists would like to see revived. We cannot reproduce this account, but we can advise those who are under any illusion on the subject to read it. It is sufficient to say that there were monopolies, which deprived the citizens of the right of choosing their own workmen and of all the benefits of competition, and placed the consumer entirely at the mercy of the different corporations. Neither employers, nor workmen, nor consumers were at liberty to do the best they could for themselves. The declaration of the freedom of labour broke up these monopolies, and it is only those

who are touched with Socialism who would desire to see them revived. M. Guyot finds that the principles of the English Bill of Rights (1689) were in harmony with those of the Declaration of 1789. Macaulay says that the Bill of Rights is the origin of all the good laws which have since been adopted in England. "What is it definitively? It is the organisation of the defence of the property, of the liberty, of the security of individuals against the State."

The question proposed by M. Guyot is, does Socialism, in its doctrines or in its practice, conform to the principles of '89? To this he unhesitatingly answers that it does not, but that it represents a return to the ancient *régime*. It attacks individual liberty, property, security, equality, and everything that the Revolution secured. The German Socialists do not understand equality as it was understood by the men of '89. They demand that the social revolution should do for the Fourth Estate what the French Revolution did for the *Tiers Etat* :

"They forget that the *Tiers Etat* was easily distinguished from the other two orders. The commoners had to bear charges which were not borne either by the priest or the noble, and these latter had privileges which were refused to the first."

The Fourth Estate is an unknown quantity; where does it commence and where does it finish? All classes are equal before the law, there are no privileges, educational opportunities are open to all, and all are liable to military service, and public offices are open to all. What constitutes a member of the Fourth Estate? Is it wages? but men of all classes live upon their earnings. Is it manual labour? but much manual labour is not purely manual, but is partly intellectual, and is highly paid, while a teacher may earn much less :

"One day M. Curé was a candidate for the Municipal Council of Paris à.Vaugirard. Curé was a son of Burgundy peasants, he had started as a working gardener, and afterwards set up as market gardener. His opponent was a little gentleman, of puny and weak appearance, who cried with all his voice :

"'You ought to elect me. I represent the labour party—I am a workman.'

"When he had finished his speech, Curé took him by the arm to his great alarm, and led him to the edge of the platform, there he said :

"'Show your hands—here are mine!'"

"Then amidst the applause of the audience he displayed, by the side of the hand of the 'workman,' thin and white, a hand as broad and full as a *battoir*, then said he contemptuously :

"'Which of us is the true workman?'"

"The man who pretended to represent the Fourth Estate gave way."

The present aim of the Socialists is to create a new dominant

party to which the sovereignty shall belong and to which the rest of the population must submit. "The Social Revolution," says Benoit Malon, "by the vote or by the rifle, according to circumstances, can only be accomplished by the proletariat organised in a class party." The men of the Revolution of '89 were for breaking down all class barriers and castes which the Socialists would reconstruct in their own interest.

"The Fourth Estate would seize all rights for itself and suppress them for others; privileges for itself, spoliation for others; we know this old distributive justice. It has been practised by all conquerors and in all feudal systems.

"It demands liberty for itself, but, as Veillot says, 'I demand liberty for myself in the name of your principles; but I refuse it to you in the name of mine.'"

As to liberty of association, this is how they understand it. Some people come together and say: "We are a union," and the union is formed. They are five, ten, twenty, thirty, it does not matter. Then they pretend to reconstitute the old corporation for their own benefit. The miners' union constitutes a company, as in the days before '89. The majority are workers only in name, but they pretend that all arrangements belong to them. They undertake to stipulate for all and treat as traitors whoever does not obey their orders. Those who do not obey ought at least to be boycotted, if not cut to pieces. Liberty of association in their eyes is only a means of oppression! M. Guyot has given illustrations of this oppression in *La Tyrannie Socialiste*, but he adds a few in this present volume which we have not space to repeat. What he contends for is that the pretensions of such associations to dictate to individuals is contrary to the principle that all sovereignty resides essentially in the whole nation, and that no individual nor any body can exercise any authority contrary to public law.

We must pass over the chapters devoted to the exposure of the claims of unions and strikers to interfere with the freedom of labour in the name of liberty and the demand that employers who will not yield to their demands should be left to their fate. They are highly instructive. M. Guyot is not less strong on the economic aspects of Socialist demands.

In place of the law equal for all, they wish the law to be made for their benefit and to the detriment of the masters. But who are the masters? The Socialists imagine that they are people who ask for or refuse work according to their own good pleasure.

"They imagine the masters have banks full of gold on which they only have to draw to pay their workmen. They imagine that this or that is the property of the master, the more he has the higher wages he can pay. If he does not increase their salaries, it is because he will not. While the workmen have such notions of economy they regard the master as an adversary, a tyrant, a sort of Caligula."



But, says M. Guyot, the master does not produce for his own use, he is only the intermediary between (1) the disposers of raw material and labour; and (2) the purchasers of products or services. Socialists, deputies, journalists, and even economists talk about the "relations of capital and labour." Do they mean to say that it is the capital which buys the labour?

Yes.

Then see the consequence. The workman can demand wages raised proportionally to the capital which purchases his labour. The larger the capital the more the salaries can be raised. A millionaire ought to pay in proportion to his fortune.

"Every day, *à propos* of a strike, you hear people say of the masters: 'They are rich, they can very well satisfy their hands.' They do not reflect that if wages exceeded the capital the capital would soon be dispersed."

What part does capital play in manufactures? First of all it is employed in founding a business, and more often it plays the part of a guarantee.

But in order to pay off loans, by which works are nearly always established, the manufacturer depends upon the sale of his products; to pay for raw material, he depends upon the sale of his products; to pay his workmen, he depends upon the sale of his products. It is his customers who pay his workmen; the masters advance the wages, the returns are usually behind the pay of the workers; they receive with one hand and pay out with the other. The initial capital is only an insurance against the risks arising from three causes: the closing or contracting of markets, the fall of prices, and the non-payment of clients. These are very elementary truths, which many people who talk about capital and labour are prone to overlook, and are thus prepared to support claims which are in themselves absurd.

The workman demands the fixing of a minimum of salary, and a maximum of hours of labour, and if the master responds, "It is not possible; your demands would force me to close my works or my manufactory; I should be ruined, and how much better off would you be if I were compelled to discharge you?" he refuses to understand and accuses him of ill-will.

M. Guyot goes on to show how in the last resort wages must depend upon the price the consumer is willing to pay, and the consumer is all the world, upon whom pressure cannot be put. "The right to work," which is another Socialist demand, is not within the power of the State; it depends, like wages, upon demand. "The right to happiness" implies a reliance upon the State or upon "Society" for a man's individual satisfaction, which is of the same class with the ancient reliance upon the will and favour of the monarch:

“What I like about you is your modesty. No one can reproach you with being proud. You are humble, a very humble servant——”

“I—I am not the servant of any one.”

“You are a servant, the most humble of servants, like a monk.”

“It is an insult to me, who would be set free.”

“Set free? From what?”

“From labour.”

“Eh, in regard to whom?”

“From a master.”

“And by what will you replace him?”

“An association.”

“Association; it is that which will tell you to work or not as it suits it, without consulting your convenience.”

“It will let me vote.”

“But when the leaders have spoken?”

“They know what ought to be done.”

“Then you rely on their wisdom, which you recognise as superior to your own. In place of deciding for yourself you put your will in their hands. It is a proof of modesty.”

“But formerly, it was the master who decided.”

“But he decided to do the largest possible amount of work; the union decides to do the least possible.”

“It is always so much gained.”

“Save this detail—that the union can only give you resources which it takes from others.”

The principles of '89 gave for the first time to the people of France the security of property, to each one “the right of enjoying and disposing of his goods and revenues, of the fruit of his labour and his industry. This is a right of which the Socialists would again deprive them.” Our space is too limited to follow our author in his exposure of the absurdity of Socialistic financial schemes and other economic fallacies, as well as the political aspects of the question, which in France are daily becoming more grave. We have not referred to the doings of some so-called Socialists and Unionists which can only be described as criminal, and are repudiated by those of a better class. But M. Guyot's purpose in this work is not so much to criticise and condemn Socialistic theories and doings, as to call upon statesmen and economists to consider the situation seriously, and to insist upon the necessity of principles which are falling into neglect; and every departure from sound principles, however well-intentioned, opens a breach which will lead to still further and more disastrous concessions. He contends that no concessions whatever should be made in a Socialistic direction, and that a *Politique de résistance* should be organised.

The work concludes with two chapters of a more philosophical character, on Socialism and Individualism, in which the author treats of the depressive action of Socialism and the expansive action of Individualism. To adopt the family ideal for society as Christian Socialists recommend, would be a retrogression and not an advance. “This law of the family, which Cleveland calls, in his message,

‘paternalism,’ is that of Oriental countries, where an individual only exists, acts, possesses, by permission of the Caliph, Sultan, or Pacha; and observation, as well as deduction, allows us to say *that every people which submits to the law of the family is struck with impotence.*”

We have only been able to give a very slight outline of the teaching of this powerful and timely and readable work, and though it may seem to have especial appropriateness to the situation in France, the perusal of it could not fail to be of benefit to many Englishmen who do not seem to realise the importance of events which are happening under their own eyes.

WALTER LLOYD.

## BAPTISMAL CUSTOMS.

THE baptismal ceremony has gradually collected round it a number of customs and superstitions, and this is not at all surprising, considering the fact that infants are invariably left in the hands of women, who are naturally more prone to observe small detail in the matter of custom and belief than men. The nineteenth century, with its extraordinarily practical and widespread educational advantages, has done much to wipe out the superstition which at one time was so universal in this country. But customs die harder still; and, in spite of the fact that we are admitted to be a prosaic nation, we still have an innate affection for anything in the form of a ceremony.

In the early ages we find an enormous importance attached to the time of birth by the astrologers, who in the zenith of their popularity were looked upon as the infallible foretellers of events; even in the present day, and after the lapse of so many years, there are found evidences of the survival of astrological belief, which is a curious instance of a lingering faith in an obsolete science.

Baptism is essentially a Christian rite; still, in heathen times and amongst all races certain ceremonials were observed when children arrived at a stated age, which may be taken as prototypes of baptism. Thus, the heathen Roman boy was solemnly arrayed in a toga, and a corresponding ceremony was observed with regard to girls.

It appears an indisputable fact that in the primitive Church the ordinary mode of baptism was by immersion. Baptism, however, in the case of sick persons was at all times administered by sprinkling, although doubts as to its complete efficacy were evidently prevalent in the third century. Baptism, however, by sprinkling gradually became more general, and the dispute concerning the mode of administering the rite became one of the irreconcilable differences between the Eastern and Western Churches; the former generally adopting the practice of immersion, and the latter the pouring of water on the head, or sprinkling the face, which custom has generally prevailed since the thirteenth century; but not universally, for it was the ordinary practice in England before the Reformation to immerse infants, and the fonts in the churches were made large enough for the purpose. To this day the rubric of the

Church of England requires that, if the godfathers and godmothers "shall certify him that the child may well endure it," the officiating priest "shall dip it in the water discreetly and warily;" and it is only "if they shall certify that the child is weak" that "it shall suffice to pour water upon it," which, however, or sprinkling, is now the ordinary practice.

Some early heretics actually baptised the dead; others baptised living proxies for dead persons. It is possible that the former custom might find its origin in an improper appreciation of St. Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 29.

The baptismal alb was a long white robe formerly worn by infants for eight days after baptism, whence *Dominica in Albis*. A somewhat similar garment was the chrisom robe, which was a white vesture put upon the child in baptism by the priest, with the following words: "Take this white vesture for a token of innocency." If the child died within a month of christening it was the practice to use the chrisom as a shroud. Parish registers contain numerous entries of "chrisom infants," and brasses also remain depicting infants thus shrouded. A portion of the churchyard at Bradford, Brandiscorner, North Devon, is called "Chrisomer's Hill, where unbaptised infants and strangers were formerly buried.

In the early Church the octave of Easter was called *Baptismalis Dies*, and during this period the neophytes were admitted to divine service.

Anciently fonts were placed in baptisteries apart from the church, but in 1571 they were directed to be placed in the church where baptism was to be administered. These baptisteries were first built in the age of Constantine. An interesting custom of *Hallowing the Font* was formerly observed by the Church on Easter and Whitsun eves, after which followed several public baptisms.

Gifts to infants on their baptism are of ancient origin. Formerly, the sponsors generally offered gilt spoons to the child; these spoons were called apostle spoons, because the figures of the twelve apostles were carved at the top on the handles. Rich sponsors gave the complete set of twelve, while for those who were not so opulent four was considered the proper number, and poor sponsors would content themselves with offering one; in the latter case the handle of the spoon generally exhibited the figure of any saint in honour of whom the child received its name. It is in allusion to this custom that, when Cranmer professes himself to be unworthy of being sponsor to the young princess, Shakespeare makes the king reply:

"Come, come, my lord, you'd spare your spoons."

The mug, or spoon and fork offering of the present day, appears as a very debased survival of a really beautiful christening offering.

Down to the early part of the present century it was usual to

name a child after the saint on whose day he happened to be born. A writer to *Notes and Queries* in 1853 states that he had recently baptised a child by the name of Benjamin Simon Jude. On his expressing some surprise at this somewhat singular conjunction of names, he was informed that the birth had taken place on the festival of SS. Simon and Jude, and that it was always considered *very unlucky to take the day from a child*. The custom of naming children after any particular saint has fallen into general disuse, except in those countries where the population is composed almost entirely of Roman Catholics. The giving of a name in baptism is really no essential part of the rite, but is merely a custom derived apparently from the Jews, and which through long practice has become an important element in the ceremony.

Many instances might be furnished of children who have inadvertently received wrong names. The registers in Warminster Church contain the following entries :

“ 1790, Jan. 17, Charles, daughter of John and Betty Haines. This child ought to have been christened Charlotte, but owing to a mistake of the sponsors it was wrong named.”

“ 1791, July 31, William, daughter of William and Sarah Weidick. N.B.—It was intended that this child, being a girl, should have been christened Maria, but through a mistake of the godfather it was named William.”

Mr. S. Baring-Gould, in *Old Country Life*, relates that in a parish on the Cornish side of the estuary of the Tamar some little time ago, the newly appointed Rector, turning over the register of baptisms in the vestry, was much astonished at seeing entries of the christenings of boys only. “ Why, Richard,” said he to the clerk, “ however comes this about ; are there only boys born in this place ? ” Said the clerk in reply, “ Please your reverence, ’taint that ; but as they won’t take the girls into the dockyard at Davenport, ’taint no good baptising ’em.” It would appear that the boys were christened only for the sake of the register requisite to present on admission into the Government dockyard.

There is a curious superstition that if one of the sponsors at a christening looks into the font the child will grow up like him. Another superstition connected with sponsors is that two people who are engaged should not be godfather and godmother to the same child. It is a sure sign if they are that they will never marry. In Lancashire the same superstition is commonly expressed by the saying : “ Those who meet at the font will never meet at the altar.” This would certainly appear to be an interesting relic of the Canon law, which forbids godparents from marrying each other.

Baptismal columns exist in some churches. At Henham-on-the-Hill is a good example ; the Virgin and Christ-child being carved on the capital, with angels censuring on either hand, while the devil

is represented on the opposite side of the column, facing the north door, where no doubt the font was originally placed.

The baptismal shell was a small metal vessel in the shape of a scallop-shell, used for taking up the water from the font, and pouring it over the head of the person to be baptised. Sometimes real shells, polished, and having some sacred subject engraved on them, were used.

By statute 23 George III. c. 67, it was enacted that after 1st October, 1783, a stamp duty of threepence should be paid to his Majesty upon the entry of every burial, marriage, birth, or christening in the register of every parish, precinct, or place in Great Britain, under a penalty of five pounds for every default of entry. The churchwardens were directed to provide a book for each entry to be made therein, and the vicar, curate, or other person receiving the duty was to be allowed two shillings in the pound for his trouble. By 25 George III. c. 75, the tax was extended to dissenters. The Act was repealed by 34 George III. c. 2, the tax ceasing altogether on October 1, 1794. The tax only applied to Great Britain, and was not extended to Ireland, probably because no Roman Catholic priest could have been got to make a *tax* charge for any sacrament of the Church.

Down to the middle of the century, when several children were baptised at the same time great anxiety was shown by their parents lest the girls should take precedence of the boys; in which case there was a popular belief that the latter when arrived at man's estate would be beardless. This superstition prevailed most extensively in the north of England, although it might be met with in nearly all parts of the country.

It is considered a good omen for the baby to cry during the baptismal service. If it is quiet all the time it is considered too good to live; where this belief obtains favour nurses generally decide the matter by pinching the child. A Cumberland superstition was that if an infant was not baptised before it was *shortened* (*i.e.* leaves off its long robes), it was bad-tempered and ill-natured all its life.

Certain days for birth have generally some particular attribute given to them:

“Monday's bairn is fair of face,  
 Tuesday's bairn is full of grace,  
 Wednesday's bairn a child of woe,  
 Thursday's bairn has far to go,  
 Friday's bairn is loving and giving,  
 Saturday's bairn works hard for a living,  
 But a bairn that is born on the sabbath-day  
 Is lively and bonnie, and wise and gay.”

There is a belief in Sweden that the devil has power over a child

until it is baptised ; but if for any valid reason baptism is obliged to be deferred, the power of the evil one can to a great extent be neutralised. One way is to wrap the baby in a red cloth, and lay it in its cradle, with a psalm-book and a pair of scissors placed crosswise upon its breast.

Christening palms were cloths about four or five feet square, generally made of rich silk or satin, often elaborately embroidered by having a quilted lining. These palms, or panes, as they were sometimes called, were often kept in the same family for generations, and used at all christenings for enveloping the infants when taken to baptism. The writer knows one of these palms which was used a few years ago, and has been a heirloom in the same family for some generations ; it is composed of satin richly embroidered with gold thread.

Christening cakes are general in most parts of the country, but in England there does not appear to be any particular kind of cake in universal use. In Scotland the christening cake is shortbread. Formerly, in Fifeshire, it was the custom, before starting for the kirk, for the *christening piece*, consisting of shortbread, cheese, and oatcake, to be made up into a white paper parcel tied with ribbons ; this the mother held in her right hand as she left the house and presented to the first person met by her, whether stranger or friend, gentle or poor. The *christening piece* was always gladly accepted, and in return kind wishes were expressed for the future happiness of the child. Shakespeare evidently refers to *christening cakes* in *Henry VIII.*, Act v. sc. 3 :

“ You must be seeing christenings,  
Do you look for cakes and ale here, you rude rascals ! ”

The christening sheet was a fine linen cloth, formerly thrown over a child's head after baptism, and was called a *crude cloth*, and sometimes *cude* or *code* simply. A will, proved in the Consistory Court of Lincoln in the year 1612, contains a bequest of a *christening sheet*. Phillips, in his *World of Words*, has “ *cude* or *cude cloth*, a face cloth for a young child, which heretofore used to be the priest's fee at the baptising of it.” In the *Booke of Christian Prayers*, published by John Day in 1569, there is a woodcut representing the baptism of a child, and round the head of the infant a cloth is thrown which is crossed upon the breast.

We must, doubtless, look to the Jews for the origin of godfathers and godmothers. The use of them in the primitive Church is so early that it is not easy to fix a time for their beginning. Some of the most ancient Fathers make mention of them, and through all the successive ages afterwards we find the use of them continued without any interruption. By a constitution of Edmund, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1236, and in a synod held at Worcester,



1240, a provision was made that there should be for every male child two godfathers and one godmother, and for every female one godfather and two godmothers. King Henry VIII., referring to the Princess Elizabeth, says :

“ My Lord of Canterbury,  
I have a suit which you must not deny me,  
That is, a fair young maid that yet wants baptism,  
You must be godfather and answer for her.”

*Henry VIII.*, Act. v. sc. 3.

A constitution of 1281 makes provision for a Christian name being changed at confirmation ; this is practically a re-naming of the child. The manner in which it was done was for the bishop to use the new name in the Invocation, and afterwards for him to sign a certificate that he had so confirmed a person by such new name. It is possible that this practice might have been in Shakespeare's mind when he wrote :

“ Call me but love, and I'll be new baptis'd,  
Henceforth I never will be Romeo.”

*Romeo and Juliet*, Act ii. sc. 2.

In the Greek Church at the present day, when a convert is formally admitted a new name is always given.

The overdressing of infants for their christening reached an absurd pitch at the commencement of the last century. The eldest brother of Frederick the Great would appear to have been actually killed through this folly. Carlyle, in his *History of Frederick the Great*, says : “ The first baby-prince . . . was crushed to death by the weighty dress put upon him at christening time, especially by the little crown he wore, which had left a visible black mark upon the infant's brow.”

In conclusion, it may be interesting to note the baptism of bells, a custom which is supposed to have been introduced about the tenth century. The rite itself is very similar to the ordinary baptismal one, and accompanied by many like ceremonies—a sort of exorcism, sprinkling with holy water, and sometimes also, if not always, the giving of a name to the bell consecrated, and even a kind of sponsorship, as by godfathers and godmothers in baptism. This custom has no doubt greatly fostered the notion of an efficacy in the ringing of bells for protection in storms, as well as for other benefits ; indeed, it has been said that “ the bells are blessed to turn off storms and tempests from the faithful.”

## MODERN HABITS AND CUSTOMS.

IN accordance with historical custom, we have divided our subject into four periods, and we now approach the last. This division, however, which is arbitrary, is simply one of convenience, for no sharp line of separation really exists between them while they follow each other. As new habits and customs arise they are adopted at first only by a few, and the old habits linger on and die slowly one by one, or, by their conservative tenacity, survive so long that they become moral anachronisms. And just as in the highest organised animal there remain abundant vestiges of its ancient and simpler structure, so in our complex civilisation are found, in slightly modified forms, all the human stages through which the race has passed. We have in our midst a host of types of each—savages as cruel and conscienceless as were the cannibal Caribs of South America, restless and idle as the nomads of the steppes; archaic thinkers whose sympathies are with the ancients, and their religion a refined Paganism, who look on our modern poets, politicians, and scientists with disdain, and consider Cato superior to Cromwell; mediævals, who live in an atmosphere stirred by occult and mysterious agencies, who cling to exploded superstitions, who believe in special providences and final causes, and who welcome with open arms all forms of fashionable quackery as they appear. Will it not be recorded against us, to our eternal disgrace, in ages to come, that at the close of the nineteenth century there were men of letters, leaders of thought, editors of influential periodicals, who were not ashamed to avow themselves believers in ghosts and in communications from a spirit world?

The ancient civilisations of Egypt and Babylonia were marvels of human progress in their days. In contemplating them we are astounded to find that there is still almost "nothing new under the sun" except the late achievements of science. The subsequent civilisations of olden times approached theirs in some respects and surpassed them in others. But all, in turn, were swept away by barbaric forces. For, whether Mede or Persian, Goth or Hun, Pagan or Mahomedan, or Christian iconoclast, all were barbarians who by violence destroyed whatsoever the patient industry of men had built up. Works of art and utility, stately edifices, glorious temples and cathedrals, pious laws, revered habits and customs, were

remorselessly attacked. And the most zealous and most destructive were those who called themselves Christians.

We generally regard the feudal period as ending with the Wars of the Roses. These wholesome conflicts almost exterminated the feudal lords, and from their ruin arose the despotism of the Tudors, and then the power of the middle classes. But not until the 12th of Charles II. was the last feudal privilege abolished. The strength of feudalism, however, had been long decaying, and was finally broken just before the discovery of the New World, at the close of the fifteenth century. The Norman influence and language which survived the blending of Norman and Saxon blood that had been effected within a century after the Conquest, declined during the fourteenth century. The tales and songs of Chaucer and the tracts and translations of Wyckliffe, gave fashion and permanence to the English tongue. Wyckliffe was to England what Luther was to Germany, but he had the merit of calmly and forcibly withstanding Papal claims and abuses two hundred years earlier than the hot-headed monk. Wyckliffe was thus the true pioneer of the Reformation, and his Bible the mother of modern English; and although he wrote much, his tract *Triologus* is the only other authentic relic of his literary work. Time and fanaticism have destroyed the rest.

Before the close of the mediæval period the spirit of inquiry was aroused, and the emancipation of the human mind had commenced. The follies and vices of the ecclesiastics, and especially of the monks, were the scorn and butt of the people. Their greed, their lewdness, their ignorance, their transparent impositions, were a constant source of mirth and ribaldry to all classes. But it was from the closets of students that the greatest changes were accomplished. Natural philosophy and mathematics were closely studied by Roger Bacon during a life of fourscore years, down to his death in 1294, and his works enlightened his country. This great and original genius spent thirty thousand pounds in scientific research. Dr. Friend says: "He was the first to introduce the knowledge of chemistry into Europe." In 1383 Wyckliffe finished his translation of the Bible from the Latin Vulgate. In 1388, Chaucer, at the age of sixty, commenced his *Canterbury Tales*. In 1471 Caxton brought the art of printing from Mentz to Westminster. Fourteen years after this the last battle of the Roses was fought on Bosworth field; and within eleven years of Henry's victory Columbus discovered America. The Reformation, irregularly commenced by Henry VIII., was completed on the accession of Elizabeth. Thus the minds of Englishmen were stimulated to an unwonted degree, and from a variety of causes. And thus, too, the reign of Elizabeth was the most eventful of modern times, rich in incident, prodigal of heroes, and one which was alone worthy to mature a Shakespeare and a Raleigh, or to

nurse the youthful genius of a Bacon. Bold, sagacious, learned, watchful of her people's interests, indulgent to herself with imperial freedom, this proud, vain woman understood how to curb the licentious and indolent, and to recompense men of talent and industry. Where else could we look for such names as those which she enrolled in her service? It was a golden age of heroism and adventure, of literature and thought, of love and song, crowned by an accomplished queen who could appreciate whatever was great and reward the doers thereof.

With the rise of the Tudor dynasty, a new aristocracy was gradually formed from the trading and professional classes to replace the Plantagenet. Of our present House of Peers only two dukedoms date before Charles II.'s reign, one from Richard III., and the other from Edward VI.; and of the rest several are the descendants of Charles's mistresses. Of the marquises, one dates from the sixteenth century; none of the remainder are older than the eighteenth. Of the numerous earls—more than 120—the two oldest creations are one in the fifteenth and one in the sixteenth centuries. One viscount alone can date as far back as the sixteenth, and of about 300 barons, only twelve are prior to the seventeenth century. It will be obvious, therefore, that whatever circumstances have combined to render ours a proud peerage, age of title is not one of them.

The reign of Elizabeth, whatever its faults, healed many divisions and removed many ancient political landmarks among her subjects. She gave union and homogeneity to the nation, and the attack of the Spanish Armada infused a deeper feeling of patriotism into the hearts of all. Since her day only three sovereigns have been worthy of sitting on her throne—Cromwell, William of Orange, and our present gracious Queen. For the political imbecility of the Stuarts, and the crass stupidity of the Georges, often went perilously near to wreck a high-spirited and gallant people who have still to suffer the evil effects of their folly or their wickedness.

Amid all the variations of government, of religion and shiftings of power among the wealthy classes, the great bulk of the people were true to their ancient habits and customs. Anglo-Saxon usages continued to flourish among the humbler classes with comparatively little change, and the numerous uncouth dialects of the Anglo-Saxon language slowly blended and grew into our rich and elegant modern English. The sports and pastimes of the Middle Ages were also those of "Merry England." All changes were resisted as injurious innovations. Even a new vegetable was a dire forerunner of evil. Potatoes were scouted as tending to produce leprosy. "No potatoes, no popery," was a singular popular cry in the Stuart time. The use of coaches would destroy the breeding of hackneys. James I. thought country ladies should not visit London. "If they were unmarried they marred their marriages, and if married, they marred

their reputations." Mobs destroyed the ironworks when they began to smelt the ore with coals, because, they said, wood was intended to smelt metallic ores. And thus the Weald of Sussex and other places became wastes. Even good old Latimer resisted blunderbusses, and preached up archery as "a godly art." Leading water through pipes was robbing the general public. Old Stow asserted that architectural novelties had been visited by divine punishment. An old farmer said, "God made the old style; man made the new"; and the populace rioted for the eleven days of which they thought they had been defrauded. Even in our time, a Canadian seeing a steamer going up a rapid, cried out, "Est ce que le bon Dieu permettra tout cela?"

An odious custom to which we have not hitherto alluded was that of bribing. It is very old. Indeed it is the first independent social circumstance on record. Satan bribed Eve, and Eve thought so well of it that she straightway bribed Adam. In England every one bribed or was bribed. Judges on circuit and sheriffs were always bribed. The ladies of great officers converted their influence into current coin. The wives of bishops did the same. Jurymen were openly canvassed for their verdict. Members of Parliament were bribed. "Sir Thomas Cook, the Governor of the East India Company, paid £167,000 in one year for bribes to members of the House." Sir John Bennett, a Judge of the High Commission Court, not only took bribes from both plaintiff and defendant, but often shamefully begged them. In 1621 the Lord Chancellor was disgraced, and two years after the Lord Treasurer was arrested. Mayors were bribed and corporations bribed. The town of Lynn in 1581 spent £68 in fees and treating in order to secure £100 for the maintenance of their harbour. In 1695 the Speaker of the House of Commons was obliged to put the question himself that he should be expelled. A Bill for securing the proper use of funds for the poor orphans of freemen of London—to give them the money belonging to them—could only be passed by wholesale bribery of members, and the Speaker's share was a thousand guineas. When Jeffries deported the Sedgemoor rebels as slaves to the West Indies, the queen and maids of honour received a large number of them as their portion of the spoils. Latimer preached from the text, "They all love bribes." "Bribery," said he, "is a princely kind of thieving. They will be waged by the rich, either to give sentence against the poor; or to put off the poor man's causes. This is the noble theft of princes and magistrates, they are bribe-takers. Nowadays they call them gentle rewards; let them leave their colouring, and call them by their Christian names, bribes: *omnes diligunt munera.*"

When the great set the example, humbler imitators were not wanting. The sordid sentiment that required a gift for every

service rendered even where duty demanded it, infected every order. Servants were largely fee'd, and called their gifts "vails," until it became as expensive to visit as to be visited. Persons of slender means refused the most generous hospitality, because they could not afford to bestow vails on a host of domestics. These latter refused to engage themselves unless their masters entertained frequently.

Gifts, however, did not always take the form of money. "Sir Philip Sidney presented Queen Elizabeth with a smock of cambric, the sleeves and collar wrought round with black silk, and edged with a small bone lace." Sugar and preserves were fashionable presents. Every one seemed to have had "a sweet tooth" in those times. The Dean and Chapter of Salisbury having a case to be tried before Justice Hale, presented him with six sugar-loaves, for which the judge, who was exceptionally scrupulous, insisted on paying. In Davenant's poem, *Madagascar*, occurs the couplet :

"Then reconcile the rich for gold-fringed gloves,  
The poor for God's sake, or for sugar-loaves."

The Serjeants of the House of Commons in Lent, 1585, received from Lord Howard a present of sugar. The Chamber of Exeter in 1610 voted sugar-loaves to two canons for their morning lectures. Sometimes marmalade, oranges, lemons, or even potatoes took its place, and when sugar became cheaper the custom ceased. In 1581 all persons in Scotland not being dukes, earls, &c., possessed of at least £250 sterling in yearly rent, were prohibited the use of confections, foreign drugs, and costly spices.

From an inedited tract, entitled *Cyvil and Vncyvil Life*, written in Elizabeth's reign, we have an account of the outdoor and indoor amusements of a country gentleman of that time: "In the spring-time (and cheesely in Lent) wee fish the Carpe, the Pike, the Breame, the roche, and the yeele, as good meates in the eating, as good sports in the ketching. In sommer we dare the lark with hobbies, and ketch them with day nettes. In harvest when corne is downe, our Sparhaukes bee ready to kill the Partridge, the Quayle, and Rayle. In winter wee hauke the Heron, the Feasant, the Ducke, the Teale. And in breefe, all sortes of volary. We course the Stagge, the Bucke, the Roa, the Doa, the Hare, the Foxe and the Badger. Or if you would rather have some Musicke to content your eare, out goes our dogges, our hounds (I should have saide); with them wee make a heavenly noise or cry, that would make a dead man revive, and run on foote to hear it. . . . In fowle weather, we send for some honest neighbours, if happely wee bee with our wives alone at home (as seldom we are) and with them we play at Dice and Cards, sorting ourselves accordinge to the number of Players, and their skill, some to Ticktacke, some Laroche, some to Irish game or

Dublets. Other sit close to the Cardes, at Post and Paire, or Ruffe, or Colchester Trumpe, at Mack or Maw. Yea, there are some ever so fresh gamesters, as wil bare you cōpany at Nouem Quinke, at Faring, Trey Trip, or one and thirty, for I warrant you we have right good fellowes in the country. Sumtimes also (for shift of sport, you know, is delectable) we fall to slide thrifte, to Penny prick, and in winter nights we use certaine Christmas games very propper, and of much agilitie; wee want not also pleasant mad headed knaves, yt bee properly learned, and will reade in diverse pleasant bookes and good authors. As *Sir Guye of Warwicke, Ye Foure Sonnes of Amon, The Ship of Fooles, The Budget of Demuundes, The Hundred Merry Tales, The Booke of Ryddles*, and many other excellent writers both witty and pleasaunt. These pretty and pithey matters do some times recreate our mindes, cheesely after longe sittinge and losse of money. In faire weather when we have strangers, or holly daies (for els in the day time wee attend our thrift) we exercise ourselves in shooting at Battes, Prickes, Roaners, and Rownes. We cast the Bar or Sledge, Leape or Run, if our ages and conditione bee fit for such exercise, els (beeing aged) wee chat at home, snd talke of Turrin and Torny, or some other notable war, wherein wee served our Prince." Simple as all this was, it was superior to the recreations of the eighteenth century. Sir George Otto Trevelyan, in his *Early Life of C. J. Fox*, says: "Society was one vast casino. On whatever pretext and under whatever circumstances half a dozen people of fashion found themselves together—whether for music, or dancing, or politics, or for drinking the waters or each other's wine—the box was sure to be rattling, and the cards were being cut and shuffled." The Countess of Hertford, writing to the Countess of Pomfret, March 26, 1741, remarked: "The girls and boys sit down as gravely to whist tables as fellows of colleges used to do formerly. It is actually a ridiculous, though, I think, a mortifying sight, that play should become the business of the nation from the age of fifteen to fourscore." Hoyle's treatise went through seven editions within a year of publication. One of the characters in the comedy, *The Humours of Whist*, says of it "there never was so excellent a book printed. I'm quite in raptures with it. I will eat with it, sleep with it, go to Parliament with it, go to church with it. I pronounce it the gospel of whist players." But it was at hazard chiefly that fortunes were lost or won in a night, and money-lenders fattened on the folly. Before he was twenty-four, Charles Fox owed the Jews about £100,000. His ante-room, where they waited until he had done playing, he called his "Jerusalem Chamber." On one occasion after dinner he played all night and lost £12,000; on the following day he lost £11,000 more. Gibbon says that before attending the debate on the relief of the clergy from subscribing to the Thirty-

nine Articles, Fox indulged himself for twenty-two hours at hazard at a cost of £500 per hour. Lord Foley's two sons borrowed so recklessly that the interest amounted to £18,000 a year. Hundreds of others followed these closely in their losses, and the ladies gambled almost as desperately as the men. At Newmarket the hazard-table rooms were never empty.

Bets were of constant occurrence with every one and on almost anything. At Brooks' and White's large books were kept for the purpose of entering those made by members. Bets were entered that Beau Nash would outlive Cibber, that Wilkes and Sir William Burdett would be hanged. Heirs to great estates made wagers on the lives of their own fathers. If a man were ill, bets were made on his recovery or his death. If one fell in the street, the bystanders crowded around and gave or took odds that the man was dead. They even protested against medical assistance on the ground that it would prejudice their bets. Some gambling-rooms were kept and advertised by a few women of rank. Ladies lost their thousands at a sitting as recklessly as the men. Chief Justice Kenyon threatened in 1797 that any of them brought before him for gambling who should be justly convicted, "whatever might be their rank and station, though they should be the first ladies in the land, should certainly exhibit themselves in the pillory." He had particularly in view four ladies of title who were known as "Faro's daughters," two of whom were shortly after convicted by the magistrates and fined £50 each. The *Times* was a youthful and light-hearted paper in those days, and persistently ridiculed the prevailing mania. On November 2 of the same year it said: "At some of our first boarding-schools the fair pupils are now taught to play at whist and cassino. Amongst their *winning* ways this may not be the least agreeable to papa and mamma. It is calculated that a clever child, by its cards and its novels, may pay for its own education. At a boarding-school in the neighbourhood of Moorfields the mistress complains that she is unable to teach her scholars either whist or pharo. However, she says, they play perfectly well at *Kissino* and all-fours."

The natural corollary of all these things was the revival of lotteries. These had appeared early. In 1569 there was a drawing at St. Paul's Cathedral which continued night and day for five months. In 1693 the first Government lottery was authorised by Parliament—for the good of the nation. Twelve years after there was a lottery for £1,500,000, and annual lotteries succeeded. Private lotteries were advertised for every conceivable object, and within a century after the fierce love of gambling had passed from the highest to the lowest the kingdom over, had made card-sharppers of peeresses and rogues of honest men, spreading ruin and disgrace throughout the nation until it wore itself out by its own forcé.



The habit of drinking to excess was concomitant with gambling. Each assisted the other. Men and women of education would never have wagered their estates, their furniture, their personal ornaments on E. and O., backgammon, faro, roulette, and other frivolous games unless they were often intoxicated by strong drinks to defy impending ruin. The English had always loved stimulants. In Elizabeth's and James I.'s time a quart of beer was the ordinary allowance to an individual for breakfast. Duchesses and maids of honour consumed this quantity. But then tea and coffee had not come into use. Sobriety, however, was more general in Elizabeth's time than in that of her successor's because hers was a period of intellectual excitement. James was a drunkard and a sot, and set an evil example to the nation. Charles I., however, in some measure, by his gentlemanly habits corrected many of his people's failings, and under Cromwell a rigid sobriety became imperative. This wonderful man, who had himself been a drunkard in his youth, seemed to have changed the very nature of the English for a time, and made them sober and God-fearing. But on the restoration of Charles II. repressed hypocrisies revealed themselves. Vile lusts that had been restrained by the strong hand, broke bounds and were indulged without stint. All except the sincere Puritans and the better sort of the country gentry gave themselves up to a carnival of sensuality. And the witty but profligate monarch cared little what happened provided he could secure sufficient money to gratify the extravagances of his harem. He sold the honour of his country for French gold, and like Richard I. he would have sold London could he have found a purchaser. Nor was it much better in France. Montesquieu in 1720 wrote: "Paris is perhaps the most sensual city in the world, and the one in which pleasure is carried to the highest pitch; but at the same time it is the city in which one leads the hardest life." On Sundays and holy days almost every one got more or less tipsy. Beside the numerous fête days of the Church, the 180 trade corporations of Paris had each a patron saint to whom at least one day in the year was devoted. Mercier tells of a cobbler who sighed as he picked up a drunken man out of the gutter on a week-day, and said, "And to think that I shall be in this state on Sunday!"

In the reign of Anne beer was despised by the upper classes. Wine, of all kinds, was their chief liquor. But during the long war with France it was considered unpatriotic to drink French wines; thus the wines of other countries came into fashion. Port was an especial favourite. In 1713 French wines paid a duty of 4s. 6d. per gallon, and brandy 6s. 8d. The ladies frequently resorted for medicinal purposes to strong waters and cordials. A satirical writer describing the lady of fashion, says: "As soon as she rises she must have a Salutory Dram to keep her stomach from the Cholick; a

whet before she eats, to procure Appetite ; after eating, a plentiful Dose for Concoction ; and to be sure a Bottle of Brandy under her bedside for fear of fainting in the Night." Punch of a simple brew came into use, and a compound named Mum that made men speechlessly drunk. Next an antidote was advertised, "The Essence of Prunes. . . . It prevents any Liquor from intoxicating the Brain." The numerous clubs promoted drinking. Every class and calling had its clubs, and the names were often as whimsical as their motives. There were, of the lower kind, the No-nose Club, the Surly Club, the Atheistical, the Ugly Faces, Split Farthing, Man Hunters, Mock Heroes, Beaux, Quacks, Lying, Wrangling, Beggars, Scatterwit, Thieves, Florists, and Smoking Clubs. The most aristocratical were the October, the Calves' Head, and the Kit-Cat Clubs. But with the Hanoverian dynasty the populace began to forsake beer for gin. In 1735 it was found that 7044 houses and shops—one in every seven—sold gin by retail, and so cheaply, that the poor could intoxicate themselves for a penny. The legislature, in order to check the growing evil, imposed an excise duty of 5s. per gallon, and compelled the retailers to take out licences. It was in the reign of George III., however, that drunkenness attained its greatest extent. Members of both Houses of Parliament often drank to speak, and spoke when drunk. "The first gentleman of Europe" led the fashion in this as in most vices. Fox informed a man of business that he could not meet him on a certain day because on that day he would be "confoundedly drunk." Many could take their six bottles at a sitting, and few of those whose names we cherish escaped the general dissoluteness of the times. "To which university," said a lady to Dr. Warren, "shall I send my son?" "Madam," replied he, "they drink, I believe, near the same quantity of port in each of them."

Every one has read that Hawkins introduced tobacco, and that James inveighed against it. Elizabeth liked to sit on a low stool and watch Sir Walter Raleigh puffing away. Once she bet him that he could not tell the weight of the smoke in his pipe, but the philosopher won. In Anne's reign almost every one smoked. In Charles II.'s reign "children were sent to school with their pipes in their satchels, and the schoolmaster called a halt in their studies whilst they all smoked." In 1702 Jorevin spent an evening with his brother at Garraway's Coffee House, Leeds, and writes: "I was surprised to see his sickly child of three years old fill its pipe of Tobacco and smoke it as *audfarandly* as a man of threescore; after that, a second and a third pipe without the least concern, as it is said to have done above a year ago." There were about 470 coffee-houses in London, besides five chocolate-houses, in Anne's time. Smoking was general in them, and intoxicants could be also obtained as well as coffee. Bishop Trelawney was much hurt because Bishop

Barnett had accused him of getting drunk in one of them on the 30th of January—a day of grief to Tories and all good Churchmen.

Before the year 1702 snuff-taking was rare in England. Only foreigners and a few travelled gentry used it, and the latter for the purpose of promoting sneezing. A small quantity was ejected upon the back of the hand from a pipe the size of a quill, and so snuffed up. But when Sir George Rooke made his descent on Cadiz, several thousand barrels and casks of fine snuffs were taken. At Vigo immense quantities of gross snuff were also seized, and every officer and sailor became a snuff merchant. Thirty thousand pounds of snuff, too, were captured from a Spanish ship off Lyme, and what had hitherto been a rare luxury became rapidly common. Before this, snuff-takers had bought their tobacco and rasped it themselves. In Swift's *Journal to Stella*, Nov. 3, 1711, occurs: "An apron for Stella, a pound of Chocolate without sugar for Stella, a fine rasp of ivory, given me by Mrs. St. John for Dingley, and a large roll of tobacco, which she must hide, or cut shorter out of Modesty, and four pairs of spectacles for the Lord knows who." Ladies took to the custom egregiously—young and old. Both sexes adopted "a very Jantee Air" when using it. The snuffbox formed a ready means of introduction or polite attention. Instead of finger and thumb, the "genteel" affected a spoon, and Arabella, in the *Play*, when offered some, says: "A spoon too, that's very gallant; for to see some People run their fat fingers into a Box is as nauseous as eating without a Fork."

The graceful dress of the early and mediæval periods made way for all kinds of monstrous fashions, copied from the fopperies of other countries, or designed from the bad taste of native artists. The farthingales of Elizabeth's and James's reigns have been reproduced from time to time, and even in our days, in the odious crinolines. The *Lady's Monthly Museum*, 1799, was the first English fashion-book; before this we can gather information only from papers, satirical prints, and other sources. We find that male eccentricities were copied by the ladies. Both sexes wore stays, and were padded and stuffed in all directions in turn. In 1793 the *Times* wrote: "The fashion of dressing, at present, is to appear *prominent*; and the stays are made accordingly. This is holding out a wish to be thought in a thriving way, even without the authority of the *Arches Court* of Canterbury. The idea was at first sent forward by a few dropsical ladies." In 1788 the crowns of ladies' hats were like small Martello towers. Six years after the ladies had no waists. The song—

"Shepherds, I have lost my love,  
Have you seen my Anna?"

was parodied by

“Shepherds, I have lost my waste,  
Have you seen my body?  
Sacrificed to modern taste,  
I'm quite a hoddy doddy,” &c. ;

the whole concluding with :

“A woman's only top and tail,  
The body's banished God knows where !”

Feather head-dresses were the next works for the satirist. “The ladies now wear feathers exactly of their own length, so that a woman of fashion is twice as long upon her feet as in her bed” (*Times*, 1796). A hundred years before “Commodoes” were almost as lofty. The “Gipsy Bonnets,” chignons, wigs, plaits, false curls, paint and powder, and tight-lacing were laughed at by turns. But the indecent exposure of their persons met with the severest criticism. “The rage for nudity” was the fashionable Parisian fever of '98. In the following year it spread to London, and has never completely left us since. The *Times* of December 11, 1799, said: “If the present fashion of nudity continues its career, the Milliners must give way to the Carvers, and the most elegant *fig-leaves* will be all the mode. The fashion of *false bosoms* has at least this utility, that it compels our fashionable fair to wear *something*.” The fashions of the men were equally grotesque, and were well caricatured by Gillray, but we have no space for describing them. We hope, however, in a future article to deal with the subject of dress more fully, and to note the sumptuary laws that have from time to time been made. We will just add that the dress of the labourer was a broad-brimmed flap felt hat, a short coat, and knee-breeches—of leather preferred. The labouring women wore very plain short dresses without furbelows or hoops, broad-brimmed straw hats, and on holidays the high-crowned felt hats. Both lived anxious lives of penury and constant toil. They had no education, no hope of a better lot, no haven in old age but the wretched poor-house, unless the grave intervened. Their homes were loveless excepting for their wives, who often looked in vain for love, because slavery had crushed all feeling out of their husbands' dead hearts. In *The Shepherd's Week*, Gay makes the poor wife recount to her good man the many things to which affection urged her for his sake, and she pathetically adds :

“Ah, love me more, or love thy pottage less !”

Hodge liked his homely fare made savoury by skilful hands, and the food of the people is a matter of high consideration. Good plain cooking, therefore, is also important, and should be taught in every school for girls. France is the country *par excellence* of high cookery, yet we have it on the authority of Lacroix that “the dishes of the seventeenth century were very plentiful, very varied, and very com-

plicated, but they were neither delicate in flavour, wholesome, nor appetising." Louis XIV. ate more than any one of his Court, and was perhaps almost the only Frenchman who ate alone. His three meals a day cost about £16, although "he was not a refined gourmet." But then he could eat steadily for an hour without speaking, and consume beyond belief. The Regency was the period when cookery was exalted to a fine art. In 1714 Voltaire found the hospitality of the Bastille attractive, but in 1749 he complained of the excessive luxury indulged in at table in Paris. Mercier, in his *Tableau de Paris*, 1792, says, "The new cookery is conducive to health, to good temper, and to long life. There is no doubt that we are healthier and better fed than our ancestors." The eighteenth century was "the century of grand cookery and eminent cooks." And Duclos, in his *Memoirs*, said that, "If the people who lived sixty years ago could revisit Paris they would not recognise it in respect to the table." The middle classes imitated the great as well as they could in trying to *se ruer en cuisine*. English cookery was stimulated by the French improvements, and the days of baked swans and herons, and porpoise-pie were over. The last had been a great dish with our coarse-feeding ancestors. In the old dialogue of *The Courtier and the Countryman* is a good narrative of what a plain farmer thought of "a great dainty, a Porpoise Pye or two cold," that had been sent him by a man of rank: "Neither man nor dog would eate of it."

We have now an excellent system of drainage—though capable of much improvement—a network of sewers that surpass the ancient Cloacæ of Rome. But these things grew slowly. Not very many years ago our people deposited their offal and refuse in the streets. Passers-by were in continual danger of being befouled from the windows above. Dungheaps were made in the middle of the streets, and mud and filth made the ways almost impassable on foot. Pigs and dogs revelled in the towns on indescribable garbage, and even rooted up the graveyards. Before Macadam, the roads were so bad that communication was difficult between inland towns. When Cromwell was made Protector the news took nineteen days to reach Bridgwater. Trees were drawn on Sussex roads by twenty-two oxen at a time. In the last century a journey from Lewes to London by coach could hardly be done in two summer days. A general Turnpike Act, passed in 1755, was met by much opposition. Landowners opposed it. Jeremiah vi. 16 was quoted against it. Many kept to the old waggon tracks in preference, although they had ruts four feet deep, and were full of holes and sloughs like Christian's Slough of Despond in the *Pilgrim's Progress*. A waggoner spoke the minds of his fellows when he said, "Roads had but one object for waggon driving. He required but five foot width in a lane, and all the rest might go to the devil." Railroads were opposed just as the turnpikes had been, just as every human improvement

has been met. Said an old coachman, "I know that if anything goes wrong, *there you are*"—here he made a sign of upsetting—"but, by the rail, if you meet with an accident, *where are you?*"

The history of postage is full of interest. In 1656 a reformer, John Hill, advocated a penny post. Twenty-three years afterwards some enterprising individuals started one for London and the suburbs. There was a fierce outcry. The porters tore down their advertisements, and Titus Oates said that letter carrying was all a scheme of the Papists. Hence it was postponed for another twenty years, and was then in private hands. In 1804 an extra fee of 6*d.* had to be paid for posting letters at the General Post Office in Lombard Street between seven and half-past seven in the evening. In 1810 the charge for a letter conveyed fifteen miles or under was 4*d.*; from fifteen to thirty, 5*d.*; and from 300 to 400, a shilling, with a graduated scale between thirty and 300 miles. Rowland Hill carried his plans after much opposition, and to-day we are blessed with abundant postal facilities.

If our great-grandfathers could rise from the dead they would not recognise this country as their own, nor London as their abiding-place, so changed are their aspects and their habits and customs. It was more dangerous to travel in England then than in the wilds of Africa now. Highwaymen and footpads robbed with impunity. Occupants of sedan-chairs were attacked in Piccadilly in broad day. At night in the dim-lighted streets few dared to stir abroad. Dr. Johnson's poem of *London* says:

"Prepare for death if ere at night you roam,  
And sign your will before you sup from home."

From Tyburn Turnpike—now the Marble Arch—to Whitechapel, crazy watchmen, old, feeble, and venal, were the only guardians of law and order, nor would they cross the road to save a life if the crime were occurring in a parish other than their own. "Decrepit old dotards" the *Morning Post* of 1788 called them. The Bow Street Runners, or "Robin Redbreasts," were the official detectives, three of whom "shadowed" the Royal Family.

"Delightful company, delicious fellows,  
To point out every minute who is who!  
To hustle from before their noble graces  
Rascals with ill-looks and designing faces,"

sang Peter Pindar. Mohawks and other wild rakes, often young men of fashion, scoured the streets in bands and disfigured the way-fares, fought the watchmen, and made night hideous. On the stage-coaches the guard sat by the coachman, and "always held his carbine ready cocked upon his knee." There were only three bridges over the Thames, and one was rickety. Kensington was cut off from Piccadilly by an impassable sea of mud. The king was two nights in his coach on the road between Kew and Buckingham Palace.

On the river, red-stockinged watermen, foul of speech, insolent and extortionate, plied between Westminster and London; distant voyages to Gravesend, or, very occasionally, to Margate, were made in "hoys," but the latter was a desperate undertaking. A good clergyman who did it wrote a tract describing his fearful adventure. "Many of us who went aboard had left our dearer comforts behind us. 'Ah!' said I, 'so it must be, my soul, when the "Master comes and calleth for thee."' My tender wife! my tender babes! my cordial friends!" And he concludes: "About ten o'clock on Friday night we were brought safely into the harbour of Margate. How great are the advantages of navigation! By the skill and care of three men and a boy, a number of persons were in safety conveyed from one part to another of the kingdom!"

When George the Third came to the throne, the angle between Edgware and Uxbridge roads from Marble Arch was a waste dotted with squatters' huts. Dead bodies were always hanging from Tyburn gallows. Bayswater was a little hamlet; Paddington a remote and rustic village. Drovers of cattle fed there. Marylebone was another small village a mile from London. Harley Street was Harley Fields, where George Whitfield preached in the open air. Tottenham Court Road was a lane scented in June with hawthorn bloom. Kentish Town was a secluded village, and snipe were shot between the two. Behind Montagu House, now the British Museum, was a stretch of fields where duellists fought. St. Giles's was a licensed Alsatia—"a perfect labyrinth of courts and alleys, tenanted by beggars, thieves, and tramps, who crowded together in one hideous chaos of filth, disease, and gin." The open country reached up to the back of Gray's Inn. St. Pancras was still rural, and Islington a fashionable suburb for City people. Canoubury was a hamlet; Clerkenwell a district of tea-gardens, mulberry-gardens, and mineral spas. More than three-fourths of Hoxton, De Beauvoir Town, Kingsland, Clapton, Homerton, and Hackney was occupied by fields belonging to market-gardeners and dairymen. Bull-baiters, badger-drawers, prize-fighters, congregated on the desolate space called the "Downs" between Westminster and Millbank. Chelsea was covered by cabbage-grounds. On Temple Bar were still nailed the heads of Jacobites, and the National Gallery and Trafalgar Square did not then exist. From Blackfriars Bridge to the Elephant and Castle there were not fifty houses. Newington Causeway was a paved roadway across a stretch of marshy land, and Newington Butts an archery ground. Clapham and Camberwell were villages surrounded by fields. Land was of little value, and space for rough gatherings and coarse sports existed in every direction. The quieter sort tripped out for tea and junketings.

The custom of arming our seaport towns arose from the other custom of piracy. Down to the beginning of the eighteenth century, pirates roamed the Channel and western coasts, seizing

vessels, landing and pillaging towns, and carrying off many into slavery. Word came from Plymouth in 1636 that fifteen sail of Turks were on the coast, harrying and doing much mischief. Five of them entered the Severn. But the most daring were English privateers, manned by English and Irish smugglers. The necessity for self-defence caused our coast population to become alert, daring, and warlike, and to give forth a breed of noble seamen. Besides which our seaports often waged wars upon each other.

In our last wars with France the ancient custom of impressment was resorted to in order to man the navy. In 1790 the pressgangs took in one night 1500 men at Wapping and 600 at Southwark, besides many at different seaport towns. Trading ships were robbed of their men and unable to sail. In the *Times*, February 19, 1795, occurs: "An embargo is about to take place on all the shipping in our ports, which it is thought will last *six weeks*, or until 20,000 seamen are procured." This system caused a vast amount of cruelty, hardship, and even bloodshed. Notwithstanding, the men, once aboard, fought as patriotically as the rest. The *Times*, November 16, 1797—the naval mutiny year—gives an anecdote of Captain Drury of the *Powerful*: "About an hour before the action with the Dutch fleet he assembled his men and thus addressed them: 'You are a set of damned, blackguard, mutinous rascals, and you know I think so of all of you. We shall soon see whether you have any courage. I have only this to say to you, you see the Dutch ship that we shall soon be alongside; if you don't silence her in forty minutes I shall know what to think of you. Now return to your quarters.' Turning to the master, he said, 'Do you take care that these rascals may not have to complain that they were not near enough.' In twenty minutes the Dutch ship struck her colours, and the *Powerful* bore away to assist the *Venerable*. After the action, the captains of the fore-castle came aft and asked Captain Drury if he still considered them a rascally set? 'No,' said Captain Drury, 'your behaviour has perfectly satisfied me.' 'Will you then shake hands?' said the men, which he did most heartily, and assured them that he should never reproach them again for what had passed, and would, on his part, entirely forget that anything had ever happened. They then gave him three cheers, and now Captain Drury is almost idolised by the crew."

All know how Wilberforce attacked slavery and succeeded, but black slaves, called "indentured black servants," were common in England down to the present century.

Religion was at a low ebb in Anne's reign. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu wrote to the Bishop of Salisbury with a copy of her translation of *Epictetus*, "that more atheists were to be found among the fine ladies of the times than among the lower sort of rakes." To the Countess of Mar, who had written that some statesmen were "cooking up a Bill to excise the word 'not' from the



Decalogue and to insert it in the Creed," Lady Mary replied: "It certainly might be carried on with great ease, the world being *revenu de bagatelles*; and honour, virtue, and reputation, which we used to hear of in our nursery, are as much laid aside as crumpled ribbons." The bishops and all trustworthy writers were of the same opinion. Cowper wrote of the clergy:

"Except a few with Eli's spirit blest,  
Hophni and Phineas may describe the rest."

They were often too idle or too ignorant to compose sermons, and thus the sermon compiler who "grinds divinity of other days down into modern use" became a steady occupation. The churches were decorated with pagan deities, except that the east end of them sometimes had something like what Bishop Newton described as

"Moses and Aaron upon a church wall,  
Holding up the commandments for fear they should fall."

Wesley and Whitfield, however, gave a new impulse to religious feeling, and to-day we have more sects than we can name.

According to Carlyle, the reign of superstition ended with the French Revolution. But men have always "groped to anticipate the cabinet designs of fate," and superstition and false credulity are still potent throughout the world. Bishop Butler justly and seriously wondered whether it was not possible for whole nations to go mad. When in 1750 a slight earthquake shock was felt at Westminster, the gambling hells were deserted, and the deserted churches and chapels were filled to overflowing. Coaches and carriages blocked the highways for miles outside London, and many ladies made earthquake gowns to sit out of doors all night of April the 8th, because a foolish soldier had predicted the ruin of London and Westminster on that day. Three ladies of rank, however, whom Walpole names, went ten miles out to play at brag till five in the morning, and then he supposed they would come back to look for the bones of their husbands and families under the rubbish. Educated people still believed in dreams, ghosts, and witches. All the charlatans of Europe flocked to England as to a happy hunting-ground, and found ready dupes from prince to peasant. Mesmerism, magnetism, earth baths, water cures, quack remedies, for all diseases, had each their day, and have reappeared again in ours.

Borough towns had formerly extraordinary powers. Each had its system of Home Rule, and was a little *imperium in imperio*. It controlled its trades, manufactures, and professional occupations, the numbers to be employed, and fixed the price of wages and commodities. It determined what were offences against the order, morals and well-being of the borough, and its codes assigned the punishments. Its bye-laws were a tyranny, and its mayor was frequently a little despot, as real as any Cadi of the East. In the court of Hustings Book were recorded the presentments of the jury, and we know from these what were the offences and modes of

punishment. The magistrates at sessions did as much for county matters and fixed the prices of all labour. No one could trade from one county to another without their license, just as no stranger could follow an occupation or reside in a borough without the mayor's permit. The tumbrel, stocks, pillory, branks, and the skimmington, were the usual instruments of punishment for slight offences, but the cucking-stool was the favourite for scolds and cheating bakers. Whipping was constantly resorted to, and was thought especially good for women and boys. Any one willing might be employed to perform it, and sometimes a woman undertook it for the sake of the fee, which varied from fourpence to a shilling. To witness it formed a part of public amusements, as in the case of hanging, and men visited the gaols on whipping-days to see the women whipped. Forestalling—buying out of market to sell again above market price—was a very grave offence, and was severely punished. A Mr. Rusby, an eminent corn factor, was indicted in the Court of King's Bench on July 4, 1800, for having purchased by sample eight months before in Mark Lane Corn Market ninety quarters of oats at 41s. per quarter, and sold thirty of them again in the same market, on the same day, at 44s. The jury instantly found him guilty, and Lord Kenyon, the judge, said to them: "You have conferred, by your verdict, almost the greatest benefit on your country that was ever conferred by any jury." A quiet stroll on the Sunday during the summer evening was visited by a heavy fine or the stocks; a boy for riding on a gate on a Sunday afternoon, was ordered to be whipped.

Education advanced slowly. In the time of the Tudors most were content to be able to sign their names. Of ninety who signed some orders for Brighton in 1580, only seven wrote their names themselves. The others had their names written for them and added some mark of their own, as a wheel or an axe. In 1680 not a half of the subscribers to a loyal petition from Bridgwater could write their names. Their hieroglyphs were said to have resembled so many "reptiles of the Nile." Those who could write could seldom read well. Ladies of rank wrote and spelt like chambermaids. Among these was the great Duchess of Marlborough who ruled England in the time of Queen Anne. Many of their husbands were not more accomplished. Sir John Germaine, for whose sake the Duchess of Norfolk had been divorced, and who married Lord Berkeley's daughter, was a remarkable example of illiteracy and ignorance. He left a legacy to Sir Matthew Decker, who had written a book on trade, because he thought he was the author of St. Matthew's Gospel. And in his last illness, when Lady Germaine caused him to receive the Sacrament, he remarked to his wife afterwards: "Betty, *that thing* you made me take has done me no good." School methods were generally weak, and teaching inefficient. Even the Universities were condemned on the testimony of all the most

able men who studied there. But we shall reserve the subjects of education and marriages for special articles.

We are compelled to omit all allusion to scores of interesting habits and customs. But in these very imperfect attempts to give a brief glimpse of some features of the past, we trust we may have succeeded in arousing sufficient interest to make our readers compare them with those of the present. Nor have we laid on the colours as strongly as the facts would have justified. For the more we investigate, the more clearly we see the immense superiority of the present. Some one said, it is of some importance to a man when he is born, and we have ample reasons to thank God that we were not born in those dark and evil days. The same forces, however, are at work now as then. We have still to encounter ignorance, presumption, and obstinacy in seeking further advancement. We have still to battle with ancient and deadly superstitions. Thus far in the struggle the outworks only have been taken, the citadel remains to be won.

Among many others we learn two great social truths: that enlightenment effects more than legislation, and that, whatever our desires, we cannot benefit the poor by violating natural economic laws. We find that much legislation is oppressive, and injurious to the common weal. We had better, therefore, reduce the laws than add to them. Full liberty for individual energy and ability and for the protection of a man's own are all that are required. Any Government that exceeds this, weakens instead of strengthening, and sacrifices the future to the present.

We apply this same principle to the subject that is nearest and dearest to our heart—the emancipation of our sex from sex disabilities and its moral elevation. We do not ask for new laws on behalf of women, but only that the old bad laws may be amended or repealed, and the status of women be left to the natural influences of sound sentiment and reason. The number of their supporters is daily swollen by fresh adhesions of noble-minded men and women. We do not doubt our cause for a moment. We cannot believe that for long one-half of the nation shall be held inferior to its social equals. Women's failings are of men's making—their virtues are their own. Just as the superior sentiments of women saved mankind in savage times, so did they, as wives and mothers, preserve in the ancient and mediæval. However corrupt at some periods our people may have been, there has always been a succession of good women to preserve the traditions of virtue and honesty. Yet, early in this century English wives have been sold in market overt. And to-day the noblest and most beautiful may be sold in other ways. But let who will help or obstruct, we, like so many of old, will continue to battle for the reign of right over might.

LADY COOK

(née TENNESSEE CLAFLIN),

## IRELAND'S POSITION IN LITERATURE.

THE movement for the revival or development of Irish literature initiated by Sir Charles Gavan Duffy has given rise to many hopes and fears in the breasts of those who really love Ireland and would like to see her taking an active part in the intellectual progress of the world. The question naturally arises—what has Ireland already done in literature?

The names of Goldsmith and Moore occupy a prominent place in the Temple of Letters. But Goldsmith wrote very little about Ireland, and Moore, sweet singer though he was, might properly be described as a drawing-room poet. Father Prout, that clever ecclesiastic and acute critic, pointed out some of Moore's foibles and pettinesses; and, while the celebrated *Melodies* will always be sung, their author cannot be regarded as a representative Irish poet.

Nearly half a century has passed since the death of Thomas Davis. He has been described as "the greatest of the patriot-poets of Ireland." As to his sincere and devoted patriotism there can be no doubt; but his poetry is weak from an artistic point of view, and even his warmest admirers can point to very little that is really great in Davis's verses. In elegance of language and harmony of versification Moore is far superior to Davis and the other poets of "Young Ireland." The exaggerated praise bestowed on the young enthusiasts who contributed to *The Nation*, apparently because all their poetical effusions were patriotic, should not blind us to the mediocre character of their work from a literary point of view. An impartial perusal of *The New Spirit of the Nation*,<sup>1</sup> just published, with an introduction by Mr. Martin MacDermott, in the New Irish Library, will convince most readers possessed of any culture or wide knowledge of literature that the "Young Irishmen," in spite of their fascinating qualities, had not sufficient of either the creative or critical faculty to achieve great results. And yet one at least of this little band of Irish patriots was gifted with "the vision and the faculty divine." James Clarence Mangan was, as Sir Charles Gavan Duffy has observed, "as truly born to sing deathless songs as Shelley or Keats." His poetry is of a weird, melancholy description: it is coloured with much of the sombre suggestiveness of Heine; but it has a distinct originality and a depth of feeling which

<sup>1</sup> *The New Spirit of the Nation*. Edited, with an Introduction, by Martin MacDermott. London: Fisher Unwin. 1894.

entitles this ill-fated Irish singer to take rank beside Edgar Allan Poe, Charles Baudelaire, and others whose favourite themes have been doubt, despair, and death. Some of Mangan's poetry is so fragmentary that it would be unfair to subject it to serious criticism. His life was, indeed, a squalid tragedy, and it is possible that, under more favourable circumstances, he would have written a great poem. He certainly had not dramatic power, and was unequal to a sustained effort. His most remarkable productions might be described as gasps of song. They have a painfully personal note, and are of a purely introspective character. To this class belong *The Nameless One*, *Twenty Golden Years Ago*, and *The Saw-mill*. Some of his translations from the Irish are very beautiful—notably, *Dark Rosaleen*, which is by no means a literal rendering of the original, and is as much a new poem as Coleridge's translation of Schiller's *Wallenstein* is a new drama.

Let us turn to some of the other members of the young Ireland group.

Charles Gavan Duffy was a struggling journalist, but he possessed organising power. As editor of *The Nation* he did good work for Ireland. He has written a splendid ballad of the "rebel" order—*The Muster of the North*—of which he may well be proud. He has since his "Young Ireland" days lived to sway the destinies of one of the British colonies.

Thomas Francis Meagher was an orator rather than a poet; but he wrote some capital verses. Like Davis, he was a pure-souled enthusiast, but he lacked Davis's profound thoughtfulness and philosophic mode of dealing with national topics. His career was a strange and eventful one, and might furnish materials for the novelist. His death was a sad termination to a life which was full of brilliant promise, and his remains, instead of being interred on Irish soil, were buried beneath the dark waters of the Mississippi. His fiery eloquence left an impression on those who heard him which could never be forgotten, and the same wealth of diction and wonderful power of word-painting may be found in some of his contributions to *Harper's Magazine* and other well-known American periodicals.

Mitchel was perhaps the most vehement revolutionist of the "Young Ireland" party, and he possessed a strong individuality which marks him out from all the rest. Eventually he broke off from the others and formed a new section of Nationalists, daring, thoroughgoing, irreconcilable, who proclaimed war *à outrance* against the English Government, and looked upon compromise as a contemptible piece of cowardice. As a writer Mitchel exhibited powers which under happier auspices might have given him a rank in literature almost equal to that of Thomas Carlyle himself. His *Jail Journal* contains passages that might well be compared with some of the finest things that have emanated from the pen of the Chelsea philosopher. Indeed, there is a strange resemblance between

their style and mode of thinking, and there can be no doubt that Mitchel, with his hatred of conventionality and his disrespect for forms, would scorn to imitate the "Saxon" Carlyle. The rough-and-ready criticism of Macaulay's essay on Bacon in the second chapter of the *Jail Journal* is well worth reading. Its contemptuous reference to the "enlightenment" of the nineteenth century is quite worthy of Carlyle, and is full of that *sarva indignatio*, of which we find so much in the *Letter-Day Pamphlets*.

"It is altogether a new thing in the history of mankind," says our Irish Timon, "this triumphant glorification of a current century upon being the century it is. No former age, before Christ or after, ever took any pride in itself, and sneered at the wisdom of its ancestors; and the new phenomenon indicates, I believe, not higher wisdom, but deeper stupidity. The nineteenth century is come, but not gone; and what now, if it should be hereafter memorable among centuries for something quite other than its wondrous enlightenment."

Dealing with Macaulay's somewhat shallow contrast between Plato and Bacon, in which the latter is commended for ignoring the higher aims of philosophy and seeking instead to promote material comfort, Mitchel says:

"The truth is that Plato and Pythagoras did not understand comfort and wealth and human *commoda* at all; but they thought the task of attending to such matters was the business of ingenious tradespeople, and not of wise men and philosophers. If James Watt had appeared at Athens or Crotona with his steam-engine, he would have certainly got the credit of a clever person and praise-worthy mechanic—all he deserved; but they never would have thought of calling him a philosopher for that. They did actually imagine—these ancient wise men—that it is true wisdom to raise our thoughts and aspirations above what the mass of mankind calls good—to regard truth, fortitude, honesty, purity, as the great objects of human effort, and not the supply of vulgar wants."

The passage that follows is so remarkable that it deserves to be quoted. Here it is:

"What a very poor fool Jesus Christ would have been—judged by the 'new philosophy'—for His aim and Plato's were one. He disdained to be useful in the matter of our little comforts; yes, indeed, 'He could not condescend to the humble office of ministering to the comfort of human beings.' On the contrary, 'whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are holy, if there be any virtue——' Why, good Messiah! this is the mere Academy over again. Have you considered that these are unattainable frames of mind? You offer us living bread, and water which he that drinketh shall not thirst again;—very beautiful, but too romantic. Can you help us to butter the mere farinaceous bread we have got; to butter it first

on the one side and then on the other? to improve the elemental taste and somewhat too paradisaic weakness of the water? These are our vulgar wants; these are what the mass of mankind agrees to call *good*. Whatsoever things are snug, whatsoever things are influential—if there be any comfort, if there be any money, think on these things. Henceforth we acknowledge no light of the world which does not light our way to good things like these.”

Smith O'Brien, though he was the nominal leader of the “Young Ireland” party, was both a feeble writer and an indifferent speaker. It was his social influence that enabled him to obtain the leadership; and it is a notable fact that in Ireland a man's position in society has more weight even down to the present time in determining his rank in a political movement than either genius or nobility of character. The Irish people are essentially aristocratic in their tastes, and in spite of the land agitation, they have still a profound reverence for “the claims of long descent.” The Ballingarry cabbage-garden escapade, of which Smith O'Brien was the hero, was rather an inglorious exploit; and though the “Young Ireland” leader was a gentleman of decided respectability, the movement might well have progressed without him. In fact, he was little better than an amiable nonentity.

Doheny, who was one of the poets of “Young Ireland,” wrote some touching and beautiful songs, in which he referred to his country, like Montrose, in the language of a devoted lover. Though he lacked the intensity and gloomy power of Mangan, he was, in his way, a genuine poet, and some of his lyrics are quite as melodious as those of Moore.

MacNevin, another of this patriotic band, devoted himself to the publication of books illustrative of Irish history, and his work on the “Irish Volunteers” is one of the most interesting volumes in Duffy's original “Library of Ireland.”

Altogether the literature of “Young Ireland,” with all its artistic shortcomings, was the reflex of Irish national life in that stirring period; and though it is by this time well-nigh forgotten, it helped to develop the intellect of the country, while it taught lessons of higher political morality than any that have since been inculcated.

The spirit of Davis was, at the same time, national and cosmopolitan. His well-known lines embodying his political faith deserve to be often quoted:

“And ah! it were a noble creed  
 To show before mankind,  
 How every cause and every creed  
 Might be by love combined.  
 Might be combined, yet not forget  
 The fountain whence they rose,  
 As filled with many a rivulet  
 The lordly Shannon flows.”

Thus he strove to unite universal benevolence and love of country,

At the same time, it can scarcely be said—politics apart—that “Young Irelandism” gave birth to anything either in prose or verse which can lay claim to immortality. Even the beautiful fragments of Mangan do not entitle him to the rank of a great poet, though they might well have won for him sufficient sympathy and public favour to have lifted him out of the obscurity and poverty in which he lived and died. Mitchel’s vigorous prose is also of a fragmentary character, and the *Jail Journal*, his best work, is little better than a clever and interesting monologue. Davis, who was himself an appreciative critic, realised the fact that nothing great had been done in Irish literature—at least so far as it adopted the English tongue as its channel of expression. And he was too modest ever to lay claim to the rank or the fame of a poet. In one of his essays he laments that such a rich mine of lore as Irish history contains should have remained so long unworked. Ireland is, indeed, a country whose chequered annals afford abundant materials on which the imagination of the poet or the novelist might successfully work; and if Irishmen have not won for their country a wider celebrity in literature, they are mainly to blame for it themselves.

What a magnificent field does not Ireland present for the historical novelist! Irish history is teeming with romance. There is not a hill or valley throughout the length and breadth of Ireland that has not historic traditions associated with it. Even the old streets of Dublin have each a thrilling history, and would supply abundant pabulum to the romance-writer. And yet Ireland still awaits her Walter Scott to embody in fiction all the lights and shadows of her national life. The writers who have attempted to delineate Irish life have failed to give anything like an adequate idea of the national character. In one series of tales, no doubt, some of its darker traits are outlined with rugged power; but, making all due allowance for the difficulties under which the *Tales of the Hara Family* were produced, it must be admitted that they are full of glaring literary blunders as well as absurd anachronisms. In *The Boyne Water*, which is perhaps the most manifest imitation of Scott that we have from the pen of John Banim (the most gifted and original of the two brothers, who called themselves “the O’Hara family”), the picture of James the Second is weak and colourless, and altogether as a historical romance the work is a sad failure. *The Croppy*, which is said to be entirely the work of Michael Banim, adheres more to historical accuracy; but, if we except the character of the Smith, Shawn-na-Gow, and that of the old servant Nanny the Knitter, there is not a single striking or dramatic figure in the entire story.



William Carleton has made an incursion into the domain of historical romance in *Willy Reilly* and *Redmond Count O'Hunlon*, but his treatment of such subjects is so clumsy and utterly inartistic as to be outside the pale of serious criticism.

Gerald Griffin, the friend of John Banim, wrote a novel called *The Collegians*, which has furnished Mr. Dion Boucicault with a subject for one of his sensational Irish melodramas; but the story, though told in an agreeable and interesting manner, is manifestly a mere tyro's experiment in fiction, and the author throughout the entire work exhibits a very scanty knowledge of human nature. Hardress Cregan, the hero of *The Collegians*, is not only a self-contradictory but an impossible type of character. Griffin published an Irish historical romance called *The Invasion*, which is not only devoid of all interest as a tale, but is full of mistakes which show that he possessed only very imperfect acquaintance with the facts of Irish history.

There are only two other writers of fiction whose attempts to deal with Irish historical subjects deserve notice. These are Charles Lever and Joseph Sheridan Lefanu. Of Lever it must be said that his tendency towards exaggeration prevented him from dealing fairly with historical scenes and personages. In *The Knight of Gwynne* he has given an utterly unreal picture of the pre-Union Irish gentry, and few persons can doubt that the Knight himself is purely a creature of the novelist's imagination. *The O'Donoghue* is even a more distorted picture, and the author has merely used the form of a historical romance to embody in it some of his own class-prejudices. Probably Lever himself would be one of the first to acknowledge that he never seriously intended to give his readers an accurate glimpse of historical facts, as Sir Walter Scott has done in *Ivanhoe* and *The Fortunes of Nigel*. He was at best a dashing story-teller who "drew the long bow" without stint or scruple, and thought his purpose attained as long as he could sustain the interest of his narrative. He had very little sympathy with popular aspirations, and if his works had any definite object it was to persuade the world that an Irish landlord is the most amiable type of gentleman in existence—a proposition which, by this time, is not likely to find much credence either amongst the English or the Irish people.

Lefanu, though he never attained the popularity of Lever, was a far more powerful and imaginative writer. He possessed a singular power of depicting the tragic and mysterious phases of life. One of his works, *The House by the Churchyard*, is a romance of Dublin life in the last century, and gives an extremely vivid picture of the social life of the period. Another tale, entitled *The Cook and Anchor*, also deals with Irish society in the eighteenth century. It is a kind of chronicle of past events, and, though it is

too fragmentary to be a perfect historical tale, it appears to depict the life of "Old Dublin" with tolerable fidelity.

So much for Irish historical fiction. The field is a prolific one, but the reapers are few. Strange to say, Mr. Justin M'Carthy, M.P., and Mr. Richard Dowling, have not even attempted to deal with any theme taken from Irish history. Perhaps the *Anglicisation* of Irish genius is the cause of this singular apathy, and the fact may by some be regarded as an excuse for the indifference of Irishmen to their own history; but the answer is, that the first duty of all Irishmen is towards their country, and, if they neglect this duty, the blame be on their own heads.

One undistinguished story-teller, whose name is probably unknown to many English readers, deserves some praise for his faithful portraiture of the Munster peasantry. The pictures of humble Irish life in Charles J. Kickham's *Sally Cavanagh* and *Knocknagow* are far more true than those of Lever or Carleton.

Mr. William O'Brien's novel, *When We were Boys*, has been extravagantly praised and still more extravagantly disparaged. It is an unequal work. Its interminable discussions give it the character of a political pamphlet. It is scarcely a true picture of Irish life; but it is written with genuine command of language and no mean descriptive power. As a novel it is much inferior to Miss Emily Lawless's *Hurriah*, which is a truly original and striking story.

Irish poetry has been at rather a low ebb of late. William Allingham wrote much that will live. The same remark applies to Mr. Aubrey de Vere, though a great deal of his poetry is unpoetic both in form and subject-matter. Mr. T. D. Sullivan's verses can scarcely be called "poems" in the higher sense of the word. The late Sir James Ferguson was a true poet, though not of a high order.

As for the Irish drama, we have nothing that can, in any sense, answer that description save *The Colleen Bawn* and the other sensational plays of Dion Boucicault. These productions are no more, true pictures of Irish life than the cheap periodical trash professing to depict fashionable society are accurate delineations of anything that takes place in the living, breathing world of men and women. A very brief reference to recent Irish periodical literature may here be introduced. A number of Irish publications have, during the past ten or fifteen years, sprung up, lived a precarious life, and then nearly all perished. Among the number may be included the *Monitor*, to which the principal contributor was Mr. D. F. Hannigan, a member of the Irish Bar; *Hibernia*, which, though well written, from the start failed to gain any success in Ireland; and the *Dublin University Review*, which was edited by Mr. T. W. Rolleston. One magazine has survived out of the wreck

—the *Irish Monthly*—which, unfortunately, is saturated with clericalism.

In conclusion, one word of stimulus, one word of encouragement, may fairly be addressed to Irish literary genius. Is there no writer of Irish birth and antecedents strong enough and earnest enough to describe truthfully and conscientiously the various phases of Irish life, and to do for Ireland all that Scott has done for Scotland and Dickens for England? The Irish are a gifted and imaginative race, and there is no reason for limiting the possibilities of Irish genius to the sterner sex. Why should not Ireland have her "George Eliot" as well as England? Several talented Irishmen have, within the last few years, written readable novels; but none of them, except Miss Lawless's clever book, *Hurkish*, has risen above the dead-level of praiseworthy mediocrity. Whatever the cause may be—whether it be that English prejudice has damped the ardour of aspiring talent in Ireland, or that culture is not yet sufficiently diffused through the country to develop fairly the dormant genius of the race—the fact remains that the Irish element in English literature is, up to the present, an insignificant factor.

If the work attempted by "Young Ireland" was a failure, it was at least a noble and glorious failure. Why should not the dream of Davis yet be realised by a band of Irish men and women, who, taking for their watchwords "Country and Culture," succeed, by the power of intellect, in crowning the arch of Irish Liberty with the priceless wreath of a National Literature?

## THE LAND LAWS OF NEW ZEALAND.

AN impression prevails in some quarters that the tendency of New Zealand legislation is theoretical rather than practical; that untried courses are entered upon more in the enthusiastic spirit befitting an irresponsible Fabian Society than with the deliberation and business forecast expected of statesmen who must count the cost and stand or fall by the economic results. This impression is a wrong one, and probably arises from the utterances of a loud-voiced minority being heard across the ocean, while the Acts of the majority lie quietly in the Statute-book.

To assist in removing a misapprehension so harmful to our little colony, I propose to describe, to the best of my ability, within the severe limits of this paper, one section of these Acts, viz., the Land Laws passed from time to time, and the gradually evolved alterations thereof proved to be necessary or advantageous. I select the statutes concerning land, because they are considered of the first importance to the people, all attempts to permanently increase and diffuse wealth being vain unless preceded by a sound system of land tenure.

The subject divides itself naturally into two parts:

*The Old System*, extending from the foundation of the colony to the abolition of the provinces, a period of over thirty years, during which land was bought and sold like any manufactured commodity, and,

*The New System*, which has gradually recognised responsibilities for cultivation and limitation of areas.

On the first period I will touch lightly, it being useful as a contrast only. To do justice to the second, I must quote copiously from the Acts themselves, because Englishmen interested in the subject will desire more to know what has been done than to hear mere opinions about the doing.

### I. THE OLD LAWS.

*Native Lands.* In the early days almost every man seized as much land as he could conveniently buy, or in any other way<sup>1</sup> obtain

<sup>1</sup> "Poor Waka's only idea of price for any piece of land was two gallons of rum."  
— *Vide note*, p. 299.

from the natives without regard to its cultivation. The Maoris, simple aborigines, had never even thought of land as a marketable commodity apart from food out of it, shelter and locomotion on its surface. They enjoyed it, in tribal fashion, as they enjoyed the sea, the river, the sunshine and rain. So when twenty-six missionaries, bringing with them British ideas of good and evil, claimed 185,233 acres for themselves, besides 11,607 for their society,<sup>1</sup> and one claimed 50,000 acres,<sup>2</sup> the original occupiers showed very little hostility; in fact, to use the words of a disinterested eye-witness:

"They (the native chiefs) are perfectly satisfied. They have not felt a scarcity of land yet. They will feel it probably in a couple of years. . . . Some of the petty chiefs in the Bay of Islands have sold the whole of their lands; so much so that they have not got sufficient ground to grow their food upon. . . . They subsist by their women going on board ship, and by trading, but specially by their women going on board ship. . . . They are paid for their land in gunpowder and guns, blankets, tobacco, and clothing"<sup>3</sup> (*calculated afterwards at the legally reduced estimate of three times their value in Sydney*).

Many missionaries held quite aloof from this scramble for land, and the above cases are mentioned, not in order to cast a slur upon the noble band of pious men, but to show what was considered justifiable and right at the time. Such being the spirit of the age, traders and speculators were, as may well be imagined, much more eager than missionaries to secure large blocks of country.<sup>4</sup> Earth hunger grew apace, and the Maories soon began to perceive the risks of doing business with a race of white men who were on a different plane of right and wrong. Hence the New Zealand wars, and on the shoulders of the present generation a war loan of £3,000,000 spent in killing off the dissatisfied original occupiers of the soil.

As time went on, successive governments became alarmed at the magnitude of private dealings with the natives, and in 1856, an Act of the Legislature<sup>5</sup> provided that no old claim for over 2560 acres (four square miles) was admissible. No glimmering of principle concerning the right use of land influenced legislators yet, it was simply a question of expediency. If a small knot of speculators were allowed to take too much, there would be none left for others. Also it was not considered prudent to strip the natives quite at

<sup>1</sup> Wakefield's *New Zealand*, vol. ii. p. 448.

<sup>2</sup> Case No. 222. Rev. ——. *Accounts and Papers House of Commons*, 1845, p. 471.

<sup>3</sup> Evidence of John Blackett, lieutenant of the Royal Navy, before the House of Commons, 1840. A specially privileged person was John Blackett to be present at one of the "beginnings," to perceive the "source," and to be permitted to amber his thoughts in imperishable words before England's highest tribunal. "*They have not got sufficient ground to grow their food upon. They subsist by their women going on board ship.*" Do not these words throw a lurid flash of light into the dark "beginnings" of poverty and prostitution?

<sup>4</sup> Ordinance II. 1841 made it unlawful to purchase land from the natives without her Majesty's consent. This restriction was partially withdrawn by Proclamation in 1844, was revised by the Native Land Purchase Ordinance 1846, was waived again in favour of the New Zealand Company's land claimants in 1851, and so on.

<sup>5</sup> New Zealand Land Claims Settlement Act, 1856.

once ; so native reserves were by legislation<sup>1</sup> increased, and more tightly tied up, for fear the next generation of Maoris should be thrown paupers on the country. In those days no legal limit to the amount of land to be held by one person was thought practicable or just, and means were easily found to acquire large blocks in very shady ways, ways well known to the older generation, and to students of such Blue-books as the Royal Commission on the *Heretaunga*<sup>2</sup> block. I have seen Maori landowners kept drunk for weeks around the shop door of a storekeeper who was commissioned to get hold of their shares in a block of splendid land. This was done by persuading these untutored, dazed savages to buy everything they took a fancy to (sometimes the goods were never delivered), and by doling out, to be spent in drink, money for which the unfortunate drunkards blindly signed whatever receipts were presented. Then to pay debts thus incurred they signed away their lands. Chief among speculators were twelve gentlemen, irreverently styled the twelve Apostles, who, fired, perhaps, by the recollection that seventy men owned half of Scotland, tried to secure a huge slice of the North Island of New Zealand. Many others worked more modestly on the same lines for years, up to the time when at the dawn of new principles in land tenure, the Government began to buy native lands for the people. In 1877 a law was passed<sup>3</sup> that a simple proclamation by the Crown of negotiations with the natives for the purchase of certain specified lands, stopped all other buyers from dealing with the natives for those lands. In 1878 mortgages of native lands were forbidden.<sup>4</sup> In 1882 the native reserves and the income to be derived therefrom<sup>5</sup> were placed permanently in charge of the Public Trustee, an officer of the colony who never dies, never leaves New Zealand, and cannot misappropriate the funds. In 1884<sup>6</sup> all sales of native lands except to the Crown were stopped within a large defined territory. In 1886<sup>7</sup> certificated lands could be disposed of by the Crown Commissioner, subject to the approval of committees of Maori owners ; but lands to which no title had been issued could not be bought by Europeans under penalty of fine, forfeiture, or imprisonment. In 1888<sup>8</sup> full power was again given to the Maoris to dispose as they thought fit of all lands for which they had received certificates of title from the

<sup>1</sup> New Zealand Native Reserves Act, 1856.

<sup>2</sup> Royal Commission on Hawkes Bay Native Land Alienation, Journal of House of Representatives, 1873, vol. iii. Complaint I. G 7, p. 18.

<sup>3</sup> New Zealand Purchase of Native Lands Act, 1877.

<sup>4</sup> New Zealand Native Land Act Amendment Act (2), 1878.

<sup>5</sup> By the Native Reserves Act, 1882, certain reserves, being the greater bulk of the Reserves not previously granted away to the natives themselves, passed from the Commissioners of Native Reserves into the administration of the Public Trustee.

<sup>6</sup> New Zealand Native Land Alienation Restriction Act, 1884, repealed in 1886.

<sup>7</sup> New Zealand Native Land Administration Act, 1886, repealed in 1888.

<sup>8</sup> New Zealand Native Land Act, 1888. Native Lands Fraud Prevention Act, 1881, Amendment Act, 1888.

Crown. The history of the Native Land Laws is a history of wire-pullings, timid vacillations, and transient repentances.<sup>1</sup>

*Crown Lands.* Meanwhile, Crown lands passed through a period of absorption nearly as indiscriminate. Under pressure of provincial<sup>2</sup> inter-jealousies and need of cash, unsurveyed Crown lands fit for agriculture were thrown open in some provinces at 10s. an acre.<sup>3</sup> In the North Island, which was in those days not so well explored as the South Island, the mode of procedure was often as follows. I will take one typical (an actual) case: The speculator called in a surveyor and tipped him a £20 note for the rough bearings by river, mountain, and valley, of one of the good pieces of land which the latter had, for the purpose of selling the information, noted when traversing the country on Government service. Having chosen his piece, the speculator, at two minutes to 1 P.M., handed in his application and a marked cheque to the Crown Lands Receiver. No other applicant appearing before 4 P.M. of the same day, the Crown Lands Receiver drew, on a nearly blank map of the district, large lines enclosing, by guess work, an area corresponding to the application form. No person in or out of the Government offices, except the fee'd surveyor, knew exactly where the land was, or had any idea what it was worth for food production. The speculator then became unconditional owner in fee simple. There were no roads or bridges. He had no intention of cultivating. *He never saw the land.* He simply waited for population, for the advent of the *bonâ fide* settler, and for the unearned increment.

When the *bonâ fide* settler, the only man who could bring prosperity to the colony, appeared upon the scene, he, in many cases, was confronted by rings of speculators, who, having secured the richest accessible blocks, asked three or four up to twenty times what they had paid. Cultivation was checked, settlement delayed, and the colony, as a whole, suffered.

## II. THE NEW LAWS.

The Land Act of 1877, repealing fifty-six enactments, was the first<sup>4</sup> serious step in the, to us, new direction of settling the people

<sup>1</sup> The Native Land Purchase and Acquisition Bill, 1893, now before Parliament, is an important measure grappling with the Native question fully for the first time. It proposes to give to the Crown a prior right over the 7,000,000 acres of waste and unoccupied Maori lands. Native owners are required to sell to the Crown at values to be fixed by a board of two high class natives and three Government officials, or to consent to lease through the Government in terms of the Land Act, 1892.

<sup>2</sup> The New Zealand Waste Lands Act, 1854, and amendments, vested in the superintendents and provincial councils power to dispose of the Crown lands. The New Zealand Land Revenue Appropriation Act, 1858, granted to the provinces five-sixths of the land revenues, the Waste Lands Act, 1858, re-vesting powers of disposal in and through the Governor.

<sup>3</sup> By the New Zealand Waste Lands Act, 1858, the Wellington Provincial Waste Lands Act Amendment Act, 1865, and others, good land was obtainable at 5s. to 10s. per acre. Many of the most valuable estates were secured after 1858 at 5s. per acre.

<sup>4</sup> Some of the principles appeared previously in the Waste Lands Act 1853, the District Waste Lands Act, and the Waste Lands Administration Act, 1876.

on the land in all parts of the colony on uniform principles. But several measures, before that date, unintentionally contributed to make such reform possible. Of these measures the most important by far was the Abolition of Provinces Act, 1875. In order to understand the far-reaching effect of this Act it is necessary to briefly describe the New Zealand of those days. A little larger than Great Britain, the two islands were subdivided into several separate provinces,<sup>1</sup> each with all the powers, ceremonies, and emoluments of a petty state. The cold mountainous south, with Dunedin the capital town, say as it were at Edinburgh, was wholly occupied by Scotch settlers. Exclusive, "self-contained," with its own laws and customs, more Scotch than Scotland, Otago had as little intercourse as possible with its English neighbour, Canterbury. Auckland, at the extreme north, with an all-engrossing Maori question, and a lavish defence expenditure, was always at variance with the south. Each province, having its own superintendent, parliament, local laws and revenues, had no common bond but jealousy of every other province and of the over-riding General Assembly. The civil, religious, and social estrangements seem almost inconceivable now, but were very real, and hindered all uniform legislation. So the abolition of these sub-parliaments and the substitution of a complete system of local self-government—measures which were forced upon the General Assembly for quite another purpose, viz., to enable the Public Works policy to be carried out—also made possible the repeal of all the conflicting land laws, and in their place one uniform and gradually improved system of land tenure.

The Land Transfer Act had also an influence in the same direction. Every transaction being registered,<sup>2</sup> it became as easy to tell, from day to day, the number of acres held under this Act by each proprietor, as to tell from a share register the number of his shares in a public company. Without such machinery ready to hand the statutes afterwards limiting holdings of Crown lands might have been as dead letters. Breaches of provisions and of covenants could not have been promptly discovered, nor could penalties have been readily enforced.

These two measures, and others which I need not particularise, cleared the way for the Land Act, 1877. The more this Act is studied, and contrasted with previous legislation, the more clearly does the inquirer perceive that, however imperfect it appears to us now, a master hand framed it, and only a master mind could have carried it successfully through the opposition of vested interests and the prejudices of the time. Although afterwards repealed, its provisions were so admirable that they have been incorporated, almost verbatim,

<sup>1</sup> Auckland, Hawkesbay, Taranaki, Wellington, Nelson, Marlborough, Westland, Canterbury, and Otago (and at one time Southland).

<sup>2</sup> "Each District Land Registrar shall keep a book called the Register Book," &c. —Land Transfer Act, 1870, and amendments.



in all succeeding enactments. By it a Minister of Lands was appointed—a great step forward—Local Land Boards in ten districts were instructed to classify lands and sell separately any of special value on account of soil, timber, minerals, or proximity to railways; unsurveyed land could not be sold without first ascertaining its position and quality; no agricultural block larger than 320 acres could be put up at auction for cash in one lot; by it land was, for the first time, obtainable from the Crown in all parts of the colony on deferred payments; and great care was taken to confine this concession to *bona fide* cultivators of small blocks. The maximum area obtainable by any one person on deferred payments was 320 acres of agricultural land, and the applicant had to sign a declaration that he was eighteen<sup>1</sup> years of age; that he held no other lands on deferred payment, nor had ever held, nor assigned his interest in any; that he was not, either in his own or in any other name, the owner in fee simple, or on agricultural lease, of more land than would in all with the present application amount to 640 acres; that he himself would cultivate, for his own benefit only, yearly one-twentieth of the land, reside on it,<sup>2</sup> and, within six years, put on the ground substantial improvements to the value of £1 per acre. After these conditions were complied with, and after the balance of the purchase-money was paid, he was entitled to the Crown grant in fee simple. By this Act the uncompleted interest of a selector in his land was not capable of being charged, encumbered, or taken in execution for debt; and the transfer of his ownership required approval by the land board of the district. Officers called Rangers of the Crown were appointed to value improvements and to see the provisions of the Act carried out. Occupation licences were also granted for cutting timber and flax, raising minerals, and for sites for manufactures. Forests were conserved<sup>3</sup> and encouragement given to plant trees.<sup>4</sup>

While provision was being so thoughtfully made for the cultivators with small means, what of the poorest agricultural immigrants to whom 320 acres seemed almost as far out of reach as ten times the amount? For them was now conceived the idea of setting apart small village settlements<sup>5</sup> in the districts where such poor labourers were likely to find constant or intermittent work on the lands of richer neighbours, or on the district roads. Each applicant was offered, at moderate prices on deferred payments, one village acre for his homestead, and, at a convenient distance therefrom, one farm

<sup>1</sup> Afterwards reduced to seventeen years.

<sup>2</sup> Subject afterwards to certain varying qualifications in the case of bush and swamp lands, and where additional improvements were made. New Zealand Land Act, 1887, and Amendment Act, 1888.

<sup>3</sup> Afterwards more fully by the State Forests Act, 1885.

<sup>4</sup> Forest Tree Planting Encouragement Acts, 1871-2-9.

<sup>5</sup> Land Act, 1877, Amendment Act, 1879.

allotment not exceeding fifty acres,<sup>1</sup> which he could improve during slack times. These village settlements have succeeded moderately well where they have been judiciously located.

To further induce cultivation, blocks of land of fine quality, called "Special Settlements,"<sup>2</sup> were laid aside, and groups of buyers, drawn together by the desire to be neighbours, or to get a share in such good land, or encouraged by the prospect of joint rapid settlement, formed themselves into associations, took up the land in block, and subdivided it among themselves. Many of these special settlement associations have answered admirably.

Three years later is introduced the most interesting measure in the statute-book of New Zealand—namely, the Act for leasing the Crown lands of the colony, commonly called the Perpetual Lease Act.<sup>3</sup> Short, lucid, simple, I would space permitted me to transcribe it here in full. By this Act power was given to set aside one-third of the agricultural land of the colony,<sup>4</sup> to be leased for thirty years, with liberty to renewal every twenty-one years for ever, subject to revaluation, deducting improvements. Regulations for cultivation, for limitation of areas, and generally, were similar to those already enumerated. The following quotations from the Act describe the new provisions :

Three years before the end of the current term of the lease, "a valuation shall be made by arbitration of the then value of the fee simple of the lands then included in the lease, and also a valuation of all substantial improvements of a permanent character made by the lessee during the term, and then in existence on the land."

Provisions for the arbitration are simple. One person shall be appointed by the lessee and one by the Land Board of the district. If they fail to agree, they shall call in an umpire, whose decision shall be binding,<sup>5</sup> and they shall make an award . . . . "After the making and publishing of the above-mentioned award . . . . the lessee shall elect . . . . whether he will accept a fresh lease of the said lands for a further term of twenty-one years at a rental equal to 5 per cent. on the gross value of the lands as fixed by arbitration, after deducting therefrom the value of the substantial improvements of a permanent character as fixed by the said arbitration. . . . If the lessee shall not elect to accept a renewal . . . . a lease of the said lands . . . . shall be put up to competition by public tender for such further term of twenty-one years on the following terms: The upset price shall be such rent as shall be fixed by the Board, not being a greater sum than that at which the lease was offered to the present lessee. If any other person than the present lessee be declared the purchaser he shall . . . . pay over to the Receiver of Land Revenue the amount of the value of the substantial improvements. . . . And if the outgoing lessee has let

<sup>1</sup> Increased to 100 acres by the Land Act, 1892, which also authorised cash advances for improvements.

<sup>2</sup> Land Act, 1877, Amendment Act, 1879.

<sup>3</sup> Land Act, 1877, Amendment Act, 1882.

<sup>4</sup> And later on to set aside as much as was at any time applied for.—Land Act, 1877, Amendment Act, 1884.

<sup>5</sup> Subject to the common restraints and conditions imposed on arbitrators by the Supreme Court of N.Z. Practice and Procedure Act Amendment Act, 1866, and afterwards by the Arbitration Act, 1890.

the new lessee into quiet possession . . . . and if none of the improvements . . . . have been damaged . . . . the Land Receiver shall pay the same (the same amount of the value of the improvements) . . . . over to the outgoing lessee. . . . If such lease shall not be sold . . . . then the lessee shall continue lessee of the said lands . . . . so long as he shall pay the (original) rent . . . . and observe the covenants . . . . or until the Land Board shall succeed in finding a purchaser of the new lease." Lessees were required to reside on their lands.<sup>1</sup>

Passed in its original form the perpetual-lease system with periodic revaluations might be considered theoretically perfect, its only weak point, perhaps, being that, so long as other tenures existed, its revaluations became a special class tax on the one most deserving of exemption. But such a radical change of tenure was not acquiesced in patiently by a powerful minority. In its passage through Parliament, the bill was successfully attacked, and a clause was inserted permitting perpetual leaseholders to purchase their holdings between the seventh and twelfth year. Not satisfied with this success, speculators soon tired of waiting so long for the chance of buying up these leases; so, in 1887, the perpetual leaseholders were allowed to purchase, *at any time*, after fulfilling certain light conditions, and, consequently, during the following three years, a number of them were bought out.

Meanwhile, legislation, in another direction, was neutralising gradually the effect of purchasing clauses, and assisting limitation of areas. To those who held, in 1877, that the possession of very large tracts of agricultural land by the average<sup>2</sup> individual was injurious to the common weal, the Land Act of that year, taken in conjunction with contemporaneous legislation, appeared to have one fatal fault. There was no limit to the number of lots a rich speculator might purchase for cash, without one single guarantee to the State that good use would be made of the land. There was no limit to the number of carefully improved deferred-payment sections he might, in bad times, buy up from the poorer cultivators after the latter had obtained their Crown grants. Hence, without fresh legislation, tenure would, in a few years, have inevitably worked, in a vicious circle, round again to the old system. The remedy for this was to tax the land, and, in 1878, the first Land Tax Act was passed.

I can clearly remember the horror with which many well-meaning persons viewed the introduction of that comparatively mild measure. Giving to each holder exemption to the value of £500, it charged one halfpenny in the pound on all lands, valuing them at the capital value to sell for cash, after deducting all improvements. This Act

<sup>1</sup> Land Act, 1885, which superseded all previous Acts.

<sup>2</sup> "The best farm in the world," according to Mr. Harris, late M.P. for Poole, in his interesting article thus headed, is a large agricultural farm in New Zealand of 15,000 acres. He admits, however, that it is an exceptional instance, and that Mr. Grigg, of Longbeach, the owner, is not an average individual.

did not stand long. The time was hardly ripe for so great a change; therefore, after a year's trial, the well-meaning opponents succeeded in repealing it. The same retrograde party movement, which afterwards added a purchasing clause to the perpetual lease, introduced the principle of taxing all wealth alike, and the Property Assessment Act, 1879, took its place among the statutes. This Act, while still taxing land, mixed it up with houses and improvements, chairs, pictures, bolts of calico, and other fruits of labour, thus taking away its distinctive character, and, amid the consequent confusion of ideas, giving it another chance to steal back into its old irresponsible condition.

But such stemming of the advancing tide of public opinion was only temporary, and, with a wave more powerful than ever, after a lapse of twelve years, during the last three or four of which the speculators exercised over both native and Crown lands policy that powerful influence which I have described on pages 300 and 301, the Property Tax was repealed and the Land and Income Assessment Act, 1891, took its place and is still firmly fixed in our Statute-book. The first part of this important enactment may be considered the crowning point of our present system. It provides that on all land, less mortgages, certain improvements, and a £500 exemption, taxation shall be levied at rates to be fixed annually, and that the owners of blocks assessed at over £1999 shall be further taxed upon a sliding scale, commencing with an *additional* one-eighth of a penny in the pound for under £10,000 worth, and increasing to an *additional* 1½d. for £210,000 and upwards.<sup>1</sup>

Leaf after leaf I have now turned over the New Zealand Statute-books of the past fifty years. From the reckless speculation in unlimited blocks without conditions, to the perpetual lease system, limiting areas, insisting on good use of the land, and securing the unearned increment to the nation, in the one direction, and to the cumulative land-tax, adjusting the burden and responsibility to the size of the freehold, in the other, I have reviewed the gradual awakening of the conscience of the colony to the distinctive character of land.

And now the latest statute,<sup>2</sup> that of last year, takes us another step towards the acknowledged goal, the nationalisation of those lands which are still in the possession of, or, through purchase from the natives<sup>3</sup> and private individuals,<sup>4</sup> are to be ultimately brought

<sup>1</sup> Proposed to be slightly increased up to 2d. additional instead of 1½d., all improvements exempted. The New Zealand Land Bill, 1893.

<sup>2</sup> Land Act, 1892, repealing all former Acts, and now (1893) the Land Act of the colony.

<sup>3</sup> (1) The Native Land Purchase and Acquisition Bill. *vide* note <sup>1</sup>, p. 300, and the (2) Rating Act Amendment Bill, 1893, are intended to facilitate the settlement of native lands.

<sup>4</sup> The Lands for Settlement Act, 1892 gives to the Crown the following powers for the purpose of providing land for settlement under the Land Acts. . . . "The Governor from time to time, on behalf of her Majesty, may contract with any owner

into possession of the Crown. The freehold cash buyer, while permitted to secure at auction lots increased to 640 acres of first-class land under this Act, is discouraged by improvement, residential, and limitation clauses. The deferred-payment-selection system is abolished; the perpetual lease is altered into a simple lease for twenty-five years at a rental calculated at 5 per cent. on the capital value, with a purchasing-clause exercisable after ten years; and the gathering in of that portion of the unearned increment, which the State may need, from time to time, from all alike, is relegated more equitably to the graduated land-tax.<sup>1</sup> A new tenure—the 999 years' lease—subject to limitation of areas and covenants for residence and improvements similar to those already enumerated and without any purchasing clause, is created and encouraged. Rent thereon is fixed at the low rate of 4 per cent. per annum on the capital value at the time of granting; and it is evident that the object of the Act is to make this the favourite tenure, and, by gradually superseding all others, to introduce one uniform system throughout the whole country.

New Zealand.	The tendency of contemporaneous legislation is towards—			The following statistics are taken from the Census Report of 1881.	Population exclusive of Aborigines.	Occupied Holdings over 1 and under 640 acres.	Occupied Holdings over 10,000 acres.
	(In principle.)	(In action.)					
Period I.	Free trade in land . . .	{ Great facilities for acquiring large Freeholds. Many obstacles to <i>bona fide</i> settlement . . . . .	1840-1871	1871	266,000	Taken together of all sizes, 10,000	
Period II.	Responsibilities for cultivation	(a) Encouragement to cultivation in small Freeholds . . . . .	1872-1881	1881	500,910	28,417	305
		(b) Encouragement to cultivation in small Leaseholds . . . . .	1882-1890				
	Limitation of areas . . . . .	(c) Additional encouragement to cultivation in small Leaseholds and great discouragement to large Freeholds . . . . .	1891-1893	1891	626,658	40,197	337
				*		*	*

\* Further complete returns not available till next Census. The annual returns

By disbelievers in this system of Crown landlords it is urged that the 999 years' leaseholders, when they increase in numbers and occupy the colony, will take advantage of their power to seize a Parliamentary majority, and vote themselves freeholds! On the

of private land in any part of the colony for the purchase thereof in blocks of such area, as he shall think fit, and at any price that may be agreed on between the Governor and such owner on the recommendation of the Board." The Lands for Settlement Bill, 1898, proposes to grant power to take land compulsorily giving full compensation assessed as in the case of land taken for public works. At the date of writing (Sept. 7, 1898) this important bill has not been yet fully discussed by Parliament.

<sup>1</sup> And to kindred measures, such as the Betterment Tax Bill, 1898, which proposes to tax augmentation of values of lands through which new railway lines run.

other side, it is contended that as well might one expect a hypothetical North of Scotland Home Rule Parliament to legalise a return to the customs of ancient Highland gentlemen and vote to themselves the cattle of the Lowlander. As change the times so do the forms of temptation change. Where, as in England, possession of a large piece of untilled soil, besides securing pecuniary<sup>1</sup> exemptions and privileges, transforms, in the eyes of his neighbours, any stupid person into an admired kind of local god, to be bowed down to and considered of different clay from the common people, what ambitious man would not scheme for such a power-bestowing position? But in New Zealand ownership of a huge piece of ground is fast losing any such effect. On the contrary, owing to the ever-increasing facilities and exemptions given by the national landlord to its small tenants, and owing to the increased<sup>2</sup> cumulative taxation and responsibilities charged upon big freehold estates, and to the power over them given and about to be given by the Lands for Settlement Act,<sup>3</sup> these estates will, as far as can be foreseen, become

Sheep.	Horses.	Cattle.	Pigs.	Poultry.	Butter.	Cheese.	Potatoes.	Wheat.	Oats.
					lbs.	lbs.	Tons.	Bushels of 40 lbs.	Bushels of 40 lbs.
9,700,629	81,028	436,592	151,460	872,174	5,199,072	2,517,507	56,039	1,833,548	3,807,729
12,985,085	161,736	698,637	200,083	1,666,114	8,453,815	3,178,694	106,025	8,147,797	6,891,961
17,865,423	211,040	788,919	222,863	1,790,070	16,310,012	6,975,698	162,046	10,267,738	11,009,020

from various sources show that the general progression continues in 1892-93.

financially and socially unprofitable, and consequently unpopular as investments; ambition will flow into legitimate channels; and the great landowner will gradually disappear by reason of his not being in harmony with the spirit of the age.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Take, for instance, as a specimen, the death duties. About £60 is charged on succeeding to a landed estate valued at £10,000, while £300 is charged on succeeding to £10,000 in money."—Address by the Chairman of the Liberal Association, Glasgow.

<sup>2</sup> *Vide* foot-notes <sup>1</sup>, <sup>2</sup>, <sup>3</sup> (2), p. 305, and <sup>4</sup>, p. 306.

<sup>3</sup> See note <sup>4</sup>, pp. 305-6.

<sup>4</sup> "The cash sales are one-sixth of what they were ten years ago; while the perpetual lease and lease in perpetuity taken together have increased thirty-nine fold in the nine years since the first of these systems was introduced."—*Annual Report of New Zealand Lands Department, 1893*.

Perhaps the chief gainers by his disappearance will be the trading classes, who, if one may judge from the attitude of their Chambers of Commerce, now keep coldly aloof. The large sum of money at present locked up in the purchase of freehold land, without adding, as compared with leasehold, one blade of grass or grain of corn, will then be set free.<sup>1</sup> And where can it be invested? A small portion may be absorbed on mortgage by the increased stationary improvements—the farm buildings, fences, and drains of his successors, the Crown tenants—but the bulk must, like ambition, flow into the legitimate channels of trade. Through every vein commercial enterprise will feel the electric flow of ambition and capital. Where one steamer leaves our ports, seeking fresh markets for our produce, there will be five; mechanical inventions and chemical discoveries will be multiplied; manufactures will thrive; underground there will be keener search for minerals; and more of virgin gold found will spread over all its peculiar gift of appreciated prices.

That the results of our New Zealand land laws will be permanently beneficial to all classes time alone can prove. Meanwhile, the preceding table will show that small holdings are multiplying and large ones are almost stationary; and that, simultaneously, production thereon is progressing by leaps and bounds.

Such figures, while undoubtedly proving the increase and diffusion of wealth, strengthen also the assertion that responsibilities for cultivation have stimulated production, and limitation of areas has dotted New Zealand with happy homes.

But far more convincing than figures is the cultivator himself as we see him throughout the length and breadth of the land. Comparatively life-enjoying, intelligent, self-dependent, he is as unlike to the thrifty French peasant-proprietor who spends his winter evenings with his cows to save fuel, as he is to the Wiltshire hind who drags along, almost unbettered, the weary fate of his ancestor the villein, and his great ancestor the serf.

Our prosperity is not the outcome of improved land laws only. A noble superstructure of reform of many kinds is being gradually erected; but the foundations on which it all safely rests is New Zealand's slowly evolved and now comparatively sound system of land tenure.

EDWARD REEVES.

<sup>1</sup> The Government has recently acquired an estate of 84,222 acres for £200,220 under a provision of the Land and Income Assessment Act, 1891.

## COSMIC EMOTION.

COSMIC emotion is that sympathy with Nature in its largest sense which has always stirred the heart of man although varying in its intensity with his culture. When we are looking at a beautiful landscape or listening to beautiful music we are sometimes conscious of a deep and far-reaching feeling which the usual language of admiration cannot express. The soul seems to yearn to get back to the great heart of Nature and to feel the pulsation of its hidden life. Such phrases as "artistic taste" or "artistic feeling" may define well enough an eclectic appreciation of the varied forms of phenomena, but seem wholly inadequate to describe an emotion in which admiration and awe and the deeper feelings of the mind are stirred. I cannot account for the strength of this passion—for passion it is—on any other hypothesis than that of an essential affinity between the spirit of man and the life of Nature—the "one being," and the "all-being."

This movement of the mind towards the universal life has been well called by Mr. Henry Sedgwick "cosmic emotion," and Professor Clifford, adopting the term, has made it the subject of a most able but somewhat desultory discourse.

I wish to submit to those who take an interest in such subjects a very general analysis or description of this emotion without, however, following the lines of Professor Clifford, who dwells more on the ordered aspects of Nature as apprehended by an age of scientific culture. I desire to call attention to what there is in man subjectively which answers to what is external to him in the universe, and to show, if I can, that there is a relationship as real and beautiful as that of child and mother.

I do not, indeed, intend to be led into the toils of a discussion on the metaphysical relations of mind and matter—whether the mind is only a blank sheet of paper on which light and colour write their golden letters, and the facts of life photograph themselves as a scribe may write on a blank scroll; nor, on the other hand, do I wish to discuss whether "matter" itself may be philosophised away by the exaltation of mind which thus becomes absolute and at once the centre and circumference of the universe; or whether Kant hit the golden mean when he formulated what mind imposes upon Nature and what it receives from her.



I have no new light to throw upon the problem of the relation of the knowing mind to the known universe, over which so many aching heads have bent! Without presuming to explain it, I merely call attention to a correspondence between man and the great Nature of which he is a part, and yet from which he is, by the attribute of individual consciousness, distinct.

If such a relationship exist it can be no matter of wonder that the ancients projected the shadow of their own personality upon the external world and held the belief that the universe or the "*Κοσμος*" was animated with a soul, and to such an extent materialised the conception as to suggest that the parts and members of the human organism had their counterparts in its constitution.

The idea was a very old one, for the Thracian poet who lived before Homer sang of the sun and moon as the eyes of the animating Godhead, the earth and mountains as his body, the ether as his intellect, and the sky as his wings.

As time rolled on and the philosophers gazed inward at the wondrous world with the scenery of which they were so little familiar, the corresponding idea was suggested that as the universe contained a soul resembling that of man, so the mind of man contained intensively the universe—that is, a spiritual organisation corresponding in its faculties and propensions to the universe without him.

Dr. Martineau admirably sums up the characteristics of the early Greek schools in this respect. "With all their mutual contradictions," he says, "they invariably assume that in order to know a thing you must have a share of its nature in yourself, and that without such common element to mediate between it and you, the reciprocal dissimilarity keeps you hopelessly estranged. According to this assumption, if man is to know the universe spread around him, he must be similarly composed; its two factors must extend to him and give him a double sympathy, answering face to face, and exchanging looks of recognition now with the inner ground, now with the outer appearance of the world. He was accordingly conceived of as the compendium, as he was the finished product, of the universe."

This idea received still more definite exposition by a somewhat grotesque thinker of the sixteenth century. The universe was the macrocosm, or great universe, and man the microcosm, or miniature universe—the one in exact correspondence with the other.

Without adopting a definite theory which must always remain a speculation, I propose to bring under three or four heads some aspects of the "correspondence" which appears to have given rise to it.

I. There appears to be in the mind a sense or emotion, if not a perfect concept, which answers to "infinite space" and "infinite time."

Before the time of Plato there was a citizen of Miletus who con

structed, it is said, the first globe and map of the earth; but when the globe was finished he seemed to be oppressed with the inquiry where the great world, of which it was a copy, hung. Pondering this problem he, according to Laertius, gave utterance to the remarkable idea that the primary element of all things was the "infinite"; "giving no exact definition," says his biographer, "as to whether he meant air or water, or anything else."

The sage of Miletus did not stay, apparently, to reconcile his discovery to the difficulty which has been pressed by modern metaphysicians. The reader will remember the puzzle.

The idea of the infinite, it is said, involves a contradiction in terms.

It introduces a duality fatal to the concept. The conceiving mind separates itself from "the infinity" in the very process of conception, and thus virtually cancels it. What we call the infinite, it is said in effect, is after all only a series of finites lost in a fog.

I am not now concerned with the puzzle or the contradiction. The home of man, this old world, hangs in infinite space, and it is part of his heritage, and his alone, to realise the wonderful environment. Beyond the old grey stone beyond the mountain-tops, behind the homestead and the harvest-field, are the boundless spaces no eye can pierce, no line can fathom; and somehow, never mind how, we feel that they are boundless. Reason, if it cannot formulate a syllogism with the infinite as a conclusion, supports the "feeling." For it asks, if there be a boundary beyond space, what is beyond that? If it cannot fully grasp the boundless, it cannot think a boundary.

"See ever so far, there is limitless space beyond that;  
Count ever so much, there is limitless time around that."<sup>1</sup>

Reiman, followed by Professor Clifford, contends that the question, "Has space a boundary?" involves a contradiction in terms, and is therefore unmeaning; but the inquiry, "Does space contain a finite number of cubic miles or an infinite number?" is a perfectly reasonable question, which remains to be answered by experiment.

With the utmost respect, however, for these great names, I cannot see how the dilemma can be escaped by this way of putting it. The "experiment" can only be conceived, never tried, and in the conception of the experiment the cubic miles come to an end, or do not; if they do, what is outside the last mile?

I am aware of an old contention that the sense of the infinite in space and time is, after all, only a sense of the "indefinite," and the word only receives its full and legitimate satisfaction in the perfection of those moral and spiritual attributes of eternal being in which the soul finds its true home and resting-place; the sum of

those "universals" which are at the foundation of the higher conceptions, as well as the source of the noblest inspiration in man. I make some reference to this aspect of the question later on; it must suffice here to say that nothing is gained, but everything is lost, by exalting one aspect of the "infinite" to the exclusion of another.

I hold the term "indefinite" is wholly inadequate as a definition of that boundlessness in time and space which appears to be the initial revelation of the "infinite," on which all others repose, and which gives its fulness to all the attributes of "being" and the perceptions of sense. At the confluence of the sense of "immensity" and "eternity" there is, so to speak, an "atmosphere which expands and modifies all the presentations of sense."

I need not dwell on the corresponding emotion stirred by the contemplation of eternal time. Beyond the great epochs which crowd the years is an infinite margin from which they emerge and which gives to them their profound significance as they pass into the boundless realm of human thought. Schopenhauer has with great ingenuity catalogued the analogues of time and space which, says Professor Bowen, from whose translation I quote, "show the curious symmetry which exists between our notions of them." Here are a few of the most striking: "Time has no beginning and no end, but every beginning and end are in time." "Space has no limits or boundaries, but all limits are in space." Rhythm is only in time, "symmetry" in space. Time is everywhere present; every part of time exists simultaneously in every part of space. Space is eternal! every part of it exists through all time. "Now," the present moment of time, is without duration. The mathematical *point* is without extension. "Time" makes arithmetic possible, "space" makes geometry possible. "And all these," says Schopenhauer, after enumerating fifty-six analogues or correspondences, "are imprinted in ineffaceable characters on the secret tablets of the mind." Can they cease, then, to excite a corresponding emotion in the conscious brain, as the never-ending vista from "everlasting to everlasting" is "dimly realised"?

It does not come within the scope of my paper to inquire where this emotion, having its home in "the infinite," comes from, whether it is but part of a relation between man and an eternal Being, whose image and superscription he bears; nor when and how it came into existence. I need not inquire for my present purpose whether Mr. Wallace is right in claiming for man's intellectual and moral life an origin altogether distinct from the physical evolution, which he accepts in common with the great naturalists of the time; or whether Mr. Darwin and Mr. Romanes are right in affirming that the faculty of speech and the intellectual powers have had an evolution corresponding to the physical—an evolution, in fact, of the whole being, ever expanding with a widening environment, until man is taken

from the dust from which he sprang, beyond the stars into the "infinite" itself.

The environment of the beast of the field, that at least of which he appears conscious, is limited by the fence which stops his way, or at least by a narrow field of vision, in the same way with the child with half-developed faculties; but when the "percept" is changed into the "concept," by whatever process, the whole universe becomes the possession of the thinking man, and as his culture advances a mysterious but real correspondence is established between the totality of Nature and himself.

And this sense of the infinite in space and time, of the boundless and the eternal, is the crown and glory of man and supplies the inspiration of his higher pursuits—giving to art and religion their sure foundation, and to all material objects their setting of immortal beauty.

It is this outgoing of the mind which accounts for those half-mystic views of the higher nature of man which, whatever be their precise physiological value, awake an answering chord. "All goes to show," says Emerson, "that the spirit in man is not an organ, is not a function like the power of memory, of calculation, of comparison, but uses these as hands and feet; is not a faculty, but a light; is not the intellect and the will, but the master of the intellect and the will; is the background of our being, in which they lie; an immensity, not entirely possessed and that cannot be possessed. From within and from beyond a light shines through us upon all things, and makes us aware that we are nothing, but the light is all!"

Within man is not the mere shadow, but, in a way, the substance of the boundless with all it holds, and therefore all being *is his home*; and as he takes up his heritage, all that is garnered within him seems environed with an infinite life as worlds are environed by infinite space.

For, to reverse the illustration, infinite space is not a void, it is filled with innumerable constellations. So the infinite in which man "lives, moves, and has his being," is not a mighty void, but is crowded with beautiful forms which are what they are because of their infinite setting.

If the evolution theory be true, man has risen step by step through countless ages, his organisation gradually perfecting itself, and his environment gradually expanding until—the same primal forces working within and without—he possesses the universe itself.

The cosmic emotion I am endeavouring to expound does not depend upon the truth or otherwise of evolution, nor does it for a moment exclude the conception of an eternal Being with other and more intimate relations with man, which I have purposely kept out of sight.

If man came as he is, perfectly endowed physically and intellectually, from the hands of a Creator, the "emotion" may be part of that "image and superscription" of the Eternal One which stamps man as being the heir of all things. Even as a small mirror may reflect the infinite heavens and the glory of a risen sun which fills it with light, so the soul of man may reflect not only the universe into which he was born, but the image of the Eternal, who is the "all in all." Ay, and if the mirror be broken and blurred, even in one small fragment may still be seen some reflection of the eternal life and the eternal love.

"Only that which made us,  
 Meant us to be mightier by-and-by;  
 Set the sphere of all the boundless heavens  
 Within the human eye;  
 Sent the shadow of himself, the boundless,  
 Through the human soul;  
 Boundless inward in the atom,  
 Boundless outward in the whole."

The "by-and-by" of the poet may fit in with a progressive evolution from an initial form of life and force, or it may refer only to the future expansion of being in a world we must die to see.

II. There is a sense or emotion of beauty in man which responds to the beauty of the universe.

Indeed, beauty is not a thing apart from the infinite, but one of the aspects under which it is apprehended, for the infinite, as we have seen, is the "all perfect" in all its expressions. "Of beauty, indeed, you may be constrained to say, lo here! or lo there! You cannot say, here it is! but here it is not! It is neither ponderable nor measurable. 'It is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.' And yet it is always changing, shifting, and showing you a fresh face. It is endlessly stable and endlessly fertile."<sup>1</sup>

I venture to maintain that the colour and glory of life and form, nay, all the delicate pencillings of Nature, are, so to speak, in miniature in the emotional life with the infinite background I have been describing.

Hence the instant recognition of beauty flashing in upon the spirit more swiftly than a ray of light, hence the fulness of the emotion, great and responsive as the love of child for mother. The spirit finds its affinity in the beauty of Nature going home to the eternal life that gave it birth.

Who cannot remember times when the senses were baptized with the beauty of the world—summer mornings when the stillness and beauty of the hour crept like a dream of peace into the soul? At such times there is a strange mingling with Nature that surely

<sup>1</sup> Lucas Malet.

tells of a near relationship. "That life and beauty," says the beholder, "are mine and are part of me."

I should be sorry indeed to maintain that man is the only being with a sense of the beautiful. To the extent of a realised environment, animal life seems to have a certain enjoyment of light and natural decoration. Isaac Taylor has a striking chapter on the "breadth of the world of mind," in which he remarks, "We may think ourselves free to entertain the tranquillising belief that the beauty of the visible world is beauty of which there is a perpetual fruition in the consciousness of all that live; some perhaps in a low degree, but some to such an extent as well to justify what we might call the lavish ornamentation of the world of organised beings."

In justification of his view, the writer gives us a vivid picture of the splendours of tropical life on the banks of the Amazon, where the foot of man has hardly trod. "If there be no enjoyment of beauty by the lower animals, even to the tiny insects which murmur their songs into the summer air, then to what end," he asks, "is all this embellishment? Why so much wearing of plumes? Why are the colours of the rainbow sprinkled and spotted and figured upon these mantles and coiffures? Why is each guild so sumptuously emblazoned with the symbols of its ancestral glories?" These are questions which force themselves upon the contemplative man who paces his garden on a summer morning, and they admit surely of more than a conjectural answer.

As one amongst several minor points of resemblance between Nature and man, I may notice the curious but suggestive analogue between the moods of both. Sunshine and shadow chase each other over the face of Nature as on the surface of the emotions. Stormy and fair weather are experienced by both.

Frederick Robertson tells how he exclaimed, after a heavy thunderstorm, "All that was in me"! He might have said the same of a calm sunny time. The deep peace of Nature has its blessed analogue in human feeling. The sea with its restless movement mirrors perhaps more than anything else the varying moods of man, now calm as a sleeping child, now wild and restless as the storm-tossed spirits of the "Inferno." Not only the ebb and flow of feeling, but the stages of life from birth to death have also their analogues in Nature. Both are subject to what the philosophers call "periodicity." The breaking of the day and its close, the procession of the seasons, have their counterpart in human experience and feeling.

What gives to George Herbert's verse its pensive charm—

"Sweet day, so cool, so calm, so bright!  
The bridal of the earth and sky;  
The dew must weep thy fall to-night,  
For thou must die!"

but the unconscious sense of resemblance between the day of Nature and the day of life.

The words and the literature of every tongue tell of the emotional association of springtide with youth, summer with manhood, autumn and winter with declining years and death. So the two great stories unfold themselves side by side, of the generations of men and the ordered changes of Nature, and touch each other with magic; conscious sympathy on the one side, who shall say with none on the other?

III. Cosmic emotion is stirred by the ordered arrangement of the universe.

Indeed, this is the primary signification of the "Κοσμος." It is the universe under the dominion of law—all its parts as organised and working to an end, as opposed to the "indigesta moles" of chaos, and the phrase "cosmic emotion" has been mainly applied to this aspect of it.

It seemed to me, however, that within the "order" is the "infinity," which is the chief home and resting-place of the emotions, and which cannot be said to be organised, although on its bosom ordered worlds move and shine.

Moreover, beauty and harmony seemed attributes of the "totality." Therefore I have not only applied the term to the "sum of things," but have ventured to point out such analogues as seemed possible to illustrate its scope.

It may seem that the "order of the universe" is more the subject of intellectual apprehension than feeling; indeed, that the discovery and exposition of the reign of law is a hard, dry, intellectual exercise, in no way feeding, but rather checking, emotional life. But this is surely an error.

In a beautiful and well-known passage, Kant, as translated by Sir W. Hamilton, says: "Two things there are which, the oftener and the more steadfastly we consider them, fill the mind with an ever new and ever rising admiration and awe. The starry heavens above and the moral law within."

I quote Sir W. Hamilton's translation rather than Lord Houghton's, as given by Professor Clifford, because the latter misses the scope of the saying and the exposition of it by Kant himself, as does also the brief comment on it by Professor Clifford.

Within the mind there is a ceaseless movement of thought following a law of its own, and often of thought on fire; without is the ceaseless and rhythmic movement of all being—a movement set to larger, vaster measures, but asserting a kinship with the instinct of causation and order within the mind.

By ordered thought the secrets of the universal order have been discovered. It would be strange indeed if there were no emotional relation between the two.

The stars are beautiful in themselves set in the darkness, but when associated in the mind with their eternal march through the heavens, they stir more faculties and inspire deeper wonder and awe.

It would be altogether wrong to say that an artist must necessarily be a geometrician, and that he who admires the building up of all the wonderful fabric of Nature with forces so delicately poised that the dew is held upon the leaf and the bloom upon the flower, while the earth is moving fast enough to rend the hardest rocks, must understand the laws of stresses and strains; yet who can say that the primal axioms by which curvature and linear direction are measured are not present potentially in the enthusiastic feeling by which they are regarded by naturalists and philosophers?

Pythagoras, the father and founder of Greek philosophy, expounds the relation of man to the "Κοσμος" with marvellous minuteness. According to Laetius, his principle involved the perfect proportion of all the active principles and emotions of the spirit of man, harmonious with and rhythmic to the universal order, and he found in harmony, interpreted by music, one of the main conduits between the inner and the outer world. He, indeed, is said to have first employed the word "Κοσμος" in its large sense, and to have first expounded the corresponding concept.

If I dare to analyse the emotion with which the mind regards organic life and the organised universe, I should say it was mainly stirred by four elements—*i.e.* law, life, freedom, purpose.

Of the first I have said enough for my purpose. The second needs hardly any exposition. The life that is pulsing within us is ever moving towards the life universal, weaving its thousand forms of beauty, building up new structure and fabric every hour, and seems to say to it: "I am thine; thou art part of me, and I of thee. Thou art my mother, sister, friend. From thee I came, to thee I must yield myself up."

John Ruskin says, in a chapter on "Vital Beauty": "It is a matter of easy demonstration that, setting the characters of typical beauty aside, the pleasure afforded by every organic form is in proportion to its appearance of healthy vital energy. In a rose-tree, setting aside all considerations of graduated flushings of colour and fair folding of line which its flowers share with the cloud and the snow-wreath, we find, in and through all this, signs pleasant and acceptable, as signs of *life* and strength."

And if with a mere fragment of life, how much more with the life working in all things and through all things? And if human life and all its affections and interests be included in the "Κοσμος," the tie that binds the individual and the universal is stronger still.

If I am to suggest the free action of the higher organic life as



kindling emotion, I must perforce include the great human story in the "Κοσμος," for, indeed, it is everywhere woven about it.

Professor Clifford quotes Kant's definition of freedom "as such a property of the will as enables living agents to originate events independently of foreign determining causes."

I do not propose to discuss this definition or the knotty problem of "free will" and necessity. Let it suffice to assume there is in human life a free play of the mind and emotions which differs from the eternal round of cause and sequence as we find it in Nature.

As we survey life, we feel it is the free blending of the "fixed" and the "free" in art and religion, and the unfolding of the great human story that excites the deeper and higher emotions; for within the man freedom and law are ever blending and ever asserting a relationship both with the free powers of humanity and the laws fixed, wise and merciful, daily doing their great and beautiful work in Nature.

"Freedom we call it, for holier  
Name of the soul there is none;  
Surelier it labours, if slower,  
Than the metres of star or of sun.  
Slower than life into breath,  
Surelier than time into death,  
It moves till its labours be done."

The recognition of freedom is therefore part of the great cosmic concept. So also surely is the recognition of purpose.

Everything seems working to an end—an end for itself and an end in relation to other elements, "individual" and "cosmic."

All the myriad forms of organic life are completed to a patterned scheme. "Forms of life sleeping in the seed," are developed into leaf and flower and fruit—each order after its kind, and all in infinitely complicated relations, working out a marvellous and progressive evolution.

New worlds are built in space from almost impalpable elements. So once launched on their way, each, we may assume, becomes the scene of similar developments.

Plato's doctrine of supra-mundane ideas is at once the recognition of this purpose in the life of Nature, and his way of accounting for it. The reflective mind was, according to him, evermore struggling into the sphere of ideas, and through ideas to the "supreme idea." Indeed, the idea of progress, "of working to an end," that shall be better than the beginnings and the far back initial forms, is found in almost every philosophy, as it is the root-principle of the modern naturalist. It is not merely "force" that we find in Nature, but force with direction working out a plan.

Herbert Spencer virtually applies this principle to the social organism, and Professor Clifford to the moral life. "Good action,"

he says, "has created the life of the world, and in so doing has purified itself as humanity."

"Good action" he defines in the general evolution as that which makes an organism more organic, or, in other words, more perfect, and he includes in it the corresponding action from within which we call "freedom." The two blended in one make a vast organic movement, ever forward. The progressive physical organisation, and the conscience and reason enlightened by the experience of the generations, are working out the gradual unfolding of all that is best and highest in man.

Let it be admitted, however, that to find the "good" other than as an ordinary abstraction, or as the result of the experience of what is fitting, or to find the golden bridge from the beautiful in Nature to what is good in life, or phenomena where the two are combined, is not an intellectual task that can be achieved by a general analogue between the growth of physical organisation and the bettering of conduct.

If the old doctrine of a moral sense as a distinct propension should prove untenable, where shall we find "good" in the "*Κοσμος*" as we find sunlight on the hills or colour in the rainbow? Surely, if anywhere, in the love of offspring—of mother and child—which is a vital force in the whole animal kingdom, and is as real a fact of Nature as birth or death.

It has its vagaries as all natural emotions have. Like the polar force, it has its local and deflecting attractions, disturbing, if not destroying, the main current; but it is as strong as the richest æsthetic emotion, and has far-reaching issues wherever life is. It broadens into love of family and race, and is at the root of the disciplined patriotism by which nations are made great, and why not of all the altruistic instincts?

It involves protection to weakness, service to the feeble and the suffering, and a passionate unselfishness which no self-interested action can utterly destroy. In fact, each new life born into the world in the entire animal kingdom is nurtured by a sacrificial love.

From the history of that love surely we might frame a moral code as orderly and beautiful as the laws which interpret the motion of sun and stars!

It is not a mere product of civilisation, but, like all other natural instincts, it has developed and become more complex as it has built itself into the generations.

If now we include in the "*Κοσμος*," not only the forces without and the free faculties and affections within, but the action of both upon humanity, in other words, the long story of human life, the life and death of the generations, with their sins and sufferings, and the miniature story in the single life, can we read, behind all, the

same purpose—the same “working to an end”—which we find in the flowering and fruitage of Nature and the movements of worlds; the same, only working by different methods—freedom itself being under the control of a still higher and more far-reaching law—sorrow and joy “working together in the meaning of all things”?

The problem is so vast, the issues so far-reaching, that as we stand with a dumb and awed wonder, while the whole panorama—partly with the measured beat of an eternal order, and partly with the infinite confusion of the sad human story—is unrolled before us, the reason seems as if it could do no more than report the eternal questions, “Why?” and “Whither?”

But I have heard of some one who, standing at the gateway of a vast Alpine gorge, cried out with a voice harsh and strident, and waiting for the echo, heard returned to him, not his own harsh tones, but strains of consoling and pathetic music. So after all we may hear an answer to our anxious questionings—we may not know from whence—which may be to us as the still small voice of an assured peace.

If we can only read the “purpose” however dimly behind the working of law and the experience of life, the foundation of the cosmic emotion I have been endeavouring to expound will be a simple and beautiful *trust*, clear shining amidst the shadows!

THOMAS EKINS FULLER.

## CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

### SCIENCE.

WE have received a large volume of *Indian Meteorological Memoirs*,<sup>1</sup> which may be recommended to the notice of meteorologists in this country as one that should not be overlooked. It deals with the more important cold weather storms which have occurred in India during the years 1876-1891. These storms occur during the prevalence of the north-east monsoon, especially in the cold months of December, January, and February, and are of considerable economic importance, since they influence the snowfall of the Himalayas, especially the western half, and give more or less general rain to Northern India, and so affect the character and value of the cold weather crops of wheat, &c., which are grown in that part of the peninsula. The discussion of the storms is a very thorough and complete one, and will certainly maintain, if it does not enhance, the high reputation of the Meteorological Department of India. Before the main purpose of the volume is proceeded with, we have an admirable account of some of the more important features of the meteorology of India during the cold weather months, in which is embodied such detailed information as is requisite for discussing the origin and characteristic features of the storms dealt with. This is clearly set forth in about thirty pages, and then the history and description of the storms is taken in hand. It would be a hopeless task to attempt anything like even an epitome of the multitude of carefully digested and well-arranged facts which are here brought together. It must suffice to say that the storms of each year are dealt with in chronological order, and every point in each which is of general or local importance is duly set forth and considered. It goes without saying that the descriptions include numerous tables which summarise the observations made at different stations during the continuance of the storms; but the reader will find that these elucidate rather than obscure the statements contained in the text. At the end of the special descriptions the most important features of the whole series of storms are presented in tabular form for each year, so that

<sup>1</sup> *Indian Meteorological Memoirs*, published under the direction of J. Elliot, M.A., vol. iv. part viii. An Account of the more important Cold Weather Storms in India during the Years 1876-1891. Calcutta: Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing, India. 1898.

while comparison is facilitated the facts become at once available for a general discussion of the whole. This discussion forms what may be said to be the third part of the volume, and seems to us to be, so far as the science of meteorology is concerned, one of the most important ever issued by the Department. It does not pretend to be either final or exhaustive, but as a contribution towards a better knowledge of the origin and characteristics of these storms it is unquestionably of great merit.

In a second *Memoir*<sup>1</sup> which has come to hand we have a further instalment of the discussion of the hourly observations recorded at various stations in India, which has been in course of publication for some time. The observations dealt with are those made at Dhubri and Roorkee with respect to the diurnal variation of the atmospheric conditions. The interest of the memoir suffers to some extent from the fact that it is only one of a series; but there can be no question of its importance, and when the discussion has covered the observations recorded at the whole of the twenty-five stations, this will perhaps be still more obvious. The atmospheric conditions which are considered are those which are now familiar to the readers of these memoirs and need not be recapitulated. They are discussed with all necessary detail and the results are set forth in a plain and straightforward manner, accompanied as usual with the tabulated summaries.

The *Monthly Weather Review*,<sup>2</sup> issued by the Indian Meteorological Department, still appears with regularity, and is now brought down to July, 1893. The three last *Reviews* are before us, those for June and July bearing the name of Mr. A. Pedler, the officiating reporter. Like those previously noticed in this place, they are excellent publications of their kind, and have an interest and value which are not confined to the students of Indian meteorology only.

Though not a scientific work in the strict sense of the word, we may mention in this connection that the *Report of the Administration of the Meteorological Department of the Government of India for 1892-93*<sup>3</sup> has been sent out, and is an exceptionally interesting one. In addition to the usual accounts of the working of the Department, which seems to be generally satisfactory, it contains a brief summary of the services rendered to India by the late Mr. Blandford, especially, but not exclusively, in the Meteorological Department, of which he was the organiser and the first director.

<sup>1</sup> *Indian Meteorological Memoirs*. Published under the direction of J. Elliot, M.A., vol. v. part iii. Containing the Discussion of Hourly Observations made at Dhubri and Roorkee. Calcutta: Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing, India. 1893.

<sup>2</sup> Government of India Meteorological Department. *Monthly Weather Review*, May, 1893. By John Elliot, M.A. Ditto, June and July, 1893. By A. Pedler, F.R.S., F.C.S. Calcutta: Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing, India. 1893.

<sup>3</sup> *Report on the Administration of the Meteorological Department of the Government of India in 1892-93*.

Mr. Blandford was undoubtedly one of those men who have deserved well of the country, and not the least valuable testimony to his great and unusual ability is the fact that since the formation of the Indian Meteorological Department, its expansion has been steady and continuous, and that on the lines which Mr. Blandford laid down in his original proposals.

Messrs. Methuen and Co.'s University Extension Series has received a useful addition by the publication of Mr. Dickson's volume on Meteorology.<sup>1</sup> Its aim is to give those who are unacquainted with the subject a knowledge of the elements of weather and climate and so lay the foundations for a scientific study of meteorology. The plan of the author is to start with the knowledge which every one possesses of the phenomena which constitute weather and climate, explaining the methods by which it may be purged of its errors, and the truth it contains arranged in scientific order. He does not aim at the treatment of the higher meteorological problems, which are becoming more and more dependent upon mathematical methods, and are beyond the requirements of those for whom this volume is intended. He seeks rather to give such information as will be applicable to practical purposes, even in the hands of those who do not profess to be meteorologists, while for those who may wish to use it in that way it will serve as an introduction to more advanced manuals on the subject. Thus the two first chapters present the reader with an excellent account of the fundamental facts and the fundamental principles of meteorology, which is so well put together that even old meteorologists may read and study it with profit. Then he is led on in succession to the study of cyclones, anti-cyclones, and weather forecasting, all of which are described and discussed with care, accuracy, and as much detail as the scope of the volume will allow. Meteorological instruments and observations are next considered, followed by the elements of climate, and finally we have a chapter on the application of meteorology to agriculture. We cannot enter into the details of these chapters, but they will be found good throughout. The last may be specially commended, as it is in agriculture that a knowledge of meteorology is of particular importance, and we could wish that the author's words on this branch of the subject were brought to the knowledge of every one in the country who is directly concerned with agriculture. Among other things he explains with great clearness the relation of soil to climate; the action of the weather in the formation of soils; the effects of rainfall upon a soil as determined by the surface-drainage, the vegetative covering, and the nature of the soil; the effects of climate upon the growth and development of plants; and the effects of vegetation on climate. In

<sup>1</sup> *University Extension Series, Meteorology. The Elements of Weather and Climate.* By H. N. Dickson, F.R.S.E., F.R. Met. Soc. London: Methuen & Co. 1893.

closing the volume we do so with the conviction that our appreciation of it has increased with its perusal, and with the hope that it will meet with the popularity it so richly deserves.

Dr. Bonavia's writings are usually characterised by originality and boldness, and his latest work, on *The Flora of the Assyrian Monuments and its Outcomes*,<sup>1</sup> is no exception. So far as we are aware, there is no similar work in the English language, and this alone will be sufficient to induce interested readers to give it a perusal. But, apart from this, those who have read the author's previous publications will turn to the book in order to see what results have followed his study of the Assyrian monuments from the botanical standpoint, and in what way his ingenuity has been applied in the explanation of the same. Whatever be the special attraction, however, readers will find it an interesting volume, even in those parts where scientific caution suggests that the author is going beyond what the evidence at present available will logically warrant. At the outset of the volume, where the author shows that some of the symbols on Assyrian monuments are to be interpreted as representations of the date-palm, the vine, the pomegranate, and the fig, he appears to be on tolerably safe ground and we see little or no reason for adverse criticism. But in the case of the banana we have some doubt, and, while recognising the ingenuity of his suggestions, would prefer more direct evidence in their favour than he seems to be in a position to adduce. Similar remarks may be made with respect to the symbol which Dr. Bonavia suggests may represent a slice of melon (*Cucumis melo*), a suggestion which does not seem to have much positive evidence in its favour. On the other hand, one can have little difficulty in accepting the author's views of the symbols which he interprets as pines and lilies, though doubt again arises with regard to those which he makes into a hawk-weed and the baobab.

Passing on to consider the sacred trees of the Assyrians, Dr. Bonavia expresses the belief that it was mainly the great usefulness of a tree which induced them to elevate it into a sacred object, although he allows that there was also a supernatural element in the process. Among such trees he includes the date-palm, the vine, the pomegranate, and fir, and, he adds, not improbably the oak. In this connection he enters into a long discussion as to the nature and the purpose of the cone-like fruit which is so conspicuous in one hand of the winged genii which are so often met with on Assyrian monuments. At one time he was inclined to regard it as a fingered citron such as are found in India, but subsequently this interpretation was abandoned. In doing so, however, he was unable to accept Dr. Tylor's theory that the cone-fruit is the male inflorescence of

<sup>1</sup> *The Flora of the Assyrian Monuments and its Outcomes.* By E. Bonavia, M.D. London: Archibald Constable & Co. 1894.

the date, and now puts forward the view that it represents a fir-cone which was used as an "*aspergillum*" for sprinkling holy water. The discussion is a long one, and of considerable interest; but, as might be expected, the results are not very decisive.

In the next chapter we have another long discussion on the extent to which the lotus has supplied the motive in ancient decorative art, in which the author severely criticises Mr. Goodyear for making it the sole origin of all such decorations, and maintains that the date-tree and others had a share in the origin of architectural and decorative embellishments. In the next two chapters, on "The Evil Eye" and "The Trident," the origin of other monumental symbols is considered in an equally characteristic manner, and then we have a series of notes on some Assyrian cylinders or seals, in which an attempt is made to interpret some of the mysterious symbols they exhibit. These last are particularly suggestive, though they do not pretend to furnish a complete analysis of these perplexing objects, nor to disentangle the maze of myths that have become associated with them. Finally, the author summarises in a brief but pointed manner the conclusions at which he has arrived, and so concludes a volume which, in spite of some defects, due largely to the present state of knowledge, will be found a useful introduction to the study of Assyrian monuments from the botanical point of view.

It does not need a very prolonged examination of this instalment of *The Royal Natural History*<sup>1</sup> to be assured that in it we have the commencement of a work which promises to be one of the best of its kind ever published in this country. At any rate, in the part before us, the author and the publishers have combined their efforts to produce a volume which will be intensely acceptable to all readers, and their name is legion, who take an interest in the facts and teachings of natural history. The first requisite of a work of this kind is obviously an abundance of illustrations, which are neither inartistic on the one hand nor exaggerated on the other, and which impress the reader with a clear and accurate conception of the form and natural appearance of the objects they represent. This has been fully recognised and acted upon in a most liberal spirit, with the result that the illustrations of this volume may be compared without detriment with those of much more elaborate and pretentious productions. In all, it contains four coloured plates, six page-plates, and over one hundred engravings intercalated in the text, which falls short of three hundred pages. A few of these last, however, like those showing the hands and feet of apes and monkeys, and young oranges and gibbons, are multiple in character, so that the actual number is even higher than this. In making the selection,

<sup>1</sup> *The Royal Natural History*. Edited by Richard Lydekker, B.A., F.G.S., F.Z.S., &c. With Preface by P. L. Sclater, M.A., Ph.D., F.R.S. Vol. I. Section I. London and New York: Frederick Warne & Co. 1894.



the editor has been exceedingly happy, as there is scarcely a single one which does not give point to some portion of the text, and which is not calculated to gratify popular taste and satisfy scientific requirements. As might be expected, they have been obtained from various sources, among which may be mentioned the latest edition of Brehm's *Tierleben*, the publications of the Zoological Society of London, and of Messrs. John Murray, Macmillan, Southwell, and Rowland Ward. An admirable feature of the engravings is that they are on a larger scale than those of many similar works, and this, added to their fidelity to nature, their boldness, finish, and other artistic qualities, greatly enhance their value as an integral part of the work.

Turning to the text, the editor's name is of itself a sufficient guarantee that it does not fall behind the requirements of the times, nor fail to present the results of recent investigations in an appropriate and convenient form. But it is due to him to say that the descriptions of the various animals dealt with are unusually clear and readable; the information given is well adapted to meet the wants of various classes of readers; and the point of view adopted throughout is the one best calculated to quicken the reader's interest in the subject and stimulate his observing faculties. The style, too, is invariably bright, not to say sparkling, and many of the sections have all the fascination of a really good novel. This, combined with the fine pictures, make the book a specially suitable one for intelligent youths of both sexes, among whom we hope it will have a wide circulation. As is indicated on the title-page, the volume before us is only the first half of Volume I., and we gather from the preface, which has been contributed by Mr. P. L. Sclater, the well-known secretary of the Zoological Society, that when completed the entire work is to consist of six volumes, of which two and a half are to be devoted to the Mammals. Taking the present issue as a sample of the breadth and fulness of the treatment to be adopted throughout, this will scarcely be too much for so comprehensive and important a group. Here the story of the Primates—apes, monkeys, and lemurs—and that of the Cheiroptera or Bats are alone dealt with and occupy nearly three hundred pages. The man-like apes of course come first, then the Old World monkeys and baboons, which fill two chapters, and after these the American monkeys, the marmosets, the lemurs, the tarsier, and the aye-aye. In each case the extinct forms, if such are known, are dealt with as well as the living ones, and the relations of the present to the past distribution of allied forms are brought under the notice of the reader. Naturally these matters are not dwelt upon at any great length, but what is said is put clearly and tersely, and the student of this particular branch of the subject will be the first to admit that his wants have not been inadequately supplied.

The two chapters on the Bats will be found to contain much interesting information relating to their flight, structure, migration, and distribution, in addition to the detailed descriptions of the various groups. In considering their affinities and origin, it is pointed out that they are distinguished from all other mammals by the power of true flight, and that among the hosts of fossil animals now known there are none which in any way connect bats with other mammals. In spite of this the author shows that naturalists still believe that bats have taken origin from mammals of ordinary terrestrial habits, and refers to the Insectivora as the group from whose ancestral forms they were probably derived. Thus bats are regarded as more or less specially modified Insectivores, and as these last were connected with some of the extinct lemurs, zoologists are now inclined to place them and the bats immediately after the Primates. This will account for the arrangement here followed, which is not that adopted in other works of a similar character.

Without going further, we think enough has been said to show that the work here begun promises to be worthy of the highest confidence at all points, and as such we hope that the following volumes will not be long in making their appearance.

## PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

PROFESSOR FLINT tells us that nearly twenty years ago he published a volume in which he endeavoured to describe and criticise the attempts made by French and German writers to comprehend and explain the history of mankind from a philosophical point of view. The volume has been out of print for many years, and he has only recently been able to return to this subject. His hope now is to complete a comprehensive history of this phase of intellectual development in France, Germany, Italy and England. The first volume, *Historical Philosophy in France and French Belgium and Switzerland*,<sup>1</sup> is now before us; and if the writer is able to fulfil the remainder of his task in the fashion in which it is commenced in the present volume he will have produced a work of sterling interest and importance. In an introduction of nearly two hundred pages Professor Flint discusses the general question, and reviews various methods of treating history in a masterly manner, and shows how, from beginning as mere narratives and chronicles, written

<sup>1</sup> *History of the Philosophy of History.* By Robert Flint. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1893.

history has developed into a more comprehensive view of the succession of human events. We are cautioned, however, to bear in mind the distinction between written history and real history, that is, the current of events itself. Our author contends that there is a science of history, which it seems to us must be admitted—though Mr. Goldwin Smith does not admit it—before there can be a philosophy of history; that there is causality as well as connection and the science and philosophy of history are inseparable. Able as the introduction is it interests us far less than the detailed account of historical writers and theories in France; in this respect, the particular purpose of the author apart, we have a most intelligent presentation not only of the progress of historical writing but of intellectual development in that country; all the greatest French thinkers from Bodin to Renouvier are passed in review, and not only their works but their influence estimated with a judicial impartiality and breadth which is as instructive as it is entertaining. The work is evidently the production of a master mind, which never loses its grasp of the subject in spite of the enormous mass of details with which it has to deal. The work is in three principal divisions, corresponding to the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. Bossuet is the chief illustration of the seventeenth-century method, which was religious but uncritical. The eighteenth century supplies the most important and interesting material in the labour and influence of Montesquieu, Turgot, Voltaire, Rousseau, and Condorcet. The nineteenth century, though in our opinion less fertile in results than the eighteenth, is treated at much greater length, and the principal subdivisions are: "The Ultramontanist and Liberal Catholic Schools"—De Maistre, De Bonald, and De Lamennais; "The Socialistic Schools"—St. Simon, Buchez, and L. Blanc; "The Democratic Historical School"—Michelet and Quinet; and finally "Positivism and the Critical School." A short chapter, of very slight importance, deals with Belgium and Switzerland.

Mr. Rutherford's translation of Dr. Wilhelm Moeller's *History of the Christian Church*.<sup>2</sup> places a very useful work within the reach of English readers. The information contained in it is really vast, and though it is largely, apparently, a compilation, it may be relied upon for general accuracy. The first volume necessarily is principally concerned with the internal development of the Church, and the various phases of early theology are presented with striking clearness considering the quantity of material to be dealt with, and the obscurity of many of the topics. Less space than might have been expected is devoted to the origin of Christianity and the Church,

<sup>2</sup> *History of the Christian Church*. Vol. I., "A.D. 1-800;" Vol. II., "The Middle Ages." By the late Dr. Wilhelm Moeller. Translated from the German by Andrew London; Swan Sonnenschein & Co. New York: Macmillan & Co. 1892-93.

and this leaves the impression upon the reader that there is very little connection between the alleged historical cause of Christianity and the historic Church itself. Upon second thoughts we conclude that this impression is correct, and probably unconsciously influenced the author, who would have had some difficulty in showing the relation between the Gospels and the Church. Again, Dr. Moeller makes us feel how much the history of the theology of the Church is the history of heresies, and that triumphant orthodoxy is after all only one heresy which has accidentally managed to survive and is likely to be vanquished in its turn. In this volume we also get a good account of the rise and spread of monasticism as well as of the development of the *Cultus*, or external forms of worship, of the Church.

The second volume, treating of the Church of the Middle Ages, is of more varied interest, as the Church covers a so much greater field, and we find the Church has become the Churches, Eastern and Western, and this latter is really far from a unity. Theology occupies a more subordinate place and ecclesiastical affairs a more important one. It is evident that the treatment of such an immense subject in a single volume can result in what is at best but a book of reference, and an attempt to read it is simply bewildering; but taking separate topics we find, notwithstanding the inevitable condensation, the information given is wonderfully full as well as precise. The author evidently regarded his subject from a liberal rather than an ecclesiastical point of view, and his sympathies are on the side of practical piety. No undue prominence is given to the corruptions of the Church, and the work concludes abruptly without any attempt on the part of the author to philosophise, or to pass any judgment upon the strange and apparently incoherent and heterogeneous phenomena which collectively go by the name of the Christian Church.

*The Way, the Truth, and the Life*,<sup>1</sup> by the late Dr. Hort, is stated to have been the Hulsean Lectures for 1871. Mr. Dunelm, in a prefatory note, explains how it is that they are now first published; some parts of the lectures were never even revised by the author. Notwithstanding the high praise bestowed upon these lectures by the editor, we must confess that, in spite of their literary merits, they are almost unintelligible to us. They are based, as may be gathered from the title, upon the very unsatisfactory foundation of the fourth Gospel, and an air of unreality seems to pervade the discourses. The author himself says: "These lectures abound, I cannot but fear, in an indefiniteness which is pure loss, the results of defects in my own thought and speech." When he is not vague he is sometimes anything but right. For instance, turn-

<sup>1</sup> *The Way, the Truth, and the Life.* By Fenton John Anthony Hort, D.D. Cambridge and London: Macmillan & Co. 1893.

ing to this book immediately after the *History of the Church* noticed above, what can possibly seem less accurate than the following sentence: "In the new world of Christianity no truth except theological truth was clearly ascertained." We were under the impression that it took some centuries for the Church to settle what is theological truth, and opinions upon it are still divided.

M. Charpillet's book on the *Errors of Léon XIII.*<sup>1</sup> has nothing to do with theology, but with the views of the Pope on social questions. The writer contends that the Pope is only infallible in religious matters, but that on all other subjects his opinions are of no more value than those of ordinary men. The Pope thought fit in the encyclical referred to by M. Charpillet to condemn Socialism generally. The writer admits that if the Pope had confined himself to condemning certain violent theories promulgated by some Socialists he would have agreed with him; but he disputes the proposition that personal property is a "natural right," and defends the tendency towards "collectivism" as a natural and just movement towards a desirable state of equality. We agree with the author in his disparagement of the Pope's admiration for the social order which existed before the Revolution, and his exposure of the fallacy that once upon a time Christian civilisation reached a perfection which it has since lost, but his general reasoning does not convince us.

A lively declamatory pamphlet<sup>2</sup> comes from the same publishers, in which the writer resents the interference of the Pope in French politics, and demands the complete separation of Church and State." "Pourquoi le Pape n'est il pas resté tranquille?"

Léon XIII. is evidently becoming unpopular in France, for another pamphlet, a *Lettre à un Evêque*, by a Catholic, expresses the grief of a Catholic at the Pope's recognition of the Republic. "J'ai vécu et je mourrai Catholique et Royaliste. . . . J'ai connu quelques Républicains estimables, mais je les compterais sur les doigts." Paris: A. Savine.

*Skeleton Sermons* for the Sundays and holidays in the year are intended for the use of Roman Catholic preachers. John B. Bagshawe, D.D. London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. 1894.

We can heartily recommend the reprint of the *Inquiry Concerning the Human Understanding*, and the *Inquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*,<sup>3</sup> just published by the Clarendon Press, with an excellent introduction by Mr. L. A. Selby-Bigge, of Oxford.

<sup>1</sup> *Erreurs de Léon XIII. dans l'Encyclique, "De Conditione Opificum."* By Charles Charpillet. Paris: Albert Savine.

<sup>2</sup> *La Politique de Léon XIII. et les Intérêts Catholiques.* Par J. de B. . . . Paris: Albert Savine, 1894.

<sup>3</sup> *An Inquiry Concerning the Human Understanding, and An Inquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals.* Edited by L. A. Selby-Bigge, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1894.

SOCIOLOGY, POLITICS, VOYAGES AND TRAVELS.

WE have had occasion before to begin this section under protest with a cookery book. We will not repeat our lament. No doubt if publishers insist on sending us cookery books we shall gradually get to believe them the foundations of sociology. But here we have more than a cookery book, and the very daintiest of cookery books. *La vie à table*<sup>1</sup> deals with theory and practice, with memoirs of gormandising and discussions as to proprieties, with breakfast and dinner, with lunch and "le five o'clock"! with women who dine and men who gorge, with table decorations and table monstrosities—indeed, on what does it not touch? The illustrations are good, the humour is excellent; the book is certain to delight many. "*La vie à table est une douce vie, mais de combien de conditions de bien-être elle se compose!*"

*Social Peace*<sup>2</sup> is an abridged translation of Dr. von Schulze-Gaevernitz' *Zum Sozialen Frieden*. It is a book which we have much pleasure in recommending to the English reader: it will give him a foreigner's view of the industrial history of our country during the past century; the tone is friendly, even optimistic; and the conclusions, though in line with Socialism, are so moderately stated that they almost disarm criticism. The narrative is evidently the work of a careful observer and industrious student. But it is well to remember that the question is not all one of statistics and nice calculations of results. There are passages in the history of England's industrial revolution, of the factory legislation and the struggle for free imports that we can never read without a quicker pulsation of the heart—without mingled indignation and remorse. They will be brought to mind by the reading of *Social Peace*.

"In describing England," says Herr Doctor, "as on the road to social peace, I mean that England is sure of a peaceful solution of her social difficulties and conflicts. No Englishman doubts it, be he on the Right or the Left, employer or employed. Nowhere do we meet the social pessimism so familiar in Germany, nowhere the belief among the lower classes that salvation can only come through the overthrow and destruction of the existing order."

Dr. Schulze-Gaevernitz' opinion of us is certainly complimentary, and not altogether, we fear, deserved. But it points the right road to us, and we may strive to follow it. We will quote a passage from the "conclusions" which suggests and deserves careful consideration:

<sup>1</sup> *La vie à table à la fin de XIX<sup>e</sup> Siècle*. Par Chatillon-Flessis. Paris: Librairie de Firmin, Didot et Cie. 1894.

<sup>2</sup> *Social Peace: A Study of the Trade Union Movement in England*. By Dr. G. von Schulze-Gaevernitz. Translated by C. M. Wicksteed, and edited by Graham Wallas. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1893.

"Its [*i.e.* socialism's] advantage over the scheme of thought which it supplanted consists in its assertions that the individual should subordinate alike his possessions and his natural gifts to the community, that the common interests must take precedence of those of the individual. But the socialistic and individualistic points of view are reconciled in the truly 'social' conceptions. It accepts without reserve the socialistic thesis that the individual exists for the sake of the community, &c."

A word is due to Miss Wicksteed's pains in translating a lengthy, if interesting, book.

*Civic Rights and Duties*<sup>1</sup> is a handbook for the English citizen, especially the one uneducated in the matters which pertain to his citizenship. It gives in a few words a good sketch of the way in which the British Empire is governed, and tells of all the forms and signs of administration. If in details we find it sometimes incorrect, we are not much surprised. It is just a little handy book.

If we looked at the title only of chapter iv. of the Second Book we should be drawn on to read M. Desjardins' new work.<sup>2</sup> The suggestion that the French have but an inadequate conception of, and a slight hold on, the idea of political liberty demands attention both from the French politician and the student of politics in all countries. But there is also much more that is worthy of study in this discussion of Political Liberty in the Modern State.

It has always appeared to us that in discussions of this nature writers are apt to neglect history and to base their arguments on theoretical ideas. It is probably almost impossible to free our conceptions from the influence of the actual experience on which they have been based—in other words, of the lessons of history. It is therefore wiser to admit consciously and conscientiously the influence of the past and to study the evolution of all ideas with a due regard to their history. This lesson is almost a platitude, yet it needs to be enforced more particularly in matters of politics; and in no inquiry more than in one whose objective is the origin of political freedom.

Somewhat unconsciously, we think, M. Desjardins admits the importance of history to his purpose; and this gives the general tone to his book. He is much more inclined to accept as satisfactory the order of things which exists than to demand change for the sake of empiric improvement. The two following passages—one at the beginning, the other near the end of his book—give a good idea of the general tone of the work, and they are both of them interesting to Englishmen at the moment :

<sup>1</sup> *The Civic Reader, or Chapters on Civic Rights and Duties.* Edited by J. Harris Stone and Ben Jonson. London: Marcus Ward & Co. 1893.

<sup>2</sup> *De la Liberté Politique dans l'Etat Moderne.* Par Arthur Desjardins. Paris: E. Plon Nourrit et Cie. 1894.

“ La constitution d’une Chambre haute limite l’égalité politique en même temps qu’elle consolide, dans le plupart des États, la liberté des citoyens. Il ne faut pas que cette Chambre ait la prépondérance, ainsi qu’il advint en Angleterre depuis la chute des Stuarts et pendant tout le dix-huitième siècle ; mais, quand elle se trouve à peu près effacée par la Seconde Chambre, la liberté politique est moins efficacement protégée. Si la Chambre des Communes d’Angleterre, poursuivant sa marche ascendante, accapare tout et remplace tout, elle pourra mésuser impunément, quelque jour, de son immense pouvoir.” . . . “ L’organisation d’une Chambre haute est bien plus difficile dans les États démocratiques.”

At a moment when there is bitter feeling against the House of Lords, and so many feel that “ something must be done,” it is well to be recalled by the dispassionate remarks of a distinguished French writer to the careful consideration of the historical position of the House in our Constitution.

“ Supprimer la propriété privée c’est tarir la source même de toute liberté dans la race humaine. L’homme naît assurément propriétaire non seulement de ces membres, mais encore de son esprit. Il a reçu ses facultés variés et puissantes pour les employer. C’est violer audacieusement la loi de sa nature que de lui lier les pieds et les bras ou de condamner son intelligence à l’éternelle torpeur. Mais s’il emploie ces facultés, c’est d’abord, selon toute apparence, pour acquérir ce qui lui manque . . . . On ne peut pas le lui ravir, même au nom de la communauté sans porter à la liberté la plus grave de toutes les atteintes. Cette démonstration a été faite mille fois et cependant elle est encore à refaire. Le plus implacable des esclavages est cette sequestration totale de la personne humaine, cette confiscation absolue du travail humain.”

This passage, occurring in the chapter on Socialism and Liberty, strikes the keynote of M. Desjardins’ view of communism. In the same chapter the author reviews, perhaps with too little patience, and rejects the various claims of modern Socialism, urging that much of what they claim as their own was the natural evolution of true political liberty. All this part of the book is of immediate interest to the politician, whatever his nationality.

On a general view we incline to accord the work a high place in sociological literature. In parts certainly it lacks the lightness of touch which to many French authors comes naturally ; it is sometimes, especially in the earlier chapters, rather difficult reading ; its method of marshalling historical facts might, as already suggested, be more obvious. But when we have said that we have said all that may tell against it.

It is divided into two books, the first dealing with the different manifestations of freedom in the State—*e.g.* that of the press or the bench ; the second with political freedom generally in monarchies



and in republics, in its relation to Socialism (or *vice versa*, rather) and then, finally, as a phenomenon in France itself.

We have had some hesitation in treating *Beust et Bismarck*<sup>1</sup> as a book of politics. Bearing on its forefront the words "histoire contemporaine," it is, in fact, a book of materials for the history of the years 1865-1868 when they come to be written. It is a very good general review, detailed and intelligent, of the events of those years; but there is not much that is specially concerned with either Count Beust or Prince Bismarck. From our hasty perusal of it we are inclined to think that it is careful and trustworthy, and it is certainly pleasant to read.

*Among the Matabele*<sup>2</sup> is a very readable sketch of "Lo Ben" and his people from a hand that might be expected to be favourable. A great deal of the information which Mr. Carnegie gives us supports the contention of Mr. Selous and others that the recent war would have been hard to avoid.

## HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

THE history of the French inhabitants of Canada is not by any means an inglorious record. Although the possession of Canada passed out of the hands of France, the descendants of the French colonists have, after many years of persecution and injustice, obtained equal rights with the English brother-colonists. The story is interestingly told by M. Gailly de Taurines in a very readable volume, entitled *La Nation Canadienne*.<sup>3</sup> The French Canadians have some of the best qualities of the great nation to which they are proud to trace their origin. They remain Catholics in spite of laws which oppressed them on account of their adherence to the Church of Rome. They have struggled for liberty, and now enjoy a large and practical measure of autonomy.

M. Gailly de Taurines deals first with the historical development of the Canadian nation since 1535, when the Frenchman, Jacques Cartier, sailed down the St. Lawrence. The original French colonists were devotedly loyal to France; but France—or, at least, the French Government of the time—was not loyal to them. To Colbert the colonists owed much; but from the day when Louvois

<sup>1</sup> *Beust et Bismarck*. Par le Prince Lubomirski. V. Calmann Levy, 1893.

<sup>2</sup> *Among the Matabele*. By the Rev. D. Carnegie. London: Religious Tract Society, 1894.

<sup>3</sup> *La Nation Canadienne*. Étude historique sur les Populations françaises du Nord de l'Amérique. Par Ch. Gailly de Taurines. Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie.

became the royal favourite the political expansion of Canada was lost sight of, and ere long the colony was forsaken. The taking of Quebec in 1760, and the treaty of Paris three years later, mark chronologically the defeat of the French and the end of the French dominion over Canada.

The political history of Canada is in some respects similar to that of Ireland, and if Ireland, like Canada, succeeds in winning autonomy, the parallelism between the two countries will be greater: The objection often raised to the proposal to give Home Rule to Ireland—that the population of the island is not homogeneous—applied with equal force to Canada, where people of French and English blood dwelt upon one soil. The success of the experiment in the Dominion is unquestionable, as the volume before us abundantly proves. Let us hope that the future of Ireland may be as bright as that of the great colony in which one of the most difficult problems of government has been practically solved!

Derbyshire is one of the loveliest English counties; and a description of it ought to be interesting to the English people at large. In a little work entitled *Round About the Crooked Spire*<sup>1</sup> Mr. A. J. Foster gives us a pleasant sketch of North-east Derbyshire, dealing at some length with Chesterfield and its historical associations. It was in Derbyshire that Mary Stuart passed many years of her captivity. There are still in this part of England many landmarks of the Civil War of Charles I.'s reign. The little volume is well worth reading.

The life of a British soldier is sure to have many features of interest. In contemporary fiction we have some pictures of life in the ranks which are lively and romantic, if not exactly correct in detail. Mr. Rudyard Kipling gives "a thing or two" about the British soldier in India; and John Strange Winter<sup>2</sup>—though a lady—is not quite unacquainted with what may be called military manners. The realities of the subject, however, if one may judge from a book just published, which is nothing more or less than the biography of a troop-sergeant-major of hussars, are commonplace enough.<sup>1</sup> Not that this little volume is uninteresting by any means. We have read it with great pleasure, and are satisfied that Troop-Sergeant-Major Edwin Mole is a brave man and a "right good fellow." But how singularly unromantic a soldier's life turns out to be; in fact, far more monotonous than the life of an ordinary sailor, or engine-driver, or commercial traveller. The hero of this book—and we need not deny him the title of hero—wished ardently to be a soldier while he was a little boy at school; and in his eighteenth

<sup>1</sup> *Round About the Crooked Spire.* By Albert J. Foster, M.A. London: Chapman & Hall.

<sup>2</sup> *A King's Hussar.* Being the Military Memoirs for Twenty-five Years of a Troop-Sergeant-Major of the 14th (King's) Hussars. Collected and Condensed by Herbert Compton. London: Cassell & Company.

year he "took the Queen's shilling" under the combined stimulus of a recruiting sergeant and a little too much alcohol. This initiation into a military career is common enough. The new recruit proved himself, in good time, an excellent soldier. He was steady and temperate, and at a comparatively early age entered the married state. He had a chum named Bill Thompson, who also enlisted, but who, by some blunder, got into a different regiment. During the first years of his military career, the subject of these memoirs was stationed at Aldershot and Hounslow. He was afterwards sent to Scotland and Ireland; and in the latter country he witnessed a contested election, at which the soldiers had to disperse a howling and stone-throwing mob. The sergeant is not quite flattering in his allusions to the Irish people, though he appears to have taken a fancy to an Irish-American called Deasey (we presume this is a fictitious name), to whom he devotes nearly an entire chapter. Subsequently he served in India and in South Africa, and the account which he gives of the Majuba disaster is a very graphic and realistic piece of description. Though apparently as free from self-consciousness as the hero of Mr. Thomas Hardy's *Trumpet-Major*, Troop-Sergeant-Major Mole is one of those honest, manly souls who, without brilliancy or originality of any kind, still reflect honour on the name of Englishman. We are glad to find that he is now in the enjoyment of a comfortable pension, and, having served his country as a soldier for twenty-five years, is now a sturdy and thriving yeoman.

A very sympathetic account of a most pious and benevolent English clergyman will be found in a little book recently published by Messrs. Swan Sonnenschein & Co.<sup>1</sup> This pure-souled and saintly man did enormous good in succouring and reforming the poor of Liverpool. The biography appears to be from the pen of a lady, and it is written in very readable English. If the intellectual powers of the Rev. George Chapman have been overrated by his enthusiastic biographer, his great moral qualities cannot fail to win our admiration and reverence.

There are few greater names in English literature than that of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Despite his faults, Coleridge was perhaps intellectually the foremost man of his time. If his achievements did not correspond with the promise of his genius, it must be acknowledged that even in a fragmentary state his works entitle him to take rank beside the Kings of Thought—Milton, Goethe, and others who have won immortality in the domain of letters. Mr. James Dykes Campbell has written an admirable and thoroughly appreciative narrative of the events of Coleridge's life.<sup>2</sup> The volume

<sup>1</sup> *George Chapman: A Narrative of a Devoted Life.* By R. S. With a Preface by Alfred Gurney, M.A. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

<sup>2</sup> *Samuel Taylor Coleridge: A Narrative of the Events of his Life.* By James Dykes Campbell. London: Macmillan & Co. 1894.

will be read with avidity by all who admire the gifted author of *Christabel*. That Coleridge was an improvident man and ill adapted for the struggle of practical existence cannot be denied. But men dwelling in the world of pure thought are not always fitted for the task of dealing with petty and sordid details. Such a man was Samuel Taylor Coleridge. His stupendous intellect was able to cope with abstruse metaphysical problems, but not with the hard realities of everyday life. His poetry inspired Scott and Byron, neither of whom treated him with the sympathy or consideration he deserved at their hands. Scott certainly imitated if he did not plagiarise portions of *Christabel*; and we find from his *Familiar Letters*, published only last November, that Sir Walter claims the credit of having introduced Byron to the "fragment" (as he calls *Christabel*) "with a view to interest him in Coleridge's fate." The condescension of the author of *Waverley* is quite characteristic of one whose social vanity exceeded his literary enthusiasm. Coleridge is now a part of the world's intellectual wealth, and posterity will recognise in him a greater man than Scott, while as a poet only three of his contemporaries could possibly claim higher rank—Wordsworth, Byron, and Shelley. Sad and chequered, indeed, was poor Coleridge's life-history. His dreamy youth; his enlistment as a soldier; his wild but noble scheme of universal happiness called "Pantisocracy"; his early disappointment in love; his domestic unhappiness; his opium-eating—all these phases of his career excite profound pity, not unmingled with wonder and bewilderment. But Coleridge's faults sprang from the tenderness and extraordinary sensibility of his nature. In one of his letters he exclaims: "Me, who from my childhood have had no avarice, no ambition, whose very vanity in my vainest moments was, nine-tenths of it, the desire and delight and necessity of loving and of being loved." In some respects we may compare this great poet's weaknesses with those of Burns—another victim of his own excessively emotional temperament. In Coleridge we have a strange combination of qualities—imagination, critical acumen, and deep insight united to waywardness and feebleness of will. Those who read Mr. J. D. Campbell's *Life of the poet* will find many of their preconceived notions as to Coleridge's character considerably modified. As the biographer justly remarks, the poet's failings are too obvious to require emphasis or moralising; but his recovery is more wonderful than his fall. If he lapsed from strict virtue his entire life was a vindication of true morality. While the English language is spoken his writings will bear eloquent testimony to the purity and honesty of his heart and to the colossal force of his genius.

The history of a New England family<sup>1</sup> who took no small part

<sup>1</sup> *Early Days in New England: The Life and Times of Henry Burt of Springfield and some of his Descendants.* By H. M. Burt and S. W. Burt. Springfield, Mass.: C. W. Bryan.

in founding and consolidating the great American Republic should have an interest for all Transatlantic and many English readers. In a volume of over five hundred pages the *Life and Times of Henry Burt of Springfield and some of his Descendants* are recorded at great length. The work has been written by two members of the family and is, therefore, "a labour of love." We find in the volume some confirmation of Nathaniel Hawthorne's vivid pictures of New England life. For example, the mention of the Pyncheon family at once recalls to our mind *The House of the Seven Gables*; and it appears that, as a matter of fact, a magistrate of that name presided at a trial for witchcraft or "familiarity with the devil" in the year 1652. A Mrs. Parsons was sentenced to death for such an alleged offence, but died in jail before the day fixed for her execution. So much for the fanaticism which the New Englanders called "religion"!

Diplomacy in the days of Louis XV. was a difficult art. The French monarch was, perhaps, a rather contemptible person; but France was then a great power, and had a proud position to maintain in Europe. England and France were rivals, and the efforts of French diplomatists were directed to the task of weakening England's military and naval power. The history of the *Pacte de Famille*, a treaty between the kings of France and Spain to unite against their common enemies, is exceedingly curious. The story is well told—the materials being taken from the most authentic sources—by M. André Soulange-Bodin.<sup>1</sup> Some interesting pictures of the social and political life of the period are introduced. The Court of Madrid in 1756 presented a singular aspect. The royal confessor was a power in the state, and Père Ravago, who enjoyed that honour, was the only friend of France at the Spanish Court. When he fell into disfavour, accordingly, French influence at the Court rapidly waned. Another important personage at Madrid was Farinelli, a musician, who having by his performances dispelled the king's melancholy, was recompensed for his services with a gift of fifty thousand francs and was invited to preside at the Council. His influence continued during two reigns. So much for the caprices of kings to which people were subject in the days when popular liberty was only the audacious dream of philosophers! In France Madame de Pompadour and Madame du Barri had more power than a modern minister. Choiseul, great man though he was, had to play second fiddle to the Pompadour. After all, the French Revolution was not quite an unprovoked expression of the people's will, and, pondering on the characteristics of the age of Louis XV., every intelligent and liberal-minded Frenchman will gladly exclaim: "*Nous avons changé tout cela.*"

<sup>1</sup> *La Diplomatie de Louis XV. et le Pacte de Famille.* Par André Soulange-Bodin. Paris: Librairie Académique Didier. Perrin et Cie., Libraires-éditeurs.

Mr. Augustine Birrell is a very clever man, and his *Essays about Men, Women, and Books*<sup>1</sup> will enhance his reputation. At the same time there are traces of prejudice in some of the essays, notably that dealing with Swift, which appear to show that the author is not an impartial critic. It is true that Swift's language is coarse; but there is no essential impurity in anything he has written. Bad taste is quite a different matter from immorality; and Swift's literary sins are, at the worst, only sins against "propriety." There was really no sterner moralist than Swift himself, though his views of life were tinged with misanthropy. To call him "an unclean spirit"—as Mr. Birrell does—is an insult to the memory of an illustrious man. We differ, too, from the author as to the absurdity of describing Swift as an Irishman. No doubt he grimly said on one occasion: "I am only a Teague by accident." But, though English by descent, he was Irish both by birth and by the power of patriotic sympathy; and Ireland has good reason to be proud of him. In the essay on Poets Laureate, Mr. Birrell appears to ignore the generally accepted view that Chaucer held the office. The charm of this little book is its geniality. We feel that in these printed pages a real flesh-and-blood man is talking to us, and we must, therefore, make allowance for a few harmless fads.

A very handy edition of Bacon's *Essays and Apothegms*<sup>2</sup> has been edited by Mr. John Buchan, and published by Walter Scott, Limited. The biographical introduction points out very intelligently the dual character of Bacon's mind, its philosophic love of truth, and its mean opportunism in the actual business of life. Mr. Buchan very properly describes the essays as "rough sketches to be filled up at will." They are useful as much for what they suggest as what they directly lay down. They certainly compress a vast amount of human wisdom into the smallest possible space. Even the most thoughtful persons cannot fail to derive profit from a reperusal of Bacon's *Essays*.

It is hard to classify a work like *Two Spheres*, by T. E. S. T.<sup>3</sup> It is full of historical speculation, and it appears to lean towards the theory that man was originally a more highly developed being than he is at present. We find it almost impossible, in the light of scientific research, to agree with the writer's conclusions. The probability is that primitive man was a savage. This view would fit in with the evolutionary hypothesis which is now generally accepted. The view of the author of this work is scarcely consistent with evolution.

<sup>1</sup> *Essays about Men, Women, and Books*. By Augustine Birrell. London: Elliot Stock.

<sup>2</sup> *Essays and Apothegms of Lord Bacon*. Edited by John Buchan. London: Walter Scott.

<sup>3</sup> *Two Spheres; or, Mind versus Instinct*. By T. E. S. T. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

*Modern Mystics and Modern Magic*<sup>1</sup> is a very curious book. It gives a sketch of the celebrated Swedenborg, written, it seems, by Balzac. Much allowance must be made for Swedenborg's hallucinations, which were the errors at any rate of a great mind; but the statements made concerning William Stainton Moses, the medium, must be received with some scepticism, if not incredulity. Both spiritualism and theosophy have made little headway with thinking persons up to the present; and no wonder, for they make demands upon reason which can only be conceded on the principle of putting reason aside altogether and allowing mere imagination to be our guide.

The late Canon Dale, whatever may have been his heterodoxy from the unbending Churchman's point of view, did good work for the cause of true religion; and we are glad to find his life written in two elaborate volumes. A man who suffered persecution for conscience' sake deserves the name of Christian. The work is edited by Canon Dale's daughter, and its interest is greatly enhanced by the publication of letters from the late Canons Pusey and Liddon, Mr. Ruskin, and Mr. Gladstone.

#### BELLES LETTRES.

MR. W. J. LINTON, in his *Life of John Greenleaf Whittier*,<sup>2</sup> gives us an unpretending though adequate account of an unpretentious man, and a sympathetic estimate of his poetry. We are told of the Quaker poet's quiet youth passed in the valley of the Merrimac, of his long-continued literary and journalistic labours, and of the earnestness with which he threw himself into the Abolitionist movement, and became its poet and its prophet. The singers of America are more in touch with the life of the mass of the people than our own: they have a mission, and are apt to regard themselves less as irresponsible artists than as seers and teachers, while their plainer measures are better adapted for homely sentiment and moral lessons. Despite constant ill-health, Whittier became a power in the State; his *Voices of Freedom* are an integral part of the history of the Anti-Slavery Movement, and are in their way as memorable and excellent as the spirited ballads, the tender idylls and lyrics on which he rests his poetic fame. The outcome of a thoroughly

<sup>1</sup> *Modern Mystics and Modern Magic*. By Arthur Lillie. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

<sup>2</sup> *Life of John Greenleaf Whittier*. By W. J. Linton. London: Walter Scott, Limited.

genuine nature, his poetry has the essentials of popularity in its warm human feeling and inspiration of active kindness, while, if closely studied, his work will be found to have far more grace and artistic charm than we are accustomed to associate with so much moral earnestness.

*Lady William*<sup>1</sup> is an excellent example of the easily written and easily read type of fiction with which the ever popular Mrs. Oliphant so plentifully supplies her public. This novel is certainly one of the most careful and interesting that she has recently produced, and this is high praise in speaking of so skilful and practised a pen. The studies of quiet village gentility and the character drawing are very successful, and many of the scenes and dialogues capitally given.

The *Buveurs d'Ames*<sup>2</sup> of M. J. Lorrain is a collection of morbidly imaginative tales, strange, cleverly written, and repulsive. M. Lorrain's mind is saturated with the poetry of Baudelaire; he cares only for the perverse and the abnormal: his masters in fiction are J. J. Huysmanns, Villiers de l'Isle Adam, and Guy de Maupassant, and his work is consequently quite unsuited to an English public. The *clou* of the volume is the conception of a class of human monsters possessed of a species of magnetic attraction, by which they, as it were, drain dry and absorb the souls of those who are affected by their personality, and it will be seen that the working out of such an idea affords a congenial opportunity to a writer of M. Lorrain's bent.

*The Fool of Fate*<sup>3</sup> starts with an exceedingly clever idea. We have all met men and women of the type of George Ainsworth, people who though well-intentioned, and honourable inasmuch as they would be incapable of any deliberate fraud, have nevertheless acquired a habit of romancing, of embroidering upon the sober facts of life, and have yielded to it to such an extent as to allow it to falsify their whole speech and intercourse, and to bring an element of dangerous uncertainty into their dealings with others. The Fool of Fate, though a lovable, well-meaning, affectionate man, suffers from this curious moral obliquity to an extraordinary degree, and chances, unhappily, to unite his life to a noble-minded, sincere, and simple girl, who with youthful intolerance holds any species of falsehood in absolute horror. We have here the elements of an unusually interesting tragedy, and in stronger hands much might have been done. As it is the idea is adequately worked out, and the book is noteworthy as the exposition of a not uncommon psychological phenomenon.

The stories by "Jane Nelson" which appear in the Pseudonym

<sup>1</sup> *Lady William*. By Mrs. Oliphant. London: Macmillan & Co.

<sup>2</sup> *Buveurs d'Ames*. Par Jean Lorrain. Paris: Bibliothèque-Charpentier.

<sup>3</sup> *The Fool of Fate*. By Mary H. Tennyson. London: Ward, Lock & Bowden, Limited.



Library under the title of *The Rousing of Mrs. Potter*<sup>1</sup> have all made their first appearance in various American periodicals. They will be found both effective and readable, and are well worth collection and republication.

We are not quite clear what it is that constitutes a "Christmas Story," but to our mind the title carries the suggestion that the book may be read aloud in the home circle, and if this be the essence of the matter the *Elsie*<sup>2</sup> of Alexander L. Kjelland has certainly no right to be thus styled. It is true that the heroine dies on Christmas Day, but the story is that of the fall of a young girl, and it seems to be intended as a satire on the callousness of her fellow townspeople and the red tapeism and inefficiency of a society whose business it was to have come to her aid.

Mrs. Tytler has two fairly interesting stories in the volume called *War Times*.<sup>3</sup> The first—the actual "War Times"—is a sketch of homely Scotch life during the Crimean War and the things which were thought and suffered by those who were left at home. The second is a tale of the adventure of two girls during the Afghan disaster and retreat of 1842, founded on Lady Bate's journals and Sir W. Kaye's history. Such books are a pleasant way to realise history, and the stories suit young folk as well as old.

In order to aid us in forming an estimate of the two books which follow we adopted a course which appears to us singularly effective, if unusual. We have placed them in the hands of the typical English schoolboy for whom they were meant. The verdict was satisfactory—"jolly good" said our young friend. Our observation confirmed it: the books were constantly in his hands and engrossed his attention.

Mr. Henty's book<sup>4</sup> deals with the present century, Dr. Stables,<sup>5</sup> with the far past. Probably the former will be the more popular with boys: its central figure is a young officer whose military career is sketched from the schoolroom; the boyish imagination twines itself more vigorously round a life akin to their own. We are glad to see that Mr. Henty annexes to his book a small map of the Punjab, in the hope of inducing a more lively interest in the basis of facts. We ourselves like *Westward with Columbus*; history and legend are intermingled in the tale, and we feel the old thrill as we turn over the pages; the book is practically a sketch of the life of that great voyager whose life has been so much before us in these

<sup>1</sup> *The Rousing of Mrs. Potter, and other Stories*. By Jane Nelson. Pseudonym Library. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

<sup>2</sup> *Elsie: A Christmas Story*. From the Norwegian of Alexander L. Kjelland. By M. M. Dawson. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co.

<sup>3</sup> *War Times and In the Cannon's Mouth*. By Sarah Tytler. London: Allen & Co. 1893.

<sup>4</sup> *Through the Sikh War*. By G. A. Henty. London: Blackie & Son. 1894.

<sup>5</sup> *Westward with Columbus*. By Gordon Stables, M.D.C.M. London: Blackie & Co. 1894.

last few months. Dr. Stables has done his work well and given boys a hero whom they will like.

*Jocrisse Soldat*<sup>1</sup> is a rather humorous and not uninteresting sketch of French military life, chiefly in the person of a youthful and clumsy conscript during the years around 1830 when the French conquered Algiers. We do not expect to get many English readers for it, for there is no great virtue that we should commend it; but it will beguile an hour or two all the same.

A book of a similar class but certainly more interesting, and often exciting, is *Adventures de deux jeunes gens au Dahomey*.<sup>2</sup> It tells how two young French people, believed to be brother and sister, were wrecked on the African coast, were taken by the natives, carried into Dahomey where the young lady narrowly escaped being made the *ujullé* or chief wife of the king, saw many exciting adventures, and finally established French influence in those regions; somehow or other (this, dear reader, you shall find out for yourself) they discover that they are not really brother and sister and return to France to become man and wife. The story is certainly a good one.

*Some Country Sights and Sounds*<sup>3</sup> has been on our hands for a long time; we are so late with the review of it that we have some hopes that this will just come in time for the second edition. The truth is that the title bothered us. It does not represent the book, and we have been trying to find a new one. We cannot get it very short; we propose: "Some Sights and Sounds and Thoughts which are sometimes to be met with in the country (but the majority not in England), delineated as they more particularly present themselves to Mr. Philip Robinson, who is alone responsible for the sentiments." There is a good deal of very fair humour in the book, which is one to take up pretty often for a few minutes at a time. Then you learn what birds and sheep and cows have thought about the world; you are let into secrets of pumas, lions, tigers and other gentle beasts, and you learn a good many odds and ends that are worth knowing. Now and again there is a real touch of love for "the country," and "country sights and sounds."

<sup>1</sup> *Jocrisse Soldat, épisode de la conquête d'Alger*. Par Charles Farine. Paris: Librairie Ducrocq.

<sup>2</sup> *Adventures, &c.* Par Henri Monet. Paris: J. Lefort.

<sup>3</sup> *Some Country Sights and Sounds*. By Phil Robinson. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1893.

## POETRY.

THE poetry of Mr. Aubrey de Vere is always thoughtful and dignified in tone, and in his work there is always much to admire, for he has scholarship, restraint, and good taste. A sympathetic student of the middle ages, he is also a good Catholic, and is therefore able to enter into their religious spirit as no Protestant or Pagan is in a position to do; for the legends which he relates in his *Mediæval Records*<sup>1</sup> show the fullest appreciation of the loyalty and self-sacrifice which are the nobler side of mediæval character, the poetry of lives that were steadied and elevated by ardent faith in a world to come. "To ignore the future is to renounce hope," he points out in his interesting preface, "and without hope life can be at best but a good-humoured despair." The most picturesque portion of the book consists of the "Legends of the Cid," in which the chief incidents of the hero's life are recalled by his knights during their vigil at his bier. Some of the sonnets are very good, though a little prosaic in quality; that, for instance, on Lord Tennyson as a poet being rather a judicial, if generous, summing up of his achievements, than a poetic pæan of praise.

Mr. F. G. Kenyon, the editor of *Classical Texts from the Papyri of the British Museum*, now gives us a readable English version of the two recently recovered orations of Hyperides, together with the Greek text. The papyrus MS. of the oration against Athenogenes, now in the Louvre, is, with the exception of some fragments, the oldest existing, the date suggested being that of B.C. 328. It is a fine piece of pleading, vigorous, clear, and persuasive, for the case of the client of Hyperides (whose name is not known) was weak in law, if strong in equity, and needed all the skill of the advocate for its effective presentation. Under Athenian law the purchaser of a slave became liable for all his debts, and in the present instance the wily Athenogenes had obtained a formal agreement from the plaintiff to buy a slave named Midas on the assurance that the debts of a perfumery business which he had managed were trifling and would be covered by the sale of the stock. The liabilities, however, proved so heavy as to mean ruin to the new owner of Midas, and accordingly, it is argued, that an engagement brought about by cajolery (for a certain Antigona appears as a go-between) and by false statement ought not to be held binding. The development of the case is full of interest, and the manner of the speech singularly natural and telling. The oration against Philpides has less dramatic interest, and the MS.

<sup>1</sup> *Mediæval Records and Sonnets*. By Aubrey de Vere. London: Macmillan & Co.

<sup>2</sup> *Hyperides*. The Orations against Athenogenes and Philpides. Edited with a Translation by F. G. Kenyon. London: George Bell & Sons.

shows considerable lacunæ. As an "advocate in a social *cause célèbre*," says Mr. Kenyon, "or in any matter requiring light and delicate handling, Hyperides was held to be unequalled," being considered superior even to Demosthenes.

A little volume by Mr. Mackenzie Bell, *Spring's Immortality and other Poems*,<sup>1</sup> is somewhat old-fashioned in manner and language, but the tone is very kindly and simple, and the thought deeply tinged with religious feeling. Many of the pieces show unaffected pathos, and the sentiment is always true and tender. The book, if it does not reach any very high artistic or intellectual level, has much poetic feeling and sincerity, and is thus invested with an interest not always to be found in more ambitious work.

The keynote of Mr. Barlow's *Crucifixion of Man*<sup>2</sup> is audacity and plain speaking, for the "crucifixion" of which he treats, we are told, is that "of man by woman, and of both by God." Mr. Barlow handles his startling theme with fluency and passion, but with little grace, and is too unrestrained in his sensationalism to fully obtain even the lurid effect at which he aims.

Mr. Goodchild<sup>3</sup> begins by informing us that his book is "not for the critic," but adds as an afterthought that by this he does not intend to say it is not for review. First he introduces himself as merely "a desultory student of poetry," and then hastily retrieves his position by the modest announcement that he has nevertheless added some thirty or forty new metres to the English language! All this is daunting, and we hardly dare to meddle in the matter, and must content ourselves with the remark that the tales appear to be good ones, and are so well told that they might have been trusted to stand alone, without any attempt at apology or defence.

The verse of Mr. Marcus Rickards<sup>4</sup> sometimes contains charming ideas, although for the most part it is wordy and inappropriate. In illustration here is a stanza from an *Ode to a Redbreast*, in which two lines are really fine :

"Thou angel-link 'tween heaven and earth,  
Did seraphs supervise thy birth,  
And lend thee guise and tune ?  
*Stamp on thy gorget a true sign,*  
*That pent within is fire divine,*  
As flaming at the year's decline  
As 'mid sweet golden June."

The gracious French custom of teaching children to greet their parents on their fête-days with a *compliment* or little address in

<sup>1</sup> *Spring's Immortality and other Poems*. By Mackenzie Bell. London: Ward, Lock & Bowden, Limited.

<sup>2</sup> *The Crucifixion of Man*. A Narrative Poem. By George Barlow. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

<sup>3</sup> *Tales in Verse*. By J. A. Goodchild. London: Horace Cox.

<sup>4</sup> *Lyrics and Elegiacs*. By Marcus S. C. Rickards. London: George Bell & Sons.

verse learnt by heart is, unfortunately, hardly known in England, for the practice is not only pretty in itself, but tends to inculcate consideration for the feelings of grown-up people, and the duty of a recognition of their kindness. The short monologues and dialogues in Miss Caroline Maynard's *Nos Petits*<sup>1</sup> are intended for recitation by little folks on such occasions, and are charmingly adapted for the purpose. The lines are graceful and simple, noticeably well written, and with many little quaintnesses and touches of naïveté, which would have great effect on the lisping tongue of a little speaker; in short, the pieces are so happily conceived as to be pleasing both to the child itself and to the audience of elders. As frontispiece the book has a clever drawing by Henri Pille.

<sup>1</sup> *Nos Petits. Monologues et Dialogues pour Enfants de 5 à 12 ans. Par Caroline Maynard. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher.*

## THE DRAMA.

BJÖRNSTJERNE BJÖRNSSON, the renowned Norwegian dramatist, has at last been introduced to the London stage, under the ægis of Miss Annie Rose, who has essayed three performances of the *Gauntlet* at the Royalty Theatre. A more unfortunate venture and a more disrespectful treatment of a foreign author has rarely been witnessed in London. So much harm has been done to the play, it has been vulgarised to such an extent, that those who have seen the original would scarcely recognise it. It would, therefore, be unfair to criticise such a performance in earnest, and it was distinctly unfair that some of the London critics, without inquiring whether the play presented to them was really Björnsson's offspring, should have passed a condemnation on him as a dramatist and as an artist. It was a foolhardy act, we would almost say a scandal, that Miss Annie Rose allowed a great work to be mutilated, and that then, having seen it mutilated, she did not even take any precautions to save it by decent acting. How little she was conscious of the great importance of the part of Svava is clearly demonstrated by the fact that she herself undertook it; and the outcome was as deplorable as it was ridiculous. She played it in a soubrette-like, kittenish manner, and nobody could help laughing at this little busybody flinging the gauntlet into her lover's face because he had played the part of the third party in somebody else's household. There was nothing in Miss Rose's conception, if conception there was at all, to warrant the flinging of the gauntlet, for her Svava was not the Norwegian woman of strong character, of strong will, strong deeds, as Björnsson's heroine was, but merely a pretty nonentity, saying serious things without understanding their meaning.

After this it is not astonishing to learn that the three performances which were given of this play have ended in a financial disaster; the receipts having amounted to £33 and the outlay to £675. Those who know something of theatrical management will shake their heads when they read this out of sheer wonderment, not only at Miss Rose's want of reverence for the author, and her want of capacity as an actress, but also for the total want of managerial sagacity. For *The Gauntlet*, masterpiece though it is, requires very little expense to be adequately produced. It is one of the simplest plays on record, and it would be interesting to know how the large sum mentioned above has been drowned in a wital slovenly production, to which it is not necessary to refer in more words.

Mr. Robert Buchanan is a fortunate man; in spite of many dramatic failures, he still enjoys the confidence of our managers, and while younger and better men than he are waiting in vain, two of his plays are seen at principal theatres of London.

Mr. Tree has replaced *Captain Swift* by *The Charlatan*, a play which is in some way in touch with the times, since it deals with the mystic science of second-sight, and introduces a character which bears the somewhat obvious name of Madame Obnosky. However, the play, in our estimation, is but a very ordinary drawing-room melodrama, the tale of which, told a hundred times before, can be laid down in a very few lines.

A dark-tinted gentleman, half-European, half-Indian, a sort of adventurer, boasting that he is in touch with world's weird and fascinating, gets a fair and noble damsel, whom he has somehow met before in India, in his power, and would no doubt have seduced her, if it had not so happened that the play had to be produced before an English audience and listened to by English ears. As it is, the young lady goes far enough. In her sleep she wanders about the castle, enters on tip-toe the room of the Charlatan, confesses her love to him, and places herself in a most critical position. We have here the sleep-walking scene of Lady Macbeth dished up in a *fin-de-siècle* manner. Fortunately for the young lady, she recovers before the Charlatan's passion reaches a fatal climax, and then, when she is bent down with grief, and the better feelings awake in the man, he gives up his evil designs and goes hence. This is, of course, but the bare outline of the main idea. It is interspersed, as all drawing-room melodramas are, with countless incidents, among others the apparition of the image of the young lady's father in a so-called dark séance, which greatly puzzles the audience as something novel, because they all want to know how the thing is done.

Their astonishment is somewhat strange, since from our childhood we remember a melodrama called the *Secret of Miss Aurora*, in which there appeared *spectres impalpables*, which were far more wonderful and no less effective. There is also in the play a comic young man, the prototype of which we have encountered in nearly every modern English play of the last ten years. We mean a young man who has a peculiar hobby. The specimen in question is mad with evolution, and walks about with the word "evolving" constantly on his lips. So much does he evolve that he is even blind to the charms of his delightful cousin for a time, but she, by continually chaffing him about his peculiarity, induces him to evolve genuine love for her, and to throw all other evolutions overboard. No doubt young men of this stamp are very amusing on paper, and vastly divert playgoers of small intellect, but if types of this kind should cross our path in life, we should no doubt treat them as lunatics, and find them rather sad than funny.

*The Charlatan* is a play in which there is very little originality and a vast amount of recollections. The French school of the fifties and sixties abounds in this kind of mock-real dramas, and then they were mostly better written. For, in Mr. Buchanan's style, with all its effort to be picturesque and powerful, there is a certain kind of dryness which produces languor. It astonishes us for all these reasons that such a play should have found its way to the Haymarket, where we are accustomed to see high-class work. Nor is it acted in that victorious spirit of conviction which we have praised so often in Mr. Tree and his company. He is interesting, as he always is, but no more, and even the subtle art of Mrs. Tree, with its charm and its grace, cannot make us forget for one moment the atmosphere of unreality which pervades the play from the outset. To put it frankly, the *Charlatan* has bored us, and, although on the first production the usual signs of favour were not wanting, we should not be astonished at all if this play were to give way after a very short time, for it does not even possess the elements of popularity.

If one goes to see such plays as *Dick Sheridan*, which Mr. Robert Buchanan presented to us on the 3rd of February at the Comedy, in a critical mood, one has every opportunity to laugh at the thing or to treat it with scorn. For it is an audacious, a precocious thing to do for a modern poet of some merits to dub a marionette with the name of a great genius and then to let this personage speak his (the modern poet's) language. Hypercritical people will have judged in this way whether the play is historical, or, as in Mr. Buchanan's case, whether it has no pretensions to historical accuracy. It is a peculiar way of judging a play, just as peculiar as the argumentation of some folk, who prefer a photograph to a picture, because the former is so much more exact. We do not trouble our minds much whether a play is called historical or not historical; we know too well that nothing except a phonograph could have exactly reproduced Sheridan's way of speaking, and as there are no records, because there were no phonographs in Sheridan's days, it is indifferent to us whether the Dick Sheridan, as seen by Mr. Buchanan, shows any affinity to the real man as he lived or not. We want to be amused, instructed if possible, edified if that can be achieved by a modern playwright, and that is all. And we must confess that with all its terrible *longueurs*, with its somewhat rhetorical dialogue, its somewhat shabbily conventional portrayal of hero, heroine, father, pretty chambermaid, and my lord, we felt during the last two acts rather interested in this play of *Dick Sheridan*. The story, known as Sheridan's life is to every scholar, well-worn as the love love affair is, may be trite, but it gains freshness through the tone of sincerity, of chivalrous intentions, which adorn the character of the fair Elizabeth Linley and the struggling playwright. There is comfort and amusement in the witnessing of the profound attachment of this secretly married couple, in seeing the woman, a picture of confidence in her



husband, his mainstay, his helpmate. And it rouses one, even in these days when wounded honour is bandaged with banknotes, to behold a man as true as steel, offering his life-blood for the fair fame of his lady—as Sheridan did to Captain Matthews. It may be that what Mr. Buchanan presents to us in this play is neither life nor lifelike; it is indeed the veriest fancy work, a fairy-tale clothed in eighteenth-century attire, with magic transformations at the end of the third (the failure of the Rivals—despair) and the fourth act (success—fortune—happiness). It is therefore not a good play, the more as it has constructive and other faults; but it has amused us to a certain extent, as it amused everybody else, and it must be said that after witnessing it, one must feel favourably disposed to the author, who relieved through his fairy-tale the clouds of pessimistic reality with the silver lining of his imagination.

We think that Mr. Comyns Carr has made a fatal mistake in burdening the youthful and inexperienced shoulders of Mr. H. B. Irving with the leading part; nor was it discreet of Mr. Comyns Carr to make a special laudatory reference to the young actor in his managerial allocution after the play. As it is, Mr. Irving has to carry a heavy responsibility—a famous name. And as he has hitherto, in his brief career at the Garrick Theatre, not given any proof of exceptional endowment, it was neither a wise nor a good service on the part of the manager to let young Mr. Irving impersonate a most difficult character, a part in which the actor must attempt to revive and to realise one of the most famous figures of English literature. Taking this primordial disadvantage into account, one may congratulate Mr. Irving that he has not failed altogether, but only partially. That he was not *the*, or even *a* Sheridan, needs no comment; but he showed us an impetuous youth with a nice character given at times to explode in passion, and at others to indulge in boisterous joking. But there was neither deeply felt emotion nor spontaneous humour in Mr. Irving's acting, and so immature is he yet in his craft that he stood frequently on the stage busying himself with his frills, but otherwise not exhibiting any feeling or even interest in what was going on. It would be wrong to blame Mr. Irving for this, for his inexperience, not his good will, was at fault. His movements at every step denote want of ease, of experience, and therefore of grace; he has a most handsome refined appearance, but his bearing lacks dignity and repose. The voice, on the other hand, fine as it is, requires training, modulation, deepening, restraint. With all his shortcomings, which may disappear through severe training and study, we see in Mr. H. B. Irving the *étouffe* of a fine romantic actor, and therefore it is all the more deplorable that his manager, blinded, no doubt, through true friendship and admiration, has rendered his career more difficult by overtaxing his powers.

Mr. Irving was admirably supported by Miss Winifred Emery, who within the limitations of her power is one of the finest and

most pathetic actresses on our stage. Her Elizabeth was a picture beautiful to behold and a character lovable in its sweetness and tenderness. Mr. Cyril Maude's Lord Dazleton was a delightful mixture of pomposity and good nature, and the Irish M.A., O'Leary, found in Mr. Brandon Thomas as warm-blooded and kind an impersonator as could be wished for. No wonder that he should feel palpitations for the fair chambermaid Mrs. Lapper, interpreted by Miss Pattie Browne; she was irresistibly comic and prim and pert and bright. To say that Mr. Lewis Waller was highly refined and dignified in the awkward and unsympathetic part of Captain Matthew is great praise. No man could have made more of it.

The Court Theatre has re-opened with a new play in three acts, by A. W. Gattie, called *The Transgressor*. The author is a novice, and he shows this clearly in his play. He has plenty of dramatic instinct, but a craftsman he is not yet. He has yet to learn the gentle art of bringing his people on and off. Especially in the first act, the continuous perambulation of the characters is most unpleasant.

But if Mr. Gattie is not yet familiar with the tricks of his trade, he has convinced us from the outset that he takes his art seriously, that he means to invent of his own accord, and not live on the fat of his predecessors. That *The Transgressor* is an original play with an original subject cannot be gainsaid.

We are made to face a great problem—the marriage question in its most sombre aspect. The *Transgressor* has a wife living, a wife that for twenty years was nothing to him, as she passed her days in a lunatic asylum. The bonds were severed, but bondage remained.

Then Langley in his middle-age falls in love with a charming young girl, marries her secretly, and makes her believe, as he did his own daughter, that the first wife died years ago. Murder will out.

The *Transgressor's* friend, Dr. Hurst, is one of the few people living who know that the wife lives, and when through force of circumstances Langley is at last compelled to make a clean breast of his secret marriage, his confession is overheard by the Rev. Meredith, a jilted but persistent lover of the unlawful wife, Sylvia. And then the clergyman befouls his cassock, partly through rancour, partly on the plea of duty, and breaks the awful truth to the unsuspecting bride. As she hears it we reach a scene which is of prodigious strength, and clearly demonstrates that there is great dramatic power in Mr. Gattie.

The climax is not more than a monologue—an analysis, as it were, of the woman's feeling, her grief, her anger, her struggle, her doubt, all overpowered at length by her great, her boundless love. And in the greatness of that love she even defies the law; she, the loving woman, proclaims that she stands above the law of man, that she will stand by the man of her choice.

A grand scene, grandly acted. With one leap Miss Olga Nethersole has reached a topmost place in the English acting world, casting shadows behind her, leaving behind her colleagues who but yesterday would fain have denied her the honour of acknowledging her as their peer.

What rendered Miss Nethersole's acting so great was not only her consummate art, the skill with which she caused her feelings to climb the mountain heights to the summit of emotions, it was the profound sincerity of her performance. She was not content to act her part, she lived it—she was the suffering, struggling woman, and as cries of pain and words of affection cascaded from her lips, tears, springing burning from her eyes, streamed over her face, and what she felt found an echo within us; her acting roused our nature.

The play ought to have ended with this scene. There is but one end possible when a woman vows eternal fidelity to a man under such circumstances (and a very poor specimen of manhood Langley is: a coward and a weakling); that end is to leave a country where all is condoned except sins against "convenience." Langley and Sylvia's only possible, probable, destiny was emigration, and the building of a new home far, far away from the shores where (as it was put in the mouth of Mr. Fernandez) society does neither forget nor forgive.

Whether the author has not grasped this, or whether he has wilfully destroyed the climax of his play, we cannot say; but the fourth act is weak, and the end lamentable. Langley goes and gives himself up to worldly justice—the poor, the arrant fool. He does it to soothe his conscience, as if there were any consolation, any condonation, in the sterile desert of the English prison-house.

We cannot afford more space for this play, and, where there is so much promise in parts, we do not like the idea of saying unpleasant things of Mr. Gattie's comedy scenes; but we repeat it again and again, the introduction of comedy is when it is not required by the action, an evil that detracts from the effect of the play.

We cannot say much for the acting of Miss Nethersole's supporters. Mr. Elwood is certainly much too wooden, too bumptious, to render the part of Langley sympathetic, and Mr. Fernandez's didactic method is also not very fascinating. Mr. Bucklaw, though preachy in the three acts, was very sincere in the fourth. Miss Fanny Coleman is always a delightful *mere noble*.

It will be interesting to watch the career of *The Transgressors*; many people will certainly go and see Miss Nethersole, but will they care for the play so sombre, and so severely attacking a phase of the marriage law which is no less rotten to the core than that which was determined by the Jackson case?

There is a powerful plea in Gattie's play, but why! oh, why! did he weaken it so by the lame end? It seems as if a big gun had been fired with no other purpose than to rattle the air.

*April 1894*

## THE RIDDLE OF THE SPHINX.

SHALL IT BE THOUGHT OUT OR FOUGHT OUT?

For I dipt into the future far as human eye could see,  
Saw the vision of the world and all the wonder that would be ;

\* \* \* \* \*

Till the war-drums throbbed no longer, and the battle flags  
were furled

In the parliament of man, the federation of the world.

TENNISON.

THERE lies embalmed in ancient Grecian mythology the legend of the riddle of the Sphinx. Seated on a rock commanding the approach to Thebes, the Sphinx propounded a riddle to every Theban that passed by. If the problem were solved, well and good ; if not, the wayfarer perished miserably at the hands of the monster.

In like manner the Sphinx of Fate bars the path of progress and propounds to each successive civilisation a riddle, to fail to answer which is to perish. The civilisations of Nineveh, Babylon, Egypt, Greece, and Rome, each in turn failed to solve the problem, and each in turn succumbed, a prey to internal dissensions or overwhelmed by barbarian hordes from without.

Now it is our turn, and imaginative writers not a few have drawn in blood-red colours many a graphic pen-picture of the appalling devastation and carnage likely to ensue if the industrial, social, and international problems with which the Sphinx of Fate confronts our modern civilisation should come to be fought out instead of being thought out. That, failing a peaceful solution of these problems, resort must be had to the stern arbitrament of war, cannot be gainsaid ; and that in such an event, Europe, now a vast armed camp, would become the arena of a Titanic struggle, out-heroding in carnage and bloodshed all previous wars, is but too probable. The engines of war now possessed by the various Powers are in all conscience deadly and destructive enough, but it can hardly be hoped that the limits of possibility in that direction have yet been reached. Should Science and Invention realise to-morrow the dreams of yesterday, we may yet see aerial navies raining down on ships, forts, and armies explosives of so deadly a character that no work of

human hands and no body of men, however brave and well-disciplined, could withstand the onset. We may yet see, as pictured in a recent "prophetic novel," an aerial petroleuse circling above the crowded streets of our modern Babylon, pouring down upon the sea of upturned faces a stream of blazing oil, and leaving in her wake a lurid track of ruin and devastation. Even now, though happily such weapons as these exist as yet only in the imagination, no man can view with equanimity the present state of affairs in Europe and the fearful possibilities that would be conjured up were the leash once slipped, and the millions of men now under arms set at one another's throats.

One might contemplate even such a prospect with a certain amount of philosophy, were it possible that by any such means a permanent settlement could be arrived at. It is manifest, however, that the ordeal of war can offer no enduring and satisfactory solution of the problems now agitating the public mind the world over. These problems are largely of an economic character. They cannot be decided by an appeal to club law, but must be thought out carefully and considerately. Failing that, war, universal war, is inevitable, and our modern civilisation, unable to solve the riddle of the Sphinx, will perish miserably, as have so many civilisations in the past.

With all due diffidence, and with an ever-present sense of the vital importance of the question, I shall endeavour, in what follows, to outline what I believe to be the answer to that riddle.

Beginning with the Australasian Colonies, I purpose to show how the adoption of the principle of absolute freedom of trade would result, first in the federation of those colonies; then in Imperial federation, to be followed by the federation of all the English-speaking races; and lastly, in the federation of the world.

"Ha! Ha!" methinks, laughs the unwary critic, "that is no new dream. We have heard all that before. Cobden, Bright, and all the early free-traders prophesied that universal free-trade and the consequent federation of the world would follow upon England's adoption of the free-trade principle."

Such criticism, however, is not to the point, for by "absolute freedom of trade" I mean much more than the free-trade, so called, now in vogue in Great Britain. Absolute freedom of trade involves not merely freedom to exchange but freedom to produce, for the production of goods is necessarily antecedent to their exchange. In order that production may be free it is essential that labour, the active factor in wealth production, should have freedom of access to that raw material—the land—without which man is powerless to produce. It is also necessary that all the multiplicity of rates and taxes that now hamper trade and industry should be abolished.

To deal first with the problem of colonial federation.

On all lands the spirit of industrial and commercial jealousy that

prevails between the Australasian Colonies, exemplified as it is by the hostile tariffs which seek to benefit each colony at the expense of the others, is admitted by colonial federationists to be one of the most serious barriers to anything like successful federation. So long as the idea obtains that the commercial and industrial interests of one colony are necessarily opposed to the commercial and industrial interests of the rest; so long as the idea obtains that the prosperity of each colony can best be secured by the imposition of tariffs which interfere with and hamper the trade of the others, besides putting a check upon the growth of that sense of community of interest and of that mutual sympathy and goodwill which would inevitably result from free commercial intercourse; so long, whatever may be done in the way of patching up a mere political federation cannot secure that union of heart and hand without which all federation will be found in times of stress and danger valueless and soulless.

Such reasoning applies with, if possible, even greater force to that federation which seeks to enclose within the common bond of brotherhood not merely the whole of the English-speaking races, but the whole world.

I am aware that even in those colonies which do not bow the knee to the Protection fetish it is believed that the customs tariff affords the only sufficient and constant source of revenue open to them. But I contend that an examination of the subject in all its bearings will show not only that protective duties do not and cannot protect and encourage industry, not only that customs duties are unnecessary and evil, but that had the Australasian Colonies from the first based their financial policy upon sound economic principles, they need never have levied a rate or a tax upon industry and commerce, and need never have incurred the heavy public debts which now hang like so many mill-stones round their necks.

The fundamental misconception of protectionists is, I think, as to the uses of money. They do not recognise that money is a mere ready-reckoner and medium of exchange, and that all trade consists in the ultimate analysis in the exchange of goods for goods. Did they realise this, they would see that for every pound's worth of goods imported into a country a pound's worth of goods must be manufactured within that country to exchange for it; that the more goods there are imported, the more goods must be exported to pay for them; and, therefore, that the free importation of goods, so far from curtailing the demand for home labour, would greatly stimulate that demand, and thus raise both wages and profits. Even granting for the sake of argument that protection could raise wages and profits, what would be the immediate result of such an event? In these days of quick and cheap communication the result would be that capital and labour would at once begin to flow to the colony

that enjoyed the benefits of protection, and would continue to flow thither until the rate of wages and profits was reduced to the outside level. For, like water, wages and profits always find their own level. But the effect of this influx of labour and capital would be that the demand for land, which forms the basis of all industry, would increase, and ultimately, as in England before the repeal of the Corn Laws, the landlord would reap all the benefit of the protective tariff.

Protective tariffs, therefore, do not and cannot permanently raise wages and profits, and so far from benefiting the colonies that adopt them, hamper their trade with the other colonies, and tend to promote a feeling of antagonism of interest, and to foster and intensify intercolonial jealousies and animosities.

Nor are protective tariffs, revenue tariffs, or any of the other rates and taxes now levied upon labour and labour products a necessity of colonial finance. By the growth and development of each one of the colonies a fund has been created which, if appropriated by their respective Governments to State purposes, would amply suffice for all the expenses of government, both general and local.

Having spent some seven or eight years in New Zealand, the facts with regard to that colony are naturally more familiar to me than those with respect to the other colonies; but the past financial history of the various colonies has been so similar—their present financial position being, roughly speaking, the same—that in giving the case of one of them I practically give the case of all. And what are the facts? Some sixty or seventy years ago there were, practically speaking, no white people in New Zealand, and the value of the land was *nil*. To-day, however, with a population of little more than 650,000, and with a loan expenditure upon public works of some £30,000,000 (£10,000,000 of the present public debt of £40,000,000 was incurred by the Maori war), the value of the land, exclusive of improvements carried out by private individuals, is estimated at upwards of £75,000,000—a value which is entirely due to the growth and development of the colony. It is, I think, an obvious principle that whatever value attaches to land by reason of the growth of a community and by reason of public improvements, should, since the value has been created by the public, belong to the public, and be appropriated by the State to public purposes. Had this principle been acted upon in Australasia the value given to the land by the phenomenal progress of the colonies has been so great that, I venture to say, the heavy public debts under which the colonies are now groaning would be non-existent, and the revenues derived from this source would have sufficed for all the expenses of State, both general and local, without any necessity for imposing those taxes on trade and industry which hamper the production of wealth and directly tend to reduce the wages of labour. If this

principle were acted upon in New Zealand to-day a tax of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. upon the capital value of the land—£75,000,000—would amply suffice for the whole of the expenses of government; and the present rates and taxes, totalling some £2,500,000, could be abolished; while with such a tax upon land values as would absorb the whole of the rental value of the land, the colony could begin to pay off its public debt at a substantial rate per annum.

The application of the same principle to the other Australian Colonies would show similar results. In New South Wales, for instance, according to the returns of Mr. Coghlan, the government statistician, the landowners of the colony estimated the value of the land in their possession at the end of 1891 at £192,714,000. This estimate was furnished under the influence of the fear that it might be used against them for the assessment of a tax upon land values, and it may therefore be taken for granted, as Mr. Coghlan points out, that the real value is considerably understated. Taking the owners' own estimate, however, we find that a tax of  $3d.$  in the £ would, even after allowing for the fall in speculative values, raise sufficient revenue to permit of the Customs taxes—which realise some £2,200,000—being entirely abolished. While, were the full rental value of the land absorbed by the State, all existing rates and taxes could be abolished, and such government services as railways, post and telegraphs, telephones, &c., could be rendered free of charge. In South Australia, too, we find that the rates and taxes of the colony amount to some £800,000, while the value of the land according to the last Land Tax valuation was about £30,000,000. With a tax of 3 per cent. upon land values it would, therefore, be possible to abolish all the present rates and taxes, while a tax of  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. would provide a handsome yearly surplus of £400,000 with which to pay off the public debt or to carry out further public improvements.

The principle of the taxation of land values has lately made great strides in the Australasian Colonies. In South Australia a tax of  $\frac{1}{2}d.$  in the £ has for some eight or nine years been imposed on the capital value of the land; and during the past year a Bill has passed both Houses of the Legislature empowering local bodies to levy upon the unimproved value of the land. In New Zealand a tax of  $1d.$  in the £ is levied on land values, and a Bill to enable local bodies to rate land values passed the Lower House last session, but was thrown out by "the Lords." As the Ministry has been returned to power by an overwhelming majority, the Bill, which was made a test-question at the election, may be considered safe. The Tasmanian House of Representatives also passed a Bill last session taxing land values up to £500 at  $\frac{1}{2}d.$  in the £, and over that amount at  $1d.$  in the £. The Bill was rejected by the Upper House, but has been adopted as a plank of the Ministerial platform,



for the forthcoming election. In Queensland, again, a Bill was passed by both Houses last year adopting the land value system of taxation for municipalities, and fixing the amount of the tax at 2*d.* in the £. Commenting on this the *Financial Reformer*, January 1894, says: "There is now no municipal taxation upon improvements in Queensland, and the result of the application of the principle has more than realised expectations regarding revenue, while it has been found to considerably lighten the burden of taxation on users of land throughout the country districts." In New South Wales, too, progress is reported. The Local Government Bill drafted by the present Government will empower local bodies to tax land values, and a party of 25 out of a Parliament of 111 members has recently been formed with the taxation of ground-rents as its principal plank.

The vitality and expansive and federative power of the principle of absolute freedom of trade may be amply illustrated by the case of New Zealand. In that colony, which could readily support 30,000,000 of people—six times the present population of the whole of Australasia—there are now only some 650,000 inhabitants, yet the "sweating system" is by no means unknown and the unemployed difficulty has at times assumed serious proportions. The reason for that, however, is not far to seek, for out of the 19,000,000 acres alienated from the Crown upwards of 17,000,000 are controlled by 1600 individuals, four of whom "own" 600,000 acres between them, while 17,000 families, numbering some 80,000 souls, have to exist as best they may on a beggarly 300,000 acres. Were such a tax imposed upon land values as would secure the whole of the ground-rent for the State, the barriers of land monopoly would be broken down, and the present £2,500,000 of rates and taxes could be abolished. And, the tax being levied on the full annual value of the land, whether the land were put to use or not, land now held out of use for speculative purposes would be forced into the market. The speculative element in land values would thus be eliminated and rents would fall to the economic standard. Thus, instead of paying rent, rates, and taxes as at present, the labour and capital at work in New Zealand would have to pay *no rates, no taxes, and a lower rent*—for the tax on land values, though a tax in form, is, economically speaking, rent. This would put the labour and capital at work in the other colonies, where they would still have to pay rent, rates, and taxes, at so grave a disadvantage as compared with the labour and capital of New Zealand, that they could no longer compete successfully with New Zealand. As a result, labour and capital would rapidly flow towards New Zealand, and as that colony could readily accommodate six times the total population of Australasia, the other colonies, if they wished to avoid depopulation, would be obliged to adopt the same principle.

It may be interesting to note in passing that the depression in the Australasian Colonies is in every case traceable to land monopoly, and to the penal taxation of trade and industry. In South Australia, for example, it is calculated that some 703 persons "own" more than half the land values of the colony; while it is estimated that less than 600 persons monopolise more than half of New South Wales. The other colonies are in very much the same position, and in all of them labour and capital are heavily burdened with rates and taxes in order to meet the interest on the heavy public debts which have been so recklessly and so needlessly incurred.

With the adoption of absolute free-trade throughout Australasia, and the abolition of the hostile tariffs that now divide the colonies the one from the other, the increased commercial and social intercourse that would follow would tend to soften down and remove the existing intercolonial jealousies and to promote intercolonial friendship and union, thus affording all the benefits of federation without the necessity for bonds of red-tape, sealing-wax, and parchment. If anything more were needed, the various colonies could readily—as Sir Geo. Grey, "the G. O. M. of New Zealand," has frequently suggested—arrive at an understanding by which, on a demand being made by one or more of their number, a Federal Council could be summoned to deal with matters affecting the common interest. Sir George has always deprecated the summoning of such a Council when there would be nothing for it to do but to get into mischief, and considers that the machinery outlined above would amply meet the requirements of the case.

Now the Australasian Colonies are capable of supporting at a very modest computation a population of 100,000,000—very nearly three times the population of the British Isles. Were such a tax imposed upon the land values of Australasia as would absorb the whole of the rental value of the land, the whole of the present rates and taxes on trade and industry could be abolished, and the millions of acres of land now held out of use by speculators and monopolists would be forced into the market. Under such conditions a field of immigration would be opened up that could readily absorb the population of the United Kingdom. A great exodus of all those who were dissatisfied with the conditions of labour at home, and who looked with longing eyes to the colonies where trade and industry would be untaxed, and where wages and profits would be much higher, would at once take place, and in order to avoid depopulation England herself would be compelled to adopt the same policy.

I have shown that absolute free-trade is, for the Australasian Colonies, financially and economically practicable. It is practicable also in this country. For while the total rates and taxes of the United Kingdom amount to some £128,000,000 per annum, the

rental value of the land, as distinguished from buildings and other improvements, amounts to upwards of £160,000,000—an estimate based on the Income Tax returns, which, to say the least, are not likely to err on the side of exaggeration.

As in Australasia, also, the adoption of the principle of absolute free-trade would solve the labour problem. The State would appropriate the £160,000,000 of ground-rent by means of a tax on land values, and could, therefore, afford to remit the whole of the present £128,000,000 of rates and taxes. This would give a great stimulus to trade and industry. While the tax being levied on the full annual value of the land, whether the land were put to use or not, the whole of the 18,000,000 acres now held out of use would be forced into the market, and the tax would compel the full utilisation of much land which is now labour-starved and only half used. Land speculation would therefore be abolished, and rents would be proportionately reduced. Thus, instead of paying rent, rates, and taxes, the labour and capital of the United Kingdom would have to pay *no rates, no taxes, and a lower rent*. Under such conditions a land which, according to Prince Krapotkin, Alderman Mechi, the late Lord Derby, and other authorities is capable of supporting from 50,000,000 to 70,000,000 of people, could surely support in ease and comfort its present population of 38,000,000!

Canada would quickly follow suit; and with Australasia to the South stretching forth her hands in welcome, and saying: "Come and join us. Come and share in the benefits of free land and untaxed industry. Our fertile plains, our mighty forests, and our rich mineral deposits afford abundant scope for nearly twice your present population"—with Canada to the North, also holding out her hands and echoing the same cry—and with England, distant scarce six days' journey, her trade and industry freed from taxation, her land rescued from the grip of the monopolist, and capable of supporting on home-grown food almost twice her present population—the United States would soon be compelled by the logic of events to adopt the same course.

Thus would absolute free-trade pave the way for the federation of the English-speaking races, and ultimately for the federation of the world.

For with England at their doors enjoying the blessings and advantages resulting from the breaking down of the barriers of land monopoly and the removal of the rates and taxes that now hamper and discourage trade and industry, the Continental nations could not long afford to retain, did they even desire to do so, their present crushing burdens—their top-heavy armaments and their grievous rates and taxes. The Anglo-American Federation could guarantee the peace of the world, and the then useless armaments could be dispensed with, and all customs tariffs and other imposts

that trammel industry and set nation against nation would be abolished.

Then, as the international intercourse brought about by unrestricted commerce gradually toned down and at length removed the racial prejudices and hatreds engendered by mutual ignorance, distrust, and fear, the nations would slowly but none the less surely come to realise that, so far from their being natural enemies, their best and truest interests are identical, and thus would the federation of the world become an accomplished fact.

\* \* \* \* \*

I fully recognise that in matters political, social, and industrial it is absolutely impossible that a position of stable equilibrium should be arrived at except along the lines of truth and justice. I am also aware that to many of my readers it will appear that the plan of operations I have outlined above involves a gross violation of the rights of property and of the fundamental canons of justice. To such I submit the following brief statement of the ethical basis upon which I found my proposal: All men have equal rights to life. The use of the earth is essential to the life of all men. Therefore all men must have equal rights to use the earth. But all men have also equal rights to liberty. Therefore, whatever each man makes by the application of his labour to the land is his as against the world, for to force him to yield up to another without return a portion of the product of his labour would be to make him to that extent a slave. The true right of property is, therefore, the right of the producer to the product of his toil. The landowner, *quid* landowner, produces nothing, and is therefore not entitled to receive rent merely because he "owns" the land; and since the application of labour to the land is the only method of producing wealth, it inevitably follows that, to whatever extent the landlord receives what he has not earned, the workers must to that extent go short of that which they have earned. Moreover, the rental value of the land, as shown by the case of New Zealand, is due solely to the action of the community. For, apart from population, land has no value whatever. It can have no value until at least two persons want the same piece, and the value of the land rises with each increase in the number of the competitors for the use of the land. As population increases land values rise; as population decreases land values fall; and when population disappears land values also disappear. Land values, in short, are created by, and therefore belong to, the whole community.

ARTHUR WITBY.

## WHAT MAY HAPPEN TO A BRITISH CAPTAIN.

A STATE paper recently issued by the Government of New South Wales, under the title of *The Report from the Select Committee of the Legislative Council on the "Costa Rica Packet" Case*, is a document calculated to make people rub their eyes in astonishment, and ask themselves with unaffected incredulity whether the piratical proceedings therein detailed by a foreign Power towards a captain flying the British flag could have possibly taken place at the close of the nineteenth century. The Palmerstonian tradition, that the British flag is a sure and all-sufficient protection against outrage or indignity in any part of the civilised world, has for so long been an accepted rhetorical commonplace, that it comes upon us with quite a shock of indignant surprise, and with all the force of an unpleasantly humiliating revelation, to learn that in the immediate neighbourhood of one of the most important sections of Greater Britain a British captain may be summarily seized by the representatives of a foreign Power, taken a thousand miles away from his ship, imprisoned in a noxious, insanitary dungeon, subjected to all manner of indignities, and, after a wholly unwarrantable detention of twenty-eight days, discharged without the semblance of a trial, or the smallest word of apology, and left to find his way back to his ship as best he can.

The master mariner who was fated to undergo these repulsive and extraordinary experiences bears the name of John Bolton Carpenter, of Sydney, New South Wales. He left that port on the 15th July, 1891, in command of the *Costa Rica Packet*, a well-equipped barque, bound for a whaling cruise in the seas surrounding the Malay Archipelago. On November 1 the barque called in for a supply of fresh provisions at Ternate, an island in the Moluccas Passage under the control of the Netherlands-India Government, who are officially represented there by a Resident. Immediately after his arrival Captain Carpenter was sent for by this Resident, and on his obeying the injunction, was promptly placed under arrest. Inquiring what was the nature of the charge on which he had been arrested, the Resident replied that he had no information on the subject, beyond an order from the Court at Macassar to effect

the arrest. Captain Carpenter energetically protested against such treatment, and represented to the Resident the serious consequences likely to ensue from the arbitrary arrest and detention of a whaling captain at the beginning of the whaling season. But it was all of no avail. Even Captain Carpenter's liberal offer to enter into a bond for 100,000 guilders, equivalent to £8000 of English money, that he would deliver himself up to the Court at Macassar at the end of nine or ten weeks, in consideration of his being set at liberty for that period, so that he, his principals, and his crew might not lose the profits of their whaling enterprise, was unceremoniously refused on the plea that "there was no such thing as bail in Dutch countries." Thereupon Captain Carpenter, before being removed to gaol, informed the Resident that he would hold the Dutch Government responsible for all losses occurring to himself, his ship and her crew, in consequence of their unwarrantable action.

It is a significant circumstance, and one that helps to explain the high-handed proceedings of the Dutch authorities at Ternate, that there was no British representative on that island. As a matter of fact, there were no English people nearer than Sourabaya, a distance of more than a thousand miles.

About 11 P.M. on the fourth day of his imprisonment at Ternate, the gaoler entered the cell of Captain Carpenter and told him that he was to start at once for Macassar. Taken on board a steamer Captain Carpenter found to his disgust and indignation that the authorities had arranged a "deck passage" for him amongst the coolies, where he would be exposed to the weather without shelter or bedding, and would have nothing to eat save rice and salt fish. In order to secure better accommodation he had to pay for a berth in the second cabin out of his own pocket. The voyage to Macassar occupied ten days, and on the arrival of the steamer there, Captain Carpenter was taken ashore and cast into the ordinary criminal gaol. Over the door of the cell in which he was placed there ran the cheerful inscription, "For Condemned Europeans." The theory that every man must be held to be innocent until he is proved guilty, apparently finds no place in the canons of Dutch jurisprudence as interpreted by the Macassar representatives of the Netherlands-India Government. For the sake of companionship Captain Carpenter would have been pleased to have another "condemned European" as a cell comrade, but no such alleviation of his woes was forthcoming. On the contrary, the cell was already in the possession of a sick Malay prisoner when he was thrust into it, and for twelve days the uncharged and arbitrarily arrested master of a British barque had to submit to this degrading and repulsive association. The sanitary arrangements of the place, as detailed in evidence by Captain Carpenter before the Select Committee of the Legislative Council of New South Wales, were of the most abomin-

able description, and the only exercise permitted to the Captain was in a large courtyard simultaneously used for the same purpose by the chain-gang and all the prisoners in the establishment. At six o'clock in the evening he was locked up in the cell, and there he had to remain in total darkness until six in the morning: For the first two days of his imprisonment at Macassar Captain Carpenter went without food for the very good and sufficient reason thus stated by himself: "I would not eat the food at all. The food for all the prisoners was brought in by coolies. The rice was in a basket, and the meat in a box, and it was dished out by the dirty hand of one of the native convicts on to a plate, and was given to us without any knife or fork or anything else. I refused to eat it." After forty-eight hours of abstinence from such uninviting prison viands, Captain Carpenter was allowed to communicate with Mr. Bernard, apparently the only Englishman residing in Macassar, and through the friendly offices of this gentleman, his meals were sent in from outside during the remainder of his detention.

It was not until the sixth day of his imprisonment at Macassar that Captain Carpenter was officially informed of the nature of the charge that was to be preferred against him. An exceedingly flimsy, unsubstantial, nebulous charge it was. The incident to which it related occurred four years previously on the occasion of a former visit of Captain Carpenter to these waters, and is thus described by himself:

"On the 24th January, 1888, we saw a derelict prow, sunken and water-logged, with just the top of the deck floating above the water, and with a big hole in her bottom. We found her drifting thirty-two miles from the nearest point of land. We first saw her in the evening. Next morning she was a little closer to us. The evening before, when the derelict was a long way off, the men asked me to let them go after it, but I would not allow them to lower the boat. But next morning at daylight the prow being a little closer to us they lowered the boat, and brought it alongside the ship. When it was alongside, the men found a few boxes which they had rooted out, and which they brought on deck. There were a few cases of arrack, a couple of cases of native brandy, or something or other, and a tin of kerosene oil. We took these few odds and ends out of the prow.

"I went into a Dutch port about three weeks afterwards—the port of Batjan—and reported the whole matter. I had it put down in my ship's log, and in my own official log, and although all these logs were handed to the Government representative there, nothing was said about the matter. When the arrack was taken on board the ship, it was put on deck, and some of the crew got hold of it, and they had a fight, and I ordered the whole of it to be thrown overboard. Instead of throwing it all overboard, they stowed a couple of boxes away. The fourth officer was drunk every day, and I could not imagine where he got the drink from, because I never carry anything of that sort on board the ship. When we got to Batjan, the crew could get liquor on shore. I suppose they got plenty of it there, but they told some one that there were a few bottles of arrack on board the ship, and a Chinaman came off and asked to buy it. I told him we had not any, but the crew said we had, and they unearthed these couple of

boxes, and I allowed them to change it for 75 lb. of sugar. That was my offence—my piracy."

And this was the trumpery accusation that served the Dutch authorities in the Moluccas as a sufficient pretext for dragging a British captain a thousand miles away from his ship, treating him in the most outrageous manner, and ruining the prospects of what promised to be a very profitable whaling cruise.

Not the least extraordinary feature of this singular case was the refusal of the Dutch authorities to allow Captain Carpenter to telegraph his arrest and unfortunate position to the British authorities at Batavia. He repeatedly requested permission to do this, but this natural and reasonable request only elicited jeers and laughter from his captors. Another illustration of the astounding arrogance of these foreign officials is afforded by their refusal to let the captain see the lawyer whom he had engaged, and whom he desired to consult. Five times was the Captain brought before a Macassar magistrate, and interrogated in private. As showing the wholly unnecessary and uncalled-for indignities to which he was exposed, the manner in which the captain was taken from the prison to the presence of the examining magistrate may be instructively quoted :

"CHAIRMAN : After reading your evidence you wish the Committee to understand that there are some things you wish to tell them which may be of importance ? Yes.

" Amongst others I believe is the mode in which you were conducted from the prison to the office of the Dutch magistrate in Macassar ? Yes.

" Will you describe it to us, please ? I was taken out of the prison by a native policeman, armed with a cutlass and a rope, as he takes a common murderer, and in that way I was walked a distance of about three-quarters of a mile across the town to be a spectacle for every one in Macassar.

" What was the object of the rope and the cutlass ? I suppose if I had proved obstreperous the native policeman would have used them. The rope, I know, is used to tie up a native malefactor if he will not walk along the street, and I suppose I would have been served in the same way if I had not gone quietly.

" You, having a knowledge of the customs of these people and the feeling amongst the natives, realised that it was the greatest indignity that could have been put upon you ? Yes.

" Did it appear to be an intentional act on the part of the Dutch authorities ? I do not know whether such treatment was meant for me alone, or whether any one else would have been served in the same way. As I never saw a European in custody there before, I do not know how they are treated.

" You were taken in the same way as you have seen them take the ordinary native criminals ? Yes.

" At what time in the day did this happen ? I was taken from the gaol to the Magistrate's office between 9 and 10 o'clock in the morning, and brought back again between 1 and 2 o'clock in the afternoon.

" You were examined before the Magistrate ; was it a public examination in any way ? No ; it was altogether private.



“Were you ever confronted with any witnesses? I never saw a witness from the time I was arrested until I was discharged.”

It was not until the close of this series of private examinations that the Captain was informed by the Magistrate that he would be committed for trial for piracy in connection with the derelict prow, and would be allowed ten or fifteen days to prepare his defence. But long before those ten or fifteen days had expired the Dutch authorities, finding that the unjustifiable arrest and detention of Captain Carpenter had come to the knowledge of the British Consul at Batavia and the Governor of the Straits Settlements, apparently came to the conclusion that their best policy was to clap a sudden extinguisher on the whole proceedings. There is a certain amusing audacity in the characteristically unceremonious style in which they dismissed Captain Carpenter after having kidnapped him and spoiled his whaling enterprise.

“On the sixth day after I was committed for trial,” says the Captain, “the Sheriff of Macassar came to the door of my cell and told me to get my traps ready. I got them ready, and he then conducted me to the front door of the prison, where he told me I was free to go; the information being conveyed to me in the Malay word ‘pigie,’ which is equivalent to our ‘clear out.’ From this point my existence was practically ignored by the local authorities, and I was left, after the hard treatment to which I had been subjected, to find my way back to my ship 1600 miles away as best I could.”

The mere recital of these facts, disclosing as they do the amount of contempt and degradation that may be heaped upon a British master mariner by the representatives of a puny foreign Power, is certainly calculated to raise a doubt whether our boasted naval supremacy is a mythical tradition or a living actuality. The Select Committee appointed by the Legislative Council of New South Wales to consider and report on Captain Carpenter's case pointedly and forcibly suggest this important consideration in the concluding words of their report: “Beyond and above all, as a matter of Imperial concern, is the feeling which will be forced on loyal subjects that should not the full reparation claimed be quickly paid on the demand of her Majesty's Government, the protection supposed to be afforded by the British flag to the most humble subject of the Queen is not the glorious inalienable right it has always been considered.” Lord Rosebery, writing to Sir Horace Rumbold, the British Minister at the Hague, formulates the view of her Majesty's Government that there was “not even such a case of reasonable suspicion as could be treated as justifying the arrest of Captain Carpenter, and her Majesty's Government are therefore of opinion that in the absence of reasonable evidence, Captain Carpenter is entitled to compensation for personal damage.” Cold, precise, formal, diplomatic language of this description is of course in accordance with the established

etiquette of the Foreign Office, but after reading the narrative of Captain Carpenter's arbitrary arrest, degrading imprisonment, and contemptuous release, most undiplomatic people will feel inclined to characterise the action of the Netherlands-India authorities in far stronger and forcible terms. They will also be disposed to entirely dissent from the decision of the Foreign Office, that £2500 would be adequate compensation to Captain Carpenter. It can easily be understood that the Dutch Government are quite willing and even eager to be relieved so cheaply of the consequences of the barbarous behaviour of their representatives at Macassar towards an inoffensive British master mariner, but it will be very regrettable indeed if they are allowed to escape so lightly. The Australian press and public have taken up Captain Carpenter's case with the keenest sympathy and earnestness, and there is general indignation at the Antipodes as the result of the suggestion that a grant of £2500 from the Dutch Government would be ample satisfaction to Captain Carpenter for the unmerited wrongs he has endured and the serious financial losses entailed upon him by the high-handed action of the Dutch authorities in the Moluccas. The Select Committee has reported unanimously that Captain Carpenter is entitled to compensation of not less than £10,000, and when it is stated and has been proved to the satisfaction of the Select Committee that the Captain has been permanently injured in health by his horrible imprisonment and pecuniarily ruined by the loss of the whaling season consequent on that imprisonment, few will be disposed to deny the moderation and reasonableness of his claim.

Apart from the personal aspect of this particular case, it is obviously necessary to teach these piratical foreigners an exemplary lesson in the international proprieties with a view to the protection of future British mariners who may find themselves in these seas, and who may have occasion to call at some port under the jurisdiction of the Netherlands-India Government. As the Select Committee very properly point out :

"Quite independently of the wrong to Mr. Carpenter, action of such a character by the authorities of a nation whose possessions are in the immediate neighbourhood of Australia, is a grave peril to every subject of the British Empire whose business may take him to the seas immediately to the north of this Continent, and who might be obliged, by accident or necessity, to enter a port of Netherlands-India, as it is manifest that a friendless man of British nationality may be arrested and charged, on the unsupported evidence of a man of bad character, with some shadowy offence said to have been committed years before, in refutation of which, from the lapse of time, it would be impossible for him to procure witnesses having any knowledge of the incident, and he, perhaps, would be convicted and sentenced, though innocent, to a long imprisonment."

In the same connection, the Select Committee call attention to the very important fact that—

“Independently of the direct injury inflicted on the persons immediately concerned in this case, who are citizens of this Colony, the whole of Australia has suffered from the attitude assumed by the Netherlands-India Government, as further enterprise by our fellow-colonists has been checked when the field of the proposed operations has been the Malayan seas or islands, even though not subject to the Netherlands-India Government, from a fear that should the operators be forced by necessity to enter a port subject to that Power they might be subjected to outrage of similar character as unjustifiable as in the case of Mr. Carpenter.”

The *Sydney Morning Herald* has given expression to the general colonial sentiment, by pointing out that Captain Carpenter's is

“a case that might happen to any mariner sailing those seas and falling into the blundering hands of the Netherlands-India officials, who seem to exercise a somewhat high-handed authority in the waters of that archipelago. Like the Portuguese on the south-eastern coast of Africa, the Dutch administrators in Netherlands-India appear to require waking up to the fact that the world has been moving during the past hundred years or so. Those seas which have so long lain undisturbed under the somnolent rule of the Dutch, have become a great highway of commerce, in which the Australias have a large and ever-increasing interest; and it is intolerable that a British subject should be wantonly subjected to such an outrage as this without reparation being demanded and enforced.”

That reparation and compensation will be made to Captain Carpenter for the outrages and indignities he was compelled to undergo, may be taken for granted, seeing that the Government of the Hague has practically pleaded guilty to the charge of having, in the persons of its representatives in Netherlands-India, illegally and violently seized, deported, and ill-treated a British master-mariner. It only remains for the Foreign Office to insist that the reparation shall be complete and the compensation adequate to the injuries inflicted. To what extent the owners of Captain Carpenter's vessel are entitled to compensation, is a point to which the Select Committee devoted much time, care, and attention, and the result at which they have arrived is formulated in these terms :

“The claims made on the Netherlands Government for these losses, in addition to that of £10,000 by Captain Carpenter, are, on the part of the owners, £10,000, and on that of the subordinate officers and crew, £5000. The evidence shows that such claims are but reasonable and moderate demands in reparation for the injury sustained by them as a direct consequence of the arrest of the master, which in justice should be promptly paid, with interest for the delay that has occurred in settlement, and we would earnestly press on the Government the duty of its making the strongest representations to the Imperial Government to this effect on their behalf.”

The Imperial Government, on the advice of their law officers, Sir Charles Russell and Sir John Rigby, is indisposed to urge the claims of the owners and crew on the attention of the Dutch Government. Replying to a question of mine in the House of Commons on the subject, Sir Edward Grey, the Under-Secretary for Foreign

Affairs, while admitting the justice and propriety of Captain Carpenter's claim for compensation, added, as the opinion of the law officers of the Crown: "It is not, however, considered that the alleged loss to the crew and owners of the *Costa Rica Packet* can be properly included in the claim. That loss is not so necessarily the result of the arrest of the master as to make it a fit subject for a claim." It would of course be a piece of presumption on the part of any layman to argue a point of law with two such eminent counsellors as Sir Charles Russell and Sir John Rigby, and it may therefore be concluded that, as a matter of strict legality, the claims of the owners and crew cannot be entertained. It was, of course, open to the officers and crew of the *Costa Rica Packet*, after the arrest and imprisonment of their captain, to unfurl their sails, clear out of the harbour of Ternate, go away in search of whales, and leave Captain Carpenter, a prisoner in a foreign land, to his fate. Lawyers become habituated to looking at everything from a cold-blooded, intensely practical point of view, and this is probably the consideration that weighed with the Attorney-General and the Solicitor-General in advising the Foreign Office that the owners and the crew had no legal claim. But no unprejudiced person can read the evidence in detail with care and attention without coming to the same conclusion as the Select Committee arrived at—viz., that the losses sustained by the owners and crew were the direct and necessary consequence of the arbitrary arrest and imprisonment of the captain, and that, if not in law, certainly in equity, the former are no less entitled to substantial compensation than the latter. For it was clearly proved to the satisfaction of the Select Committee that Captain Carpenter, as the result of his thirty-five years' experience in these waters as a trader and whaler, had acquired a special and exclusive knowledge of the best whaling grounds and the right time to visit them. As that knowledge was virtually a valuable trade secret not shared in by, and not communicable to, any of the officers and crew, it follows that the latter, had they put to sea after the captain's arrest, would have been placed at a serious disadvantage, and would have incurred a responsibility of no little weight and magnitude.

The following extract from Captain Carpenter's evidence not only summarises the situation at the time of his outrageous arrest, but also conveys some interesting and little-known information as to the extent and importance of the whaling industry in Australasian waters :

"On what date does the whaling season commence in the neighbourhood of Ternate? I consider about the beginning of November. I have caught whales a few days before that date; but, as a general thing, we never troubled to whale before the 1st November.

"Then on the day of your arrest you had just arrived on your whaling ground? Yes. I went into Ternate to buy a few boat-loads of fresh provisions, and to get medical advice for one of the men. It was my

intention to go out again on the same day, and had I done so, I could have been on the whaling ground in twenty-four hours.

"I suppose, from your knowledge of the habits of whales, you expected to meet with whales almost daily until what day? Until the 10th January.

"Then your experience teaches you that the whaling season in those seas ceases about the 10th January? Yes; it ceases until the 1st June.

"Then from the 1st November until the 10th January was your opportunity for making a voyage? Yes.

"And you have every reason to believe that you would have had a highly successful voyage? Yes. From the experience of former voyages, I believe I should have done a great deal better than ever I did before, because I went before with only part of a crew, and with very indifferent whalers, but this time I went with a full crew and good whalers.

"In a former voyage how many boats did you lower? Generally three, but sometimes four.

"How many boats were you prepared to lower on this voyage? Six.

"On the voyage when you lowered three boats, do you remember the value of the oil captured? I took sixty-two whales between the 1st November and the 1st or 10th January.

"Roughly speaking, what was the value of those sixty-two whales? From £14,000 to £15,000.

"The marketable products of a sperm-whale are oil, spermaceti, and sometimes ambergris? Yes.

"You have a chance of getting ambergris in any whale you may capture? Yes.

"You always search for it? Yes.

"What is ambergris worth? Grey ambergris is sometimes quoted at £10 an ounce.

"How much has been got out of a whale? Two thousand pounds in weight, I have heard.

"Did you ever get any ambergris out of a whale? I got 50 lb. once.

"What did you sell it for? I did not sell it; I was only an officer of the ship.

"Ambergris is always a very saleable and marketable product? Yes.

"Then on a former voyage you absolutely obtained from £14,000 to £15,000 worth of oil during a similar season in a ship less efficiently equipped? Yes."

The claim of the officers and crew to compensation is based on the fact that it is the custom to admit them as partners in whaling enterprises. In the technical slang of the trade, they each receive a prescribed "lay," or fractional proportion of the profits of the cruise. That is the only payment they receive for their services. In the present instance it was stipulated that Captain Carpenter's "lay," or relative share of the profits was to be one-twelfth, the first mate's one-eighteenth, the second mate's one twenty-fifth, the third mate's one thirty-fifth, the fourth mate's one forty-fifth, the fifth mate's one fifty-fifth; the boat-steerers were to receive the same "lay" as the fifth mate, the steward and cook were to take one-sixtieth and the "lays" of the ordinary crew varied from one-hundredth to one hundred and fiftieth. As the cruise was brought to a sudden termination at the outset by the forcible seizure and removal of the captain to a distance of a thousand miles from his ship, none of these

"lays" were realised, and it does not seem unreasonable under the circumstances to call upon the Dutch Government and their official representatives, as the parties obviously and directly responsible for the non-realisation of the "lays," to make due and adequate restitution.

Last, but by no means least, the owners of the *Costa Rica Packet*, an association of enterprising Sydney citizens and British subjects, had a not unimportant "lay" in the business, that calls for consideration at the hands of the Foreign Office and the Government of the Hague. They had reckoned on a profit of £11,170, an estimate based on the returns of previous whaling cruises of the *Costa Rica Packet*. But the Netherlands-India officials not only deprived them of the opportunity of realising that profit, but actually subjected them to a positive loss of close on £8000. For, when Captain Carpenter, after his peculiar liberation from Macassar gaol, got back to Ternate, which he did not succeed in doing until some three months had elapsed, he found his crew prostrated with illness, the ship wholly neglected and seriously depreciated from lying idle so long in tropical waters, the ropes and sails rotting, and all hope of utilising the *Costa Rica Packet* for the whaling season gone. It was therefore deemed the best course to sell her at Singapore for what she would bring, and as the sale only realised £1250, whereas she had cost the owners £8930, according to the sworn testimony of their managing director, it certainly does seem to the ordinary non-legal mind that the owners have a pretty substantial foundation on which to build up a claim against the Government of the Hague for the resultant effects of the illegal and uncivilised conduct of their accredited representatives in Netherlands-India.

Such is the history of a curious and suggestive contemporary international episode—an episode that carries the mind back to those distant days when mariners ploughed the sea and entered strange ports at their peril, when a wide berth was given to every suspicious-looking sail, and no naval officer went ashore in a foreign country without a strong protecting bodyguard. It is surely an aggravating anachronism that in the last decade of the nineteenth century, in an era of universal peace when the comity of nations is understood to be an established reality, and not a mere figure of diplomatic speech, that a British captain cannot enter a port under the jurisdiction of a European State without liability to seizure on some stale and frivolous charge, deportation to a distance of a thousand miles, imprisonment under revolting conditions, liberation without trial, apology, or means of returning to his ship, and the utter ruin of his professional prospects. The Imperial Government has a plain duty to perform in this matter, and that is to strenuously assert its Imperial character and responsibilities and carry conviction to the minds and pockets of arrogant foreigners in out-of-the-way localities, clothed with a little brief authority, that they will not be permitted

to play fantastic tricks with British subjects with impunity. Australian colonists have taken up Captain Carpenter's case with warmth and earnestness because he is one of themselves, and because they feel an honest indignation at the gross treatment he received at the hands of the Netherlands-India authorities. They call upon the Imperial Government as a matter of right and duty to vindicate Captain Carpenter's character and claims, to exact full compensation, not only for the wrongs and outrages he was personally compelled to endure, but also for the concomitant losses of his principals and partners, and to emphasise the exemplary lesson that every colonial captain flying the British flag in the remotest and least frequented waters of the globe is as fully and absolutely under Imperial protection as if he were navigating the seas surrounding the British Isles.

J. F. HOGAN.

## MORE FACTS ABOUT THE WORKING OF THE GAME LAWS.

IN the WESTMINSTER REVIEW of October 1893 there appeared an article entitled "The Working of the Game Laws," in which was discussed the bearing of existing laws on the classes most immediately concerned—*e.g.*, the poachers, or persons supposed to be poachers. It is the writer's wish in approaching the subject to throw light upon the influence of the Game Laws upon the main body of the inhabitants of districts where preserving is extensively and vigorously carried on.

Such effects are for the most part unknown or unnoticed both by town and country people, for reasons easily understood. People that live in towns are often good enough to be genuinely interested in land questions—that is, in a theoretical way; and, among other moot points, this question of game preserving of course takes its place. But whether they are induced to condemn the existing system on theory or to excuse it, it is inevitable that they should in either case fail to grasp the actual condition of things, or to realise what actually happens in a phase of life they have little real experience of, except as visitors or from books.

Again, country people are often victims of a sort of dogged and stupid fatalism. They are hidebound to a great extent by immemorial usage, and having grown up amid a given set of customs, they come to suppose that there is something in the nature of things that renders all this as inevitable as the law of gravitation; so that the prevalence of obvious wrongs and abuses is traced back to the necessary conditions of existence in an imperfect world like this. "It seems to be wrong, but it always has been so, and must be so." The rustic mind is hardly at all exercised in detecting or redressing grievances, from pure want of power even to conceive of their removal, still less to suggest reasons for removing them, or means of doing it.

Thus the question is apt to escape attention on both sides—on the one hand because people know what should be but not what is, and on the other because they know what is so well that they can conceive nothing better. Here, then, I hope to show from my own experience the way in which existing arrangements affect the



general interests of the people—"respectable" or otherwise—of a rural district; I mean a district which, as often happens, is thoroughly under the thumb of its main landed proprietor.

To begin with, in such a locality the feudal system is to be found in full swing. In manuals of history one reads that feudalism was put an end to in the reign of Henry VII. This was only true so far as it concerned the nobles and upper classes of society. At the end of the nineteenth century it still survives and flourishes exceedingly, so far as concerns the "common people."

But why is the existing system feudal? Simply because the chief owner, who is sometimes practically the entire owner of the land and the houses as well, is able to make himself a despot; and if he has the power, it is not in human nature that he will lack the will. He may be a benevolent despot, often very much so, but he is a despot none the less; and even the most benevolent despotism cannot fail to produce its paralysing effects on the population that has long felt it.

The means by which such autocratic rule is maintained are fairly obvious. Lands are often let so that the landlord can take them away at short notice without compensation for such improvements as may have been made, while the tenants of the houses can be turned out in six months, and are merely tenants at will. They cannot object to this system of tenancy, because there is no choice, since the owner has a monopoly. The landlord often refuses to make any improvements, even in the case of needful sanitary alterations, as he cannot be made to see the need of them, and the tenant is afraid to call in the sanitary inspector from fear of incurring the landlord's displeasure and being turned out promptly. Even if he does so, and the inspector takes up the case in earnest, and reports it before the Board, the owner may easily snap his fingers in the face of the constituted authorities, and take his own way, and most likely no one will venture to compel him to comply with their decisions. This case actually took place quite recently. And if the landlord will not make improvements, the tenant cannot, without risking the loss of the entire sum sunk in his tenement if he is turned out of it.

All this certainly leads to a depreciation in the capital value of the property; but what matter, so long as monopoly keeps up rents? If any one desires to be independent, and to build a house for himself, the owner declines to sell the land altogether, except on the copyhold system involving reversion. This acts prohibitively in most cases.

Again, the feudalised condition of things is reflected in the prevailing mental condition which it brings about among the population.

That character is one of helpless dependence and incapacity for self-government.

Often enough the "squire," or other local magnate, wishes honestly to do his best for his tenantry, which means that he does for them most of the things that must positively be done, but generally no more, since nothing can be done in any way unless he takes the lead. The populace soon learn to be treated as children, and leaving both thought and action to their "betters," they become enervated, and lose the power, or never acquire it, of striking out any improvements, or organising any undertaking for their own benefit.

So far it must be admitted that I have wandered somewhat from the subject proper—that of Game Laws; it is necessary, however, to premise so much in order to explain conditions which render possible certain cases now to be adduced.

From and after this point I will confine myself to actual facts bearing on the question, as the writer of the former article referred to has done, and leave their application almost entirely to the reader; I should add, too, that I am willing to give the actual names of persons and places referred to in support of my statements, either to the Editor of this Review, or to any one else that has any real concern in asking for them.

Fact I. A medical man has a dog that comes presumably from a part of the country not haunted by gamekeepers. Therefore the dog's morals are not so strict as they should be as to foraging about, and he trespasses on the squire's preserves after rabbits. As a consequence the dog comes home one day with a gunshot in his body. To shoot a dog is a penal offence; but laws are meant for the lower orders and don't apply to the squire, so the medical man, being a lover of peace, treats the dog himself, and brings him round, and nothing whatever is said about the matter, though the deed lay between the squire and his gamekeeper. But the animal's "vile" habits get the better of him once more, and he returns to his forbidden sport. This time the squire himself happens to catch him at it. He knows the dog's owner, and is aware that an odd rabbit more or less is of small consequence in comparison with the value of the dog. He knows also, being himself a J.P., that to shoot a man's dog is unlawful. Yet he deliberately aims at the dog and kills him. He makes no effort to conceal the facts, but unblushingly tells them with his own mouth to the present writer. The doctor hears all about it and says nothing at all. Now supposing the law had taken its course in either of these cases, it is important to observe what would have happened, as all persons concerned in them know very well.

Had the gamekeeper been charged with the former offence, he

would have been brought for trial before his own master, the very person who in his private capacity has given him distinct orders to act like this—a somewhat grotesque position of things. The result would most likely have been that he would have been discharged with a caution not to do it again, accompanied possibly with a wink, especially as to shoot a dog twice is often unnecessary.

If the squire himself had been prosecuted on the same charge, one can only suppose that he would have been brought before himself or before his brethren on the bench, none of whom can afford to offend him, and the result may be guessed.

But this is not all; how would such prosecutions meanwhile affect the doctor? This can be briefly made plain. The doctor lives in a house. That house belongs, of course, to the squire, and the tenant knows very well that if he makes himself obnoxious to the owner he will be quickly ejected. But he cannot take another house because the rest belong to the squire too, so that if turned out he will be forced to abandon his practice and start elsewhere, and this just because he objects to his dog being arbitrarily shot. The doctor knows all this, but being a feudal inferior he has to put up with it; the *seigneur* has willed it so. Parallel cases might be given *ad nauseam*; yet no wholesome resentment seems to be excited in the neighbourhood, because the "serfs" are accustomed to this state of things and have known no other.

Fact II. is not unlike the former, but possibly outdoes it for effrontery. A private gentleman lives on the outskirts of that sacred enclosure—the preserves. It happens that there are a good many rats in the neighbourhood of his house, so it is necessary to have cats in order to keep them down. These cats have a strange way of disappearing one after another. It is, of course, easy enough to replace them; but still it is very annoying to have to do so continually, especially to lovers of cats. The neighbours account for their removal by unanimously ascribing it to the gamekeeper. This official seems a very civil and decent fellow personally, so the aggrieved housekeeper accosts him, and asks him pointblank whether he can account for the disappearances, "not to put too fine a point upon it," as Mr. Micawber would say—which means, of course, whether he has not shot the animals. The gamekeeper makes no attempt to repel the soft impeachment, but very candidly replies:

"Well, sir, you see I'm a servant, I have my orders, and I've got to obey them."

"But are you aware, keeper, that this is a penal offence?"

"Dare say it is, sir, but that's my orders."

"Who from?"

"Why, the squire, you know, of course."

The discussion thus terminates distinctly in favour of the gamekeeper; because the squire is, as before, a magistrate; and by virtue

of uniting the two functions in his own person he can afford to defy law with impunity, and to have his own way. There is, in fact, no remedy at all.

Fact III. throws a rather lurid side-light on the working of the Game Laws. Many preservers, zealous in the cause of sport, desire on that very account to keep the sympathies of the populace on their own side of the question, for reasons dictated by obvious expediency. As a bid for popularity, therefore, they think it prudent to provide some outlet to the sporting instincts of the people, which are rigidly repressed in almost all other directions. To this end a meeting for rabbit-coursing is arranged yearly, countenanced and encouraged by the landowner. In a particular case, with which the writer is familiar, the titled patron is prominent at anti-vivisection and anti-opium meetings; and the very windows of his drawing-room, where some of these meetings are held, look out upon the grounds that he generously lends for the rabbit-coursings. There it is not *one* rabbit that is put to pain, in pursuit of some definite and worthy object, but a hundred are mercilessly run to death and slaughtered in cold blood, for no better purpose than to satiate the innate savagery of a crowd of gloating roughs, and "lewd fellows of the baser sort," who would, most of them, be better employed on the treadmill; but as these wholesale cruelties are carried on in the sacred name of sport, no one thinks anything of them; especially as they are needful in order to keep the people in a good temper, and so that the owner may be all the better able to keep the rest of the sport to himself.

But this is by no means all the wholesale cruelty that preservers have to countenance consistently. All round the same estate which was referred to just now, and all round almost every preserve in England, more or less, gamekeepers are in the habit of placing steel traps, with the owner's concurrence or by his positive order, so as to catch the legs of dogs and other troublesome vermin. The miserable animal that is entrapped in one of these passes days and nights of continual agony before it dies, or is able to tear itself free from the merciless iron teeth, and sometimes lives through it leaving a limb behind. All this, too, happens in the name of sport, that is in order that a gentleman may enjoy rather better shooting than he otherwise would.

Fact IV. refers to the loss of natural freedom of movement inflicted upon a population by the restrictions that meet them everywhere in a highly preserved district.

The state of things is this. The whole of the land being at the disposal of the proprietor, he or his predecessors have naturally chosen all the more attractive or interesting portions of it for their own purposes; so that every river is rigidly guarded for fish, and the public are often not allowed even to walk on its banks. Each

stream that forms a dell is covered by a plantation, which is jealously kept for game, and so on with each other pretty or desirable bit that the country offers.

Thus there remains hardly any freedom of movement open to the public but that of walking to and fro along the highroads and pathways; to roam at large across the country is not possible without constant collision with gamekeepers. The result is that the natives of a district of this sort hardly ever know the land that bore them, and are rigidly excluded from even the simplest enjoyment of it, that of walking upon it; so that their life becomes one dull and hopeless routine, and is robbed of the healthy variety which country life naturally presents.

The mental tone of the population is of course an outcome of its surroundings, and cannot but vary along with its conditions. It does so by presenting a tinge not so much of resignation, as of a stolid acceptance of the inevitable, surly or servile, as the case may be; and results in an apathetic temper at once sodden, sluggish, and without aspirations.

Now, what we are aiming at just at present is not the possession of the land for the people—"England for the English"—that is too much to ask for just now, but at least let us demand the privilege of seeing our native land and walking over it, and not living on it as aliens that are forbidden to know anything about it. The people are the product of the land at any rate as much as the rabbits, even as much so as the pheasants themselves; and therefore have as much claim as they to live upon it in freedom.

One or two general considerations may not be out of place here as a moral to all this:

It is obvious that in the working of the system at present prevailing a huge waste in the productive power of the land is involved. Large tracts that are intrinsically suitable for crops are now laid out of cultivation altogether and only used for grazing or occupied by woods. These latter are certainly beneficial in an indirect way on climate, but that object would never have been adequate to warrant their withdrawal from tillage. But besides all this, the annual value of what is actually eaten and destroyed by the preserved animals themselves is itself very great. I have it on the authority of a Conservative owner who still holds by the "squire and parson duet" arrangement, that while the common dictum, that three hares eat as much as one sheep, may be somewhat exaggerated, yet that the destructiveness of hares, foxes, and other animals is very considerable; while the amount of Indian corn that has to be supplied to the pheasants on a single estate amounts to nearly 200 lbs. per day, a quantity sufficient to supply a good sized village with bread. Surely this is a monstrous abuse of the land and its products, especially at a time when its resources are at their lowest.

All this very serious national loss, both to the land capable of producing and to the results of its production, are incurred in the interests of a special and very limited class, or rather, not so much in their real interests as for the enhancement of their immediate pleasures.

The class in question, however, that of the landowners, happens to be precisely the class that looks back regretfully on the days of Protection and would welcome their return.

To hanker after a corn-tariff in order to afford the landed interest an artificial stimulus, and all the while to support a policy which must seriously depress the landed interest by lessening its productive power must surely appear a glaring inconsistency.

Then again, besides this waste of land, there is the no less huge waste of capital that has to be devoted to sporting objects. There is the army of gamekeepers, the army of horses and of dogs, and the innumerable accessories, all of them expensive, that are necessary besides. All this comes, of course, in the last instance, out of the landowner's pocket; though, in the first instance, it has come out of the land and out of the sweat of the labourers. But, at any rate, the owner legally enjoys his undoubted "right to do as he likes with his own." By all means. But then laws may be changed, and changed so that this particular way of employing his superfluous funds shall be no longer open to him, because its employment in that way is found not to be conducive to the national well-being, and especially to that of the land itself.

So orthodox an economist as J. S. Mill lays it down as an axiom that private ownership in land is only defensible on any terms in the interest of the land itself, that is, in order that the owner of it may have a sufficient incentive to improve it to the fullest extent.

Looking at the matter from this point of view it is easy to see how the interests of the land would be affected by the abolition of game laws. There would then be more land to cultivate, and more capital to spare for its cultivation, and more to spare, too, for repairs and improvements, and to cover reductions of rent in hard times such as the present. If, then, ownership of land is maintained for the good of the land, it surely becomes us to hedge it with such conditions as seem most for the land's benefit, or at any rate to cease from arbitrarily hampering it with conditions that are clearly injurious.

But as soon as we discover that improvement is no longer held as the sole excuse for ownership, but that the fact of ownership is itself distorted into a barefaced right of neglect and misuse, and also used as a weapon of oppression, then it is surely time, granting that ownership is to be tolerated at all for the present, to consider how to make it tolerable.

## A SHORT HISTORY OF MARRIAGE.

So much of the happiness and prosperity of mankind depends upon the right relations of the sexes, that it is desirable that all should have a clear perception of the origin and nature of marriage, and of the conditions which it requires. We live in an age in which social questions are becoming of vital importance, and of these marriage must occupy a front place. Old prejudices are dying out, ancient barriers are visibly decaying, stubborn ignorance is yielding to multiplied knowledge, floods of benevolent and intellectual light are thrown upon every dark spot in our social system, and, therefore, it is not possible that the unjust and one-sided views of sex-unions still prevailing can for long remain unchanged.

Bishop Taylor said: "The first blessing God gave to man was society, and that society was a marriage, and that marriage was confederate by God Himself, and hallowed by a blessing." But McLellan says: "Marriage laws, agnatic relationship, and kingly government, belong, in the order of development, to recent times."

All divines agree with Taylor, all men of science with McLellan. Unfortunately, our present marriage laws were instituted by the divines. It remains for us to bring them into harmony with those advocated by the scientists. For all these human laws, which the theologians call sacred because of their ecclesiastical origin, were, from their supposititious character, intended to become stationary; whereas, marriage is by its very nature progressive. It advances as minds advance, and the ideals of the past can never be satisfactory nor suitable in the wiser future. Thus every endeavour to hinder its development is a crime against humanity.

In our brief remarks upon the subject we shall mainly rely for our facts upon those agreements exhibited by a number of original and independent investigators of unquestioned abilities and veracity. Nor shall we forget that "the concealment of truth is the only indecorum known to science, and that to keep anything secret within its cold and passionless expanses, would be the same as to throw a cloth round a naked statue."

The early stage towards marriage was the comparatively peaceable and promiscuous intercourse between those of the same family, or group of families. Even in each tribe every woman was common, and none knew the father of her own child. Thus the children were the

property of the tribe, and not of the parents, and for ages derived their descent from their mothers. Display, in the forms of ornamental dress, dancing, and boasting, began to take the place of prowess. Thus vanity had its rise in the male breast before it was communicated by heredity to the female. Sir John Lubbock dignifies this promiscuous breeding by the name of Communal Marriage, but with all deference to so high an authority we consider that it was not until extra-tribal women were captured that marriage had a beginning. For these became the peculiar property of their captors, and gave rise to both monogamy and polygamy, as a man might have as many women as he could capture and keep. Without defining at present our idea of what true marriage is, or should be, we cannot concede that any vagrant amour deserves the name, even though it be a tribal one. The union must at least have some degree of permanence. In a general way, however, we can agree with the mediæval proverb: "Boire, manger, coucher ensemble est mariage, ce me semble."

It should be clearly understood at the outset that love, as we understand it in its highest sense, is altogether the product of modern times. It had its inception in the age of chivalry. Sacred and profane poets sang of love, but it was a sensual passion only that inspired their song. No Greek or Roman could so much as have imagined the feeling which a high-minded and cultured European entertains for the maiden whom he woos and weds. Their love was coarse, voluptuous, lascivious, and when most refined, as in Plato's "Banquet," was infinitely beneath the spiritualised sensuousness which we are here and there able to acquire.

The so-called communal marriage was attended by curious circumstances. One was that when men were allowed to select women for wives from their own tribe, the others had still their common rights in her. When this was abandoned, "a temporary recognition of the pre-existing communal rights" had to be made; or, as in much later times, every woman was obliged, once in her life, to submit herself indiscriminately to the worshippers of some Phallic divinity, or to strangers at a great periodic festival, as in the primæval custom. It may be, too, that the *jus primæ noctis*, claimed sometimes by the chief or noble, and at others by the priest, was a survival of communal rights, these officers representing the community. With numerous tribes unmarried girls were free to practise promiscuity, when married women were jealously guarded, and a man often disdained to marry a woman unless she had previously had many lovers. Thus, too, when civilisation appeared, the "social evil" was regarded with a tolerance amounting to approbation. The Hetairæ of Greece were long held in much esteem, and were publicly known by their coloured or flowered garments. The women of the fornices at Rome used to stand openly



at the doors of their cells in loose and light attire, with their bosoms exposed and the nipples gilt.

All male savages are much given to jealousy of their property. Daughters were their father's slaves, and they and their mothers—also slaves—did all the hard work required for the family. Thus difficulties in obtaining wives by tribal or inter-tribal arrangement, coupled with female infanticide or the love of war, partly led to the practice of capture. This custom prevailed in various parts of the world, and has now almost perished, but the form has survived as a mere ceremony. Even with us the bridegroom's best man represents the faithful friend who formerly helped to steal a wife, and whose reward afterwards was the *jus primæ noctis*. In the beginning of the present century capture *de facto* was in full force among the South Slavonians. One of the eight legal forms of the marriage ceremony in the "Laws of Manu" was the Rākshasa rite: "the forcible abduction of a maiden from her home, while she cries out and weeps, after her kinsmen have been slain or wounded and their houses broken open." The use of the symbol has been found among all except the Chinese and a few others, and perhaps these formed no real exception. The most brutal form of capture was that of the Australians. A man stalked a woman as he would a kangaroo, stole behind her and with his nulla-nulla, a heavy club, struck her senseless. In this state he carried her off, and, when she revived, her marriage was at once consummated.

Capture, however, gave way to purchase. Bartering women between two tribes was a favourite method at first. A man gave a daughter or some other female relative for a wife. The bought wife was his absolute property and slave, over whom he had the power of life and death, but in process of time more merciful ideas modified her condition. The system of purchase did much to abolish the horrible practice of female infanticide. As sons strengthened the fighting power of a tribe, and daughters weakened it, exogamous peoples destroyed their female infants except the first-born, preserved for menial purposes, and thus capture and infanticide were almost universally established, and regarded as social duties. Marriage was prohibited between members of the same tribe so long as the tribes were undivided, but when clans were formed members of the same clan were prohibited, although persons of one clan might marry with those of others. Next members of the same stock or family name might not intermarry, then divisions of the same tribe might marry with some and not with others, until finally caste was developed. On the contrary, with endogamous tribes marriage outside the tribe was forbidden and punished. When by fusion of primitive groups the tribal system was less distinct, marriage was forbidden except between persons of the same family or stock name. Next it was restricted to members of particular families; and, lastly,

old tribal divisions were disregarded or forgotten, and those having by custom the right of connubium, became a caste. And thus, by two opposite processes, caste came about. It is not, of course, to be supposed that those methods were invariably followed with mathematical precision. They were frequently modified just as promiscuity was modified by polyandry, in which one woman had several husbands who were sometimes brothers and at others not. Polyandry still exists over large areas in the East, and was formerly practised in Germany and this country. Sometimes it arises from a desire to prevent undue increase of family; at others from sheer poverty. A few club together and obtain a wife between them. As soon as purchase became the fashion, daughters were valuable property to their fathers and female infanticide ceased. The price depends, as it has always done, upon the rank, condition, and accomplishments of the bride, and the extent of the demand.

Virgins generally fetch more than others, and many strange customs have been adopted to preserve their purity, especially in those cases where a general warranty is understood, and a fraudulent sale would entitle the husband to return the lady and claim back the price paid for her. With some a platform is built by her parents' hut immediately after an early betrothal, and there she is fed and kept high up out of harm's way without once leaving it until delivered to her husband. In parts of Africa she is shut up at six or seven years of age in a bamboo cage, and constantly watched and attended to by an old woman, who fattens her for the Mohammedan mart. Many other plans are adopted to the same purpose, and when married her virginity was sometimes proved *coram populo*, or the evidences were preserved by her parents, as among the Jews, in case of repudiation by the husband. The first form of inheritance was through the female line. This originated from the uncertainty of male parentage. Polyandry was a fertile cause of both methods. A Nair woman, under some restrictions as to rank and caste, might have twelve husbands. In Ceylon, when a woman lives in a house and village of her husband's the marriage is "Deega," but when the husband or husbands go to live with her it is "Beena"; "and among the Kandians the rights of inheritance of the woman and her children depend upon whether she is a beena or a deega wife." Chief Justice Starke, of Ceylon, said that "sometimes a deega married girl returned to her parents' house and was there provided with a beena husband." Deega marriages, where the husbands were brothers, promoted male kinship; beena marriages, female inheritance and kinship, to the exclusion of the males. In the first, the eldest brother was the head of the house and the father of the family, to whom the others succeeded in turn on his decease, and continued to "raise up seed to their brother." Where exogamy was the rule, the mothers were necessarily foreigners, and

by the system of kinship their children were foreigners also. McLellan shows that thus, "so far as the system of infanticide allowed, their young men and women accounted of different stocks might intermarry consistently with exogamy. Hence grew up a system of betrothals, and of marriage by sale and purchase." But when civilisation advanced, and paternity became recognised, and conjugal fidelity and family property commenced, kinship through the males superseded that through the females. The whole subject is a very large and complex one, far too large for a short article. It can easily be proved, however, that all the social and moral virtues have arisen from the circumstances attending the right of family and individual property; and that, therefore, any attempts towards destroying these valuable incentives to personal exertion and national energy, would be so many fatal steps backwards towards barbarism and universal immorality. Honour, chastity, modesty, fidelity, in their first feeble birth, date from the time when the right to individual property made its appearance, and when this occurred "barbarism was already far in the rear." Before this everything was common, and enjoyed promiscuously. Now men begin to feel the delights of family and home. Every personal acquisition was thereby invested with a new charm. And the love of one's own developed into the larger love of one's country, and at length into sympathy for the whole human family. And probably the germ of all these elevating sentiments was the humble right of absolute ownership to a wife by capture. If this be so, then marriage was the foundation of all civil rights and moral virtues.

We owe to the Jews that theory of a primitive state which has been the cause of so many errors and failures during the last eighteen centuries. Human history opens with Eden, a perfect marriage and a happy family. But it was not in this way that man commenced his career. Whatever is good in him had to be groped for, fought for with blood and tears, and held through infinite and severe struggles. Many races perished, and those that survived had and have to work out their own salvation. Neither can any tribe or nation trace its descent to an individual. Many peoples have professed to do so, but in all cases their genealogies are spurious and their common ancestor fictitious. Besides, it can be demonstrated that the family appeared last in the order of social development. Indeed, this has now almost become an ethnographical axiom, and the law of progression, as against the debasing theory of retrogression, has been amply vindicated.

In the earliest times of purchase, a woman was bartered for useful goods or for services rendered to her father. In this latter way, Jacob purchased Rachel and her sister Leah. This was a Beena marriage, where a man, as in Genesis, leaves his father and his mother, and cleaves unto his wife, and they become one flesh or kin.

—the woman's. The price for a bride in British Columbia and Vancouver Island, varies from £20 to £40 worth of articles. In Oregon, an Indian gives for her horses, blankets, or buffalo robes; in California, shell-money or horses; in Africa, cattle. A poor Damara will sell a daughter for a cow; a richer Kaffir expects from three to thirty. With the Banyai, if nothing be given, her family claim her children. In Uganda, where no marriage recently existed, she may be obtained for half-a-dozen needles, or a coat, or a pair of shoes. An ordinary price is a box of percussion caps. In other parts, a goat or a couple of buckskins will buy a girl. Passing to Asia, we find her price is sometimes five to fifty roubles, or at others, a cartload of wood or hay. A princess may be purchased for three thousand roubles. In Tartary, a woman can be obtained for a few pounds of butter, or where a rich man gives twenty small oxen, a poor man may succeed with a pig. In Fiji, her equivalent is a whale's tooth or a musket. These, and similar prices elsewhere, are eloquent testimony to the little value a savage sets on his wife. Her charms vanish with her girlhood. She is usually married while a child, and through her cruel slavery and bitter life, she often becomes old and repulsive at twenty-five.

When Augustine converted the Anglo-Saxons to Christianity, marriage by capture was dying out with them, and purchase had become general. Nevertheless, capture was not extinguished in England until centuries later, for Ethelbert, while enforcing the new law, also ratified the old one, so that they ran concurrently. He recognised the right of a raptor to carry off a woman by force on his afterwards paying fifty shillings to her owner as a fine, and then buying her from him at a reasonable price. If she were a maid, the fine went to her father; if a wife, then to the husband; but the raptor had to buy the defrauded husband another wife, and in each case he retained by law the woman whom he had stolen. It will be seen that the transition from capture to purchase in this country was very gradual, and that both methods existed, for a time, together. Even our princesses were bought by kings with cattle and costly articles, just as the poor creatures we have noticed were obtained by humbler purchase. We learn that the covetous Anglo-Saxon fathers drove extortionate bargains, and cheated simple buyers like modern horse-dealers at a fair. Ethelbert provided against this by enacting: "If there be any deceit, let him bring her home again, and let the man give him back his money." This privilege, in its turn, became obsolete when "morning gifts" were general. These were presents, made to the bride by her husband on the morning after the marriage night, to show his satisfaction with his bargain, and she who received a morning gift could not be afterwards returned. In process of time, when the brutality of selling one's own offspring dawned upon the coarse minds of our ancestors, a

euphemism was invented to conceal its baseness and satisfy public conscience. Contracts for future marriages had been called "espousals." The bride-price was paid at the time of espousal, and was now called "foster lean," or a supposed repayment to the parent of the daughter's cost for nurture and training. Greedy fathers made a trade of this by accepting "foster lean" from many suitors, and cheating all but one; but at length this fraudulent practice was checked by the public sentiment demanding that foster lean should be paid on the marriage day instead of the day of espousal. In those times the wedding day was only the day of betrothal, when the suitor gave a "wed," or pledge for the due performance of his contract. Our present law of damage for seduction originated in the law of Ethelbert, and was strengthened by Alfred, who enacted that the betrayer of an unbetrothed woman should pay her father for the damage done to her. "Breach of promise" by the maiden incurred the forfeiture of presents and the foster lean, and another third of the latter by way of penalty. The man who refused to marry his spouse, or delayed more than two years when she was of marriageable age, forfeited all further right to her and to the foster lean which he had paid. Subsequently, when the Church controlled marriage, she dealt more severely with flirts and dishonest fathers, and compelled the latter, in the event of breach on the woman's part, to pay back four times the amount of the foster lean. Later it was reduced to twice the sum.

Among civilisations far older than ours the system of purchase had ceased before we were a people. The Indian lawgiver, Manu, strictly forbade it, and said: "A man who through avarice takes a gratuity is a seller of his offspring." In the historical times of the Greeks they no longer bought wives. In Rome *coemptio* was only a symbol of the ancient custom. In the Jewish Talmud the purchase is also symbolic, as is frequently the Mohammedan "mahr." With all, the bride-price, foster leans, and marriage gifts, when returned, were converted into dowry, and became at first the bride's property. Thus marriage portions chiefly derived their origin from the habit of purchase, and dowry often became, as with the Hebrews, a religious duty. Not less than the tenth of a father's property was considered a just dowry. In Aristotle's time nearly two-fifths of all Sparta belonged from this cause to the women. Sir Henry Maine considers that the amazing thrift of the French is also owing to this custom, which probably descended to them from the marriage law of Augustus Cæsar. It was only by an anachronism that Euripides made Medea lament that women were obliged to purchase husbands at a great price. And it is often as true to-day as when the Latin poet sang:

"Pars minima est ipsa puella, sui."

As we have seen, there were at first no marriage ceremonies, and this is the mode still with many uncivilised tribes. When they did arise it was by degrees and in many ways; and in all, customs such as capture, when superseded, became by symbolism a part of the succeeding legal form of contract. Sometimes the ceremony symbolises sexual intercourse, but more frequently companionship or the wife's subjection. To eat maize pudding from the same plate, or to eat in any way together, is a widely distributed marriage ceremony. In Brazil a couple may be married by drinking brandy together; in Japan, by so many cups of wine; in Russia and Scandinavia it used to be one cup for both. The joining of hands among the Romans and Hindoos is common to many parts of the world. In Scotland it is called "hand-fasting," and couples live together after. To sit together on a seat while receiving friends, or to have the hands of each tied together with grass, or to smear with each other's blood, or for the woman to tie a cord of her own twisting around the naked waist of the man, constitutes marriage in one part or another. In Australia a woman carries fire to her lover's hut, and makes a fire for him. In America she lays a bundle of rods at the door of his tent. A Loango negress cooks two dishes for him in his own hut. In Croatia the bridegroom boxes the bride's ears, and in Russia the father formerly struck his daughter gently with a new whip—for the last time—and then gave the weapon to her husband. Down to the present, it is a custom in Hungary for the groom to give the bride a kick after the marriage ceremony, to make her feel her subjection. Even with all civilised peoples the servitude of the bride is clearly indicated.

The religious ceremonies, where they exist, are as numerous and various as human whims and caprices can make them. Rossbach says that the farther we go back the stricter they become. But as Paganism perished in Europe, marriage was deprived of religious rites, and became a purely civil institution. Christianity restored its religious character, and by a much too free translation from the Greek to the Latin Vulgate of the word "mysterion," used by St. Paul, the dogma of sacramental marriage had its rise. By the twelfth century it was gradually developed, and in 1563 the Council of Trent made the religious ceremony the essential part of marriage, without which it was rendered invalid. In this way a dangerous blow was struck at social and civil liberty, and Christendom still suffers from its pernicious effects. From that day concubinage, illegitimacy, and prostitution flourished. These were greatly accentuated by another evil law of the Church—the celibacy of the priests and the "religious."

Asceticism is a very ancient Pagan custom, and has found followers in all civilised times and countries. Even savages often expected celibacy, but not chastity, from their medicine men and

priests. With some of the cultured it has been assumed from misanthropy, or as a protest against profligacy ; with others, from a hollow assumption of superior virtue. It never occurs under natural conditions. Neither animals nor savages are ever celibates from choice unless infirm or diseased. The Jewish proverb "He who has no wife is no man," was a universal sentiment, and always put into practice. With uncivilised men, if one remained single he was thoroughly despised as unnatural, and classed with thieves and witches. Neither did he rank as a man in his tribe. Among the savage and partially civilised, celibacy is unknown among women, and the enforced celibacy of a few men is owing to a scarcity caused by polygamy or to extreme poverty. In Sparta celibates were criminally prosecuted ; at Rome, bachelors were taxed. Exception to marriage was only made in the case of a few priestesses devoted to special work, as in Peru, Persia, Rome, Greece, and Gaul. Religious asceticism, however, comes from the East. Buddhism is its centre. Buddh was the only son of his mother, the best and purest of women, whose conception was supernatural, so that she still remained a virgin. Christianity reproduced this original idea. In India, where polygamy is the rule, celibacy is permitted only to men, who must devote their lives to contemplation ; but in Tibet, where polyandry is the rule, women are encouraged to become nuns. Both monks and nuns are as unchaste as were those of Europe before the Reformation. "Lust and ignorance," it is said, "are the chief causes of misery ; we should, therefore, suppress lust and remove ignorance." The *Dhammika-Sutta* tells the faithful, "A wise man should avoid marriage as if it were a burning pit of live coals." Sexual intercourse was sinful in itself, and the first indulgence by a monk entailed expulsion from the fraternity, and he was no longer a monk.

These Eastern ideas probably spread to Syria, and made a few converts there, known as Essenes. Josephus, who was born at Jerusalem three years after the Crucifixion, knew them well. They rejected pleasures, and, from their esteem of continence, neglected wedlock. It is not quite certain whether Christ Himself favoured their views to any degree, for although He put religious duty first, He did not reprobate marriage, but He commanded desertion of wife and family for the kingdom of heaven's sake. St. Paul, however, held celibacy to be preferable, although he admitted "it was better to marry than to burn." Marriage was for the incontinent, as the lesser of two evils. It does not seem that Christianity at first forbade polygamy, for Paul held that a bishop (or pastor) should be satisfied with *one* wife, and many learned theologians held polygamy lawful to a Christian. St. John saw the celestial band of a hundred and forty-four thousand around the throne of God, all virgins who had never known man. The Fathers soon strengthened these notions. Tertullian,

who died in 216, held that celibacy ought to be chosen though mankind should perish. Origen, born in 185, taught that marriage was profane and impure. Taking Christ's words literally, he emasculated himself. Yet he lived to A.D. 254. St. Jerome, born eighty-eight years after, tolerated marriage only for the sake of producing monks and nuns. He said that, though marriage fills the earth, virginity peoples heaven, and twenty years before he died, a Roman Synod insisted on the celibacy of the superior clergy. In fact, all the Fathers agreed with those named, but human nature was too strong for the general acceptance of their views. Chastity, however, became, in theory, the cardinal virtue of the Church, whatever it may have been in practice, and divorces were freely granted *sine causa sententia*, and from no other reason than to promote celibacy. When the Church sanctified marriages, she desired that they might be as platonic as possible. Thus the Emperor Henry II., Edward the Confessor, and Alphonso II. of Spain, were husbands only in name. All human beings produced through sexual union were "born in sin and conceived in iniquity." "To have children under any circumstances was a sin," but to have them without the sanction and blessing of the Church was a deadly sin. "Woman was the instrument of Satan," and a Gallican Bishop declared that "she was not human." At the Council of Mâcon the Bishops debated whether she had a soul. The fanatics who taught these unnatural and abominable doctrines forgot that marriage was the oldest human institution, and therefore immeasurably older than the Church; that, by their own Bible, the first law given to man by his Maker, unqualified by any restriction, was to "increase and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it." Thus the immortality of the race depended upon its power of reproduction, and the first duty of man was to ensure the continuance of his species. Procreation was the sovereign law of being. Yet, as Huth says, "there is no doubt that if the clergy had had their own way, they would have forbidden all mankind, as they forbade themselves, ever to enter the bonds of matrimony."

In the Council of Rome, 1074, all ministers already married were ordered to divorce their wives. In England, however, this could not be enforced, and at the Council of Winchester, held two years after, the secular clergy were permitted to retain their wives. The edict of Gregory the Great produced terrible results, so that laws were repeatedly made forbidding priests to have their sisters or even their mothers as their housekeepers. Formerly they had been permitted to keep concubines, and were generally taxed for this license. Early in the fifth century the Council of Toledo legalised these unions, but Henry III. of Castile ordered the concubines of priests to wear a piece of scarlet cloth in their head-dress. The Puritans of New England compelled the unwedded mother to wear a scarlet A on her breast, and this custom gave rise to Nathaniel Hawthorne's



beautiful story, *The Scarlet Letter*. In France the priests often practised polygamy. Everywhere bigamy was especially common. Their compulsory celibacy, therefore, led to every possible immorality and to the most infamous crimes, until at length the Papal throne itself became polluted. Speaking of Pope John XXIII., Gibbon says: "The most scandalous charges were suppressed; the Vicar of Christ was only accused of piracy, murder, rape, sodomy, and incest." D'Israeli, in his *Curiosities of Literature*, quotes the lines written on a lady's tomb by way of pasquinade on Pope Alexander VI., to whom she had been too well known:

"Hoc tumulo dormit Lucretia nomine, sed re  
Thais: Alexandri filia, sponsa, nurus."

The hostility of the Church to sexual union, even in the form of marriage, caused her to devise innumerable impediments. Married women were forbidden to approach the altar or to touch the Eucharist, and were commended for refusing the embraces of their husbands. If a woman wished to become a nun, she could leave her husband without his consent, nor could he take a wife in her stead. The Rev. S. Baring-Gould, in his *Lives of the Saints*, tells the following anecdote of St. Dominic, which at once illustrates the childish superstition of devotees and the arguments for encouraging celibacy: "A lady of extreme beauty wished to leave her monastery, and resisted all the preacher's arguments. She blew her nose, and it came off in her handkerchief. Horror-stricken, she implored the prayers of Dominic. He put her nose on again; and the lady consented to remain in the convent." Widows promising to remain single were excommunicated on marrying again, which was then called bigamy. Abstention was demanded of married people for three days before communion and forty days after Easter; next, it became as great a sin for them to cohabit during Lent as it was to eat flesh; then, marriage was prohibited during Lent, and at other specified seasons, so that, as an old writer said, "there were but few weeks or days in the year in which people could get married at all." And in the Confessional even the youngest and fairest wives were compelled to lay bare the most secret acts of their wedded lives. Marriage was forbidden within the seventh canonical degree (or to sixth cousins), equal to the fourteenth civil degree of blood relationship, and spiritual affinity had been invented, and made equal to that of blood, to increase the prohibitions. Thus godfathers and godmothers were held as related to the child and its relations and to each other. Bridesmaids, groomsmen, bride, bridegroom, and officiating priest were similarly related to each other and to all the relations of all. No one, therefore, could tell to whom he was not related. Repudiation after marriage, fraud and trickery, were made easy for the unprincipled, and the authority of

the Church was appealed to from a thousand directions. Pope Zachary had said that marriage must be denied when any relationship could be traced, and this was confirmed by two Councils. But by Luther's time the prohibition extended only as far as to third cousins. Hallam points out that these "affinities" rendered it necessary for the Royal Houses of Europe to keep on good terms with the Court of Rome, because it was scarcely possible for them to intermarry without transgressing the canonical limits. Hence arose constant requests for Papal dispensations. "History," he says, "is full of dissolutions of marriage, obtained by fickle passion or cold-hearted ambition, to which the Church did not scruple to pander on some suggestion of relationship." Nor is this to be wondered at, seeing the Council of Trent, held in 1545, re-affirmed the spiritual affinities declared by the Nicene Council in 325.

All this systematic opposition reduced marriage, but did not prevent indulgence. We have already noticed two out of the many popes who led scandalous lives. The irregularities of the ecclesiastics would be almost too astounding for belief were it not that the authorities are unquestionable. One abbot, for instance, had seventy concubines, and a bishop was deposed for having sixty-five illegitimate children. Many a congregation having an unmarried priest stipulated, for the protection of their wives and daughters, that he should keep a concubine. For it was not until Peter the Lombard had discovered the sevenfold operation of the Spirit of God in the seven sacraments that the Church in the twelfth century included marriage as one, and by the middle of the thirteenth every wife of a priest had been driven from her home. Since the sixteenth century the Roman canons have remained unchanged.

We have the authority of the pious and learned Bellarmine, a Roman Catholic, that "for some years before the Lutheran and Calvinist heresies broke forth, there was no justice in ecclesiastical courts, no discipline in morals, no knowledge of sacred literature, no reverence for sacred things; there was almost no religion remaining." The Roman Curia published a book containing a tariff of fees for pardons. A deacon could commit a murder for twenty crowns; a bishop or abbot, for 300 livres; and any ecclesiastic might violate his vows of chastity with the most aggravating circumstances for 100 livres, or £80 of our money. The loathsome condition of the Church caused two of her most earnest monks to become distinguished reformers. St. Cajetan and Luther were born within three years of each other. The one effected a schism which we call the Reformation. The other gave his life and genius for her internal purification. Cajetan remained a rabid celibate. The monk Luther married a nun. But the early Protestants—so strong is custom—looked with a timid eye on the marriage of their priests. Queen Elizabeth, when leaving the episcopal palace, insulted Arch-

bishop Parker's wife, by saying that she did not know how to address her, implying that Mrs. Parker was only a concubine. And even to-day, from some cause or other, an unmarried clergyman, *cæteris paribus*, finds more favour with his congregation than a married one.

Monogamy was instituted long before Christianity—long before even the Mosaic law. It was established in Egypt, for instance, ages prior to Joseph's captivity. Potiphar's amorous wife was evidently his only one. We know that in Egypt polygamy was legal, and yet monogamy was the more general practice. It has been the same in other countries; and owing to the numerical equality of the sexes, where men can afford to marry, monogamy is a natural necessity. We may take it, therefore, that with or without a Divine revelation, monogamy would become the final and most perfect form of marriage.

The "communal marriage" was the gratification of a periodical sexual passion—a mere brutal instinct. The marriage by capture secured a like purpose, with the addition of personal possession and the services of a household slave. Marriage by purchase procured the same advantages without the danger of retaliation from injured relatives. Women now were a sort of cattle, bought and sold, exchanged and lent, just like any other chattels. Next dower supplanted purchase, and she began to possess legal rights, sometimes to obtain the mastery over the husband. Her jubilant freedom made her audacious. Her superior subtlety gave her pre-eminence in the home. When her social and legal equality were well nigh assured, the emissaries of Christianity brought a message from God and imposed it on the people, whereby her humanity was questioned, her possession of a soul doubted, her inferiority divinely affirmed, her perpetual guardianship legalised, her civil rights merged in her husband, and her subordination to him laid down by ecclesiastical laws. In childhood she was denied her share of mental education; in womanhood her civil and political rights. If, in exceptional instances, she led armies or ruled states, or legislated, or otherwise distinguished herself, these were regarded as exceptions to a general rule, and her inferiority to man was still determined. And now, when women in large numbers have shown their capacity in every permitted profession and occupation, when every office that has been opened to them has been worthily filled, there are still heads and hearts so obtuse that old conditions are re-asserted, old prejudices revived, old customs invoked by all the aids of ridicule and religion. An ignorant and corrupt Church enslaved her body and starved her mind, defiled her morals, and denied her even the right to read the Scriptures.

In England this battle for the equal privileges of women commenced more than 150 years ago, when, in 1739, "Sophia, a woman

of quality," wrote an able work entitled *Woman not Inferior to Man*. She said: "There is no science or public office in a State which women are not as much qualified for by nature as the ablest of men." In 1792, Mary Wolstonecraft, in her *Vindication of the Rights of Women*, demanded that the medical profession, which had been wrested from women, should be thrown open to them again, and that they should be allowed to vote for members of Parliament. She pointed out that "meek wives are in general foolish mothers," and that business and professional education of various kinds for women "might save many from common and legal prostitution." And for this she was denounced "as an infidel and monster of immorality."

Marriage is usually either misunderstood or the ideal is set too low. People marry from a variety of reasons: for a living, for convenience, from vanity or lust, or for companionship or a family. With Mary Wolstonecraft, we denounce the first four as "legal prostitution," and assert that nothing but true companionship and desire for children can ever justify marriage. We doubt whether the mere desire of a family could alone justify it unaccompanied by mutual love. But we regard love as all-sufficient in itself, and the true touchstone by which marriage may be proved. And by love we mean that intelligent and mutual respect and sympathy, that unity of thought and aim, that blending of two in one which makes each ready for any sacrifice, or even to die for the other—a union which neither time nor accident can destroy. This alone is marriage, and is able to transform the peasant's cot and patch into a veritable paradise, while without it a palace may be hell. We have heard of men, rough, commonplace beings, who could brave Arctic or Torrid wastes in severest cold or heat, in hunger and thirst, so long as they were cheered by the companionship of their fellows. Our first real hunger is heart hunger. Prisoners denied human companionship have sought comfort in the affection of a bird, a mouse, or even a spider. All true natures must have some one or something to love. And although the love of youth is charming and picturesque, the love of old age is radiant with beauty. To see two human creatures who have weathered together in closest communion all the storms and ills of life, battered and deformed by time, yet able to look into each other's eyes with a love surpassing that of their first affection, is a sight grander than any other the world can show. For it reveals to us the depth and purity of marriage as it should be. What are rites and priestly formulas to such as these? And what dignity or value can any ceremony add to the union of true minds?

We read of Gretna Green and Fleet marriages and the outcry with which their abolition was met by younger sons, and even statesmen like Fox. The Marriage Act, as they well knew, was passed

for the protection of heiresses and ambitious fathers. It was a rich man's Act, and opposed to the interests of the poor, for whom marriage and divorce should be as inexpensive, easy, and expeditious as of old. We know that love will not fill the larder, but a man who loves will work for his wife, and the wife who loves will work for her husband. Love sets in motion a twofold energy which is able to conquer many difficulties.

We must not omit to point out as briefly as possible that to secure the happiness and welfare of the married and their offspring, the fitness of candidates is of the highest importance. The sexual side of our being has been so stigmatised that our other natural appetites have shared in its degradation. We boast of our love of art, of literature, or of science, but never of our love of eating or sleeping. We are ashamed of our bodily organs and functions, and shun the knowledge of our own physiology. These beautiful structures, which it should be our pride to improve and preserve untainted, are accounted vile and not to be discussed; consequently, those most unfit are united in marriage, and those subject to personal or hereditary disease increase and multiply, filling the earth with sin and sorrow. The nauseous "purity" which produces all this should be scouted as criminally filthy and recklessly foolish. We should then see how necessary it is to inquire into character, habits, and family antecedents; how wicked it is to permit those who can produce none but diseased or defective offspring ever to marry; and that no iniquity of parents can equal that of giving a pure maiden to an impure man. Physical beauty alone should never be allowed to outweigh moral beauty, nor mental excellency be held inferior to wealth. Great authorities, like Möbius, Charcot, Féré, and others, group together as brain and nerve diseases: insanity, eccentricity, violent temper, paralysis, epilepsy, hysteria, neuralgia, scrofula, gout, diabetes, consumption, asthma, dipsomania, deformities, and malformations. "All these may alternate with each other in a given family, one member suffering from one and another from another." All arise from imperfect brain nutrition, which is always transmitted from parent to child.

Our social vices entail widespread scourges. This is so common among a certain class of men that they affect to treat it as of little moment. Often men of rank and education are not ashamed to give their daughters to those who have suffered from them. When marriage is contemplated, no questions are asked, no investigation is made. The men who are careful—extremely careful—in the breeding of their domestic animals, ignore the same necessity for their children. Hence the royal houses of Europe are profoundly tainted with insanity, and the aristocracies with epilepsy and other neurotic diseases. Benoiston de Châteauneuf proved that the average life of a French noble family was about three hundred years. And, at

the beginning of the last century, "the *haute noblesse* at the French Court looked like *une société de malades*."

We have only touched the fringe of our subject, but we must stop. We commend our readers to search further for themselves. Possibly the day is not far distant when education will be directed on better lines, when the teaching of physiology will be compulsory, and soundness of mind and body will be the chief desiderata. And when sex distinctions and privileges are swept away, physical, moral and mental improvement will grow apace. This beautiful world will be the home of beauty. Ignorance and crime, like unclean beasts, will flee to its remote recesses. Men will live for themselves and for each other, and not for arbitrary laws that harass, injure, and destroy. The foul brood engendered by ages of superstition will disappear, and all will see that only through a new and wiser system of marriage can the regeneration and perfection of mankind be brought about.

LADY COOK

(née Tennessee Claflin).

## NEW LANDLORDS.

IN 1863 a farmer, a blacksmith, and a few labourers started a sick benefit club in an agricultural village. It was formed, as others are formed, to pay a weekly allowance to its members when sick, and make a contribution to save its members, when dead, from a pauper's funeral. The management lay in an annually elected committee, three trustees, a secretary, and a steward. From the beginning it was known as "The Dry Club," because it never held its meetings at a public-house. To-day it numbers some 570 members, some of whom have taken their membership with them to London, Birmingham, and elsewhere, following the migration of the rural labourer.

Very little help has come to this body of workers, living on an average wage of something less than 15s. a week, either from the clergy, the farmers, or the landowners, in this their effort at self-help. For one of their members in distress the Board of Guardians considers only how much less relief can be given by reason of his membership. Something more than £350 a year gathered from their joint wages and spent in supporting sick comrades fails to excite the admiration of the ratepayers whose rates are thus diminished, or to attract the special attention of the Guardians of the Poor.

Other sick benefit clubs have risen and fallen with as little help and as little sympathy in a thousand villages. "They are unsound." "They are not based on actuary tables." "They must break down when the members grow old." Thus say those who have the knowledge and the administrative ability to help organise success, and so they are left to take their chance.

There is in this "Dry Club" a healthy regard for the contents of the club chest and an honest ignorance of finance which have enabled it to escape thus far the conclusions of actuary tables and place on record the life of a generation spent in useful work. It is in regard to the policy of this club as a landowner that some special interest is attached. Thanks to the fact that the noble owner of the soil on which the members of this "Dry Club" earned their daily wage had been enabled by Act of Parliament to part with the possession of an estate too early squandered, the club committee learnt one day that the land around their homes was for

sale by auction. Here, indeed, was a chance to invest part of their surplus fund, earning small interest in a country bank. The anxious discussions of the committee, the relative value of this and that field, the choice of a man who would go to the sale and bid—all these are matters of local history. Sufficient, that in due time the trustees of the club became absolute owners of fifty-six acres of freehold land in the centre of the village, comprising three meadows, small farm buildings, and thirty-seven acres of good arable land. Whoever has lived within the narrow limits of a rural village will recognise the revolutionary aspect of a state of affairs which brought an unhappy farmer to the position of paying rent to a labourer's club, and it can be imagined how dismal the future foretold for all those who had dared to take the step producing such a reversal of all recognised precedents. However, the trustees and committee of the club, being warmly supported by its members assembled in annual meeting, awaited the expiration of the remaining year of their lease and in due time placed their rent in the bank. A time came for receiving applications for land from members of the club, and one evening the committee met to select their future tenants, letting the land as follows :

Seven holdings of 3 acres (including 1 meadow).

Five holdings of 2 acres.

Eight holdings of 1 acre.

One holding of  $\frac{1}{2}$  acre.

One holding of  $\frac{1}{4}$  acre.

Four members financially a little stronger than the others united to take two of the meadows and the small buildings; there was no farmhouse. On a quiet October afternoon the partridges watched a group of committee-men dragging chain and stakes around the fields intent on the mystery of dividing irregular fields into convenient acres, setting out accommodation roads, deciding the fate of timber-trees and the future of fences. All being prepared the new cultivators met at an inauguration tea to sign agreements and record their hopes. Rents were fixed to produce the same rent previously paid by the farmer, with an additional margin of 5 per cent. The agreement adopted seeks to give to each tenant the fullest security, and as far as possible a tenant's right in his improvements.

It is as follows :

This agreement made the 5th day of October 1893, between ———, the Trustees of the Morden Benefit Society of the one part, and Amos Green (hereinafter called the said Tenant) of the above part whereby the said Trustees agree to let, and the said Tenant agrees to hire, *all that* piece or parcel of land, being three acres of arable land situated in the Society's field marked C on the plan.

To hold the same from the 29th day of September 1893, at the yearly rental of £6. And it is hereby agreed and declared that the tenancy hereby created shall be subject in every respect to the Rules of the Benefit



Society's Estate, a copy whereof is in the Schedule hereto, and to any alteration thereof or additions thereto; and each and every of them the said Trustees and the said tenant do hereby covenant with the others of them that they and he will abide in all respects by the said Rules.

*As witness* the hands of the said parties.

THE SCHEDULE ABOVE REFERRED TO. BENEFIT SOCIETY  
ESTATE.—RULES.

1.—The whole management of the Estate shall be in the hands of the Trustees and Committee of the Morden Benefit Society.

2.—The rents shall be paid by the tenants personally to the Committee or any person or persons to be appointed by them in half-yearly payments on the 25th day of March and the 29th day of September in each year. The Trustees or any one of them at the request of the Committee, shall have power of re-entry and reletting, if the rent shall be in arrear for the space of twenty-one days, and if no sufficient distress can be made upon the holding.

3.—The Committee of Management shall have power to eject any tenant who, in their opinion, is not cultivating his holding in a proper manner, or who wilfully breaks any of the Rules for the time being of the said Estate, by giving to him six months' notice in writing of their intention so to do. Except for the causes above mentioned, or for non-payment of rent, no tenant shall be disturbed in his holding.

4.—Any tenant shall be at liberty to quit his holding by giving the Committee of Management twelve months' notice in writing, expiring on the 29th day of September in any year.

5.—No tenant shall sublet or assign to any other person the whole or any portion of his allotment.

6.—No tenant shall sell the growing crops without the consent in writing of the Committee, and without previously paying all rents due.

7.—The Trustees or any person appointed by the Committee of Management shall be at liberty to enter on any holding at any reasonable time for the purpose of viewing the same for any reasonable purpose.

8.—All buildings which may be erected by any tenant upon his holding, all fruit trees planted by him, and all improvements effected by him upon his holding, shall be his property, and he shall, at the expiration or determination of his tenancy, by any means whatever be entitled to compensation for the same from the incoming tenant, provided such incoming tenant be previously accepted by the Committee. Provided that there shall be no obligation upon the Committee to pay any such compensation under any circumstances, but it shall *not* be lawful for the Trustees or the Committee to accept any fresh tenant of any holding unless he shall agree to pay to the outgoing tenant a reasonable compensation. In case of dispute the amount of such reasonable compensation may be fixed by the Committee or such persons as they may appoint.

9.—No tenant shall be allowed to put a cottage on his holding without the written consent both of the Trustees and the Committee.

10.—No pasture land shall be broken up without the written consent of the Trustees and the Committee.

11.—All rates and taxes shall be paid by the Committee for three years commencing September 29, 1893.

12.—All disputes between tenants shall be referred to the Committee, and the tenants shall abide by their decision.

13.—These rules may at all times be altered by a resolution passed at the Annual General Meeting of the Steeple Morden Benefit Society or at any meeting of the Society specially called for that purpose. The Trustees shall have the power of vetoing any alteration of Rules.

14.—Two copies of these Rules shall be signed by the Trustees and by every tenant on the Estate, one copy being delivered to the tenant and the other received by the Trustees.

Signed by the above named,

In the presence of

} Trustees of the *Morden*  
Benefit Society.

In the presence of

, Tenant.

Here then is an experiment calling for the attention not only of village clubs but also of the trades unions and co-operative societies in our great cities who would seek to solve the question of land and labour by self-help. The members of this "Dry Club" have obtained an investment in land, the only investment they understand, directly benefiting some of their members and giving to the others an income larger by 20 per cent. than that previously received from a bank deposit. They have formed a stronghold of independence in at least one village. They are learning a daily lesson in the management of property. They have eliminated all that is antagonistic in the relations of landlord, farmer, and labourer within a small area in the best way. Their future is of some public interest. I record only the birth of their venture. In earlier years the committee of this club bought a field and built six of the best cottages in the village, giving to each a large garden, and they hold four other cottages with good gardens. These have their social worth. Such are some simple facts from the life of a small unaided village sick benefit club touching the limits of some present land questions. They indicate a way by which the social influence of other sick benefit clubs may be widened and strengthened, and reasons why all of them should be aided in the work many of them are doing, silently, in difficulties, and alone. Work, which even when it fails, is a standing record of the providence, common sympathy, and spirit of self-help so little credited as being among the best characteristics of our agricultural labourers.

Men of this character want land throughout England.

The old landlords heed neither them nor their wants.

This "Dry Club" has waited long for its opportunity, and but for a rare incident which has extinguished a great landlord would be waiting still.

It is to give men like these the land they need that Parish Councils, having compulsory and simple powers to acquire the use of land for those who can cultivate for themselves, are urgently required. The facts that illustrate the life of the "Dry Club" cannot be denied, the conclusion drawn is sometimes denied by those whose knowledge of the land is contained in the one word rent, and who rarely consider the details of life in the rural villages whose fate has been left too long in their autocratic hands.

## THE LITERARY EVOLUTION OF MAN.<sup>1</sup>

LITERATURE, like the physical universe and human society, is subject to the great law of evolution. It is because the historians of literature have overlooked this fact that such superficial views prevail as to man's intellectual development. In his great work on *Literary Evolution*, M. Letourneau has endeavoured to show that written compositions belong to an advanced stage of civilisation, and that it is necessary to investigate the rude beginnings of literature amongst barbarous or primitive races in order to arrive at any valuable conclusions from a psychological or sociological point of view.

The origin of literature is biological; and that simple truth has long been obscured by the transcendental school of critics. Our mental impressions, our emotions, our volitions, and even our thoughts, have for their substratum the molecular vibration of certain nerve-cells. It is unnecessary to trace the process by which nervous sensibility is so operated upon as to produce sensations and ideas. Suffice it to say that modern science has, for all practical purposes, demonstrated the physical basis of mind. Between the most highly-developed of the lower animals and the most unenlightened specimens of the human race there is a strong mental analogy. A Hottentot is, in some respects, inferior to a parrot.

The impressions derived from the sense of smell and that of taste are not so vivid and enduring as those derived from the sense of hearing and that of sight. For that reason the two last-mentioned senses may be described as intellectual, our minds being enabled by them to grasp the realities of the world around us. By the aid of memory we can easily conjure up the sensations aroused by what we have either seen or heard, and we may attempt artificially—or rather artistically—to reproduce our impressions by lines, colours, or sounds. Such is the genesis of literature and art.

The primitive art common alike to man and many of the lower animals is the mimic dance. The earliest type of human being was a dancing animal; and music, in some form or other, soon followed as an accompaniment to the dance. The graphic and plastic arts were later developments.

<sup>1</sup> *L'Evolution Littéraire dans les Diverses Races Humaines*. Par Ch. Letourneau. Paris: Ancienne Maison Delahaye, L. Betaille et Cie., Éditeurs. 1894.

Amongst birds we find the rudiments of æsthetics, for they both sing and dance, and in this way they stand artistically on much the same footing as savages. It is by the use of articulate language that man is distinguished principally from the other animals.

But the theory that human language has a supernatural origin has long since been exploded. The utterance of a cry is but a reflex action; and the most uncivilised human being has probably no more intelligible form of speech than a mere cry or ejaculation. The primitive man probably attempted to reproduce certain sounds that struck his ear by a kind of onomatopœia. By a frequent exercise of the imitative faculty human language grew up. Intonation, accent, and combinations of articulate words are, of course, later developments. Social life, sympathies and antipathies, and the necessity for mutual understanding, partly account for the complex sounds and forms of civilised languages. Primitive idioms have two great imperfections—the poverty of the vocabulary, and the vaguely defined meanings of the words. The monosyllabic languages must have consisted of an extremely limited number of sounds, each intended to convey some rude impression of the savage mind. At the present day, the savages of Australia, America, and Africa have passed the monosyllabic period. Their languages are polysynthetic, agglutinative, and from that very fact are often deficient in clearness, for the verbal forms are complicated and confused. The Tasmanians, according to a traveller, had words for different kinds of trees, but no abstract word signifying “tree.” The Australians appear to have no means of conveying the idea of “justice” or “crime.” The American Indians have no words for “time,” “space,” “substance.”

There is a certain similarity between the language of a child and that of a primitive or savage man. The infant cries, and even sings, before it has learnt to speak. So with man in his rudest state before human society has been formed. Savages and infants are equally disposed to animate external objects, and to conceive mental pictures of mental phenomena as fantastic or supernatural beings. We are told that a little girl refused to pluck flowers lest she might hurt them. The idea is a poetic one—quite Wordsworthian in fact, but it would probably occur, too, to the imagination of a native of Central Africa. The literature of savages is, accordingly, childlike, irrational—the vague gropings of an undeveloped intelligence.

In surveying the growth of literature we have to look at the social *milieu*. The early form of human society was not the family, in the modern sense, but the clan, a small group of individuals whose interests were rigidly subordinated to those of the entire body. In their primitive forms, then, literature and art are the expression of the united life of the clan or small community. So the savage

war dance is a thing in which the entire tribe or clan take part. At this stage there is no room for individuality.

We may divide the human race, for the purpose of studying literary evolution, into the black, yellow, and white types of man.

The literature of the negro races covers a rather extensive field, as M. Letourneau shows in his exceedingly learned book. These black races group themselves into the Australians, the Papuasians, and the African negroes.

The Tasmanians may be coupled with the Australians, for in all that concerns their intellectual life they resemble one another. The Australian blacks are still in the clan-stage, out of which all races have to pass on their way to a higher social condition. Their language is very imperfect. They have no words for abstract terms, and they have a variety of dialects subject to no distinct grammatical or linguistic laws. They dance in imitation of the kangaroo, and they sing in a wild and incoherent fashion. They have two or three notes, which they frequently repeat. These songs relate to love, hunting, or war. Their rhyme is in many instances obtained by repeating the same line, for instance :

“Ne popila raina pogana,  
Ne popila raina pogana,  
Ne popila raina pogana.”

The meaning of the words matters little to the singer ; they are merely an accessory to the air, and, if they please the ear, that is enough. Though singing amongst the Australians might be separated from dancing, they never danced with the accompaniment of some kind of song. Men and women rarely dance together amongst these savages. The dance of the women had reference to some incident in their daily life. The men imitate the movements of animals, and their dance is regarded as a more important function.

The Papuasians inhabit the islands of New Guinea, New Hebrides, New Caledonia, and New Ireland. They are more advanced than the Australians, for their intelligence is more sharpened. They have a certain talent for drawing, of which art the Australians are, entirely ignorant. They carve figures on the barks of trees representing serpents, crocodiles, and sometimes obscene objects which seem to be connected with Phallic worship. Their dances resemble those of the Australians. In New Guinea the men alone are allowed to take part in the national dance, the man performing the musical accompaniment on a rude kind of “tom-tom.” These dances may be said to possess a kind of literary character, as they are always expressive, and typify some important scene in the eyes of the community. In New Caledonia the dances represent the different stages of agricultural labour. The natives of New Hebrides manufacture wooden gongs with which their women

accompany the dancers. Amongst the New Caledonians bamboo-canes answer this purpose. The latter race exhibit more imagination than the other Papuans. The milky way is for them "the river of the sky." One of them said to a missionary on one occasion, "You speak like a brook." Had he been acquainted with Tennyson's poetry, he might have added :

"For you go on for ever."

The African negroes may be divided into those sunk in utter barbarism, and those who are a little removed from such degraded savagery. The superior African savage is found in Nubia and Abyssinia. The other type may be found in parts of Central and South Africa, and include the Hottentot.

The Hottentots have a kind of savage opera of the embryonic sort, the orchestra being composed of reeds which are said to have the sound of a harmonium. They have two kinds of song, sacred and profane. They are as yet in that state of primitive animism when stocks and stones are worshipped as divinities.

Amongst the negroes of the Congo district dancing is a mere amusement; and music and song are only accessories to the dance. The mere sound of the "tom-tom" sometimes makes them perfectly delirious, and then they rush forward and dance with wild gesticulations like lunatics.

The superior African negroes have a class of singers or poets whose function it is to sing the praises of their kings. This class is called "griots." They are sometimes part of the savage aristocracy and enjoy important privileges. Specimens of the compositions of these minstrels, exhibiting some rude literary instinct, are given by M. Letourneau.

The second portion of this interesting work deals with the literature of the yellow races, including the Polynesians, the American Indians, the Aztecs of Mexico and the Incas of Peru, the Mongolians (including the Esquimaux), the Chinese and Japanese. The most curious chapter in the book is that devoted to Chinese literature. By subjecting every art to pedantic rules, the Chinese appear to have killed out originality. They have no idea of "art for art's sake." Every Chinese drama must have a moral, and the principal object of literature is supposed to be the exposition of the rules of etiquette. The account given of Chinese lyric poetry shows profound research. The monarchic tone which pervades Chinese poetry renders it stiff and lifeless. As for Chinese prose, to quote M. Letourneau, "it exhales a veritable atmosphere of *ennui*, combining equal doses—all equally insupportable—of savagery, pedantry, and banality. It is the literature of a people grown old, whose spirit is in a state of decay."

In the concluding portion of his work, M. Letourneau deals

exhaustively with the literatures of ancient Egypt, Greece, Rome, Assyria, and of the Indians, the Arabs, and the Jews. He expresses the opinion that the only pearl in Assyrian literature is the celebrated legend of Istar, which may have furnished inspiration to Homer, for, no doubt, the Assyrian Venus was an earlier creation than the Greek goddess of Love. Of the Arabs he says that the ante-Islamite period of their literature was more free and imaginative in its character than that which followed the advent of Mohammed. The prophet hated poetry; and his system, though it has a touch of true sublimity, is too dogmatic and inflexible. The estimate of Jewish literature presented to us by M. Letourneau scarcely does justice to that extraordinary people. According to him the Jews were mentally enslaved; but they were at least the propagandists of a great idea, whether in our modern wisdom we call it superstition or not.

The tribute of admiration paid in the work to Greek literature is only what is due to the rare genius of Hellenism. It is, no doubt, the most perfect and comprehensive of all literatures. While Latin literature proved abortive, that of the Greeks had a glorious development.

In his concluding chapter M. Letourneau deals with "the Literature of the Future," and draws attention to the fact that there is a necessary correlation between the destiny of literature and that of society. When a people degenerates its literature also decays. Mere perfection of form will not prevent literary decadence; and herein truly lies one of the dangers of modern French literature. M. Letourneau blames the realistic school of fiction for dwelling too much on the nasty side of life. His strictures are just. Realism should not be synonymous with ugliness; and even those who believe that the naturalistic movement is sure to triumph would like to see the noble side of humanity depicted as faithfully as its base and degraded side. What is really required in the literature of our time is thoroughness. We are "the heirs of all the ages," and we should not be merely critical and fastidious. We should face all the problems of modern life boldly, and endeavour to solve them. In M. Letourneau's own work we have a splendid example of this earnest and fearless spirit; and he has enabled us to look at literature not as a collection of masterpieces, but as the true expression of man's intellectual life and spiritual aspirations.

D. F. HANNIGAN.

## THE PRINCIPLES OF BETTERMENT.

ALTHOUGH the principle of betterment is of such vital importance to Englishmen generally, and to the citizens of London in particular, little of any value has been written upon the subject in this country.<sup>1</sup> Even in the *Law Quarterly* the writer on Betterment<sup>2</sup> confuses the totally distinct principles of betterment and compensation.

Before, however, attempting to meet the criticisms of the opponents of betterment I propose to define shortly what is meant by this principle, and to show its application in the United States, the Dominion of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and Gibraltar.

The principle of betterment may be defined as the special taxation of real estate which is benefited by some local improvement carried out by the public authorities.

The term "betterment" is no doubt derived from the marginal note to sec. 26 of the Statutes of Charles II., viz., "Houses which be bettered in value." And it is asserted that this statute forms the precedent for the application of betterment in the United States. It will be well, therefore, to state shortly the object and effect of this legislation. Disastrous as the Great Fire was in many respects, it at any rate gave an opportunity not to be lost of laying out the streets of the City in a more convenient and sensible fashion. The Government of the day, servile as it undoubtedly was, recognised its opportunity and determined to take advantage of it. Now, without exceptional legislation it would have been impossible for the City authorities to have purchased the land necessary for the new streets and have carried out all the improvements unaided. It was considered only equitable by the Government that the owners of land which would be benefited by the improvements should contribute their fair share of the cost. Section 26<sup>3</sup> of the Act<sup>3</sup> speaks for itself: "And forasmuch as the houses now remaining and to be rebuilt will receive more or less advantage in the value of the rents, by the liberty of air and free recourse for trade, and other conveniences, by such regulation and enlargement." If the owners or others interested in such houses refused to agree and compound with the City authorities, then a jury was to be empanelled, "to judge

<sup>1</sup> The recent article by Lord Hobhouse is of course an exception to the above statement.

<sup>2</sup> John R. Adams, *Quarterly Review*, July 1893.

<sup>3</sup> 19 Car. II. c. 3.



and assess upon the owners and others interested of and in such houses such competent sum and sums of money with respect to their several interests, in consideration of such improvement and melioration, as in reason and good conscience they shall think fit;” and the sums so received were to be devoted to carrying out the said improvements.

Mr. Arthur A. Baumann contends that this Act was merely an exceptional measure to meet exceptional wants, and “that it is dangerous to make the extreme medicine of the Constitution its daily bread.”<sup>1</sup> This, to my mind, is sheer nonsense. The principle of the Act was that people who derived a pecuniary benefit from a public improvement were justly bound to contribute to such improvement, and it makes no difference in the world whether the Seven Dials had been destroyed by fire or by the pickaxe of the County Council; the result to owner is exactly the same.

Now the term “betterment” was used by the older American writers for our phrase “compensation for improvements” in the law of landlord and tenant, but the term is now used in the same sense that it bears in this country.<sup>2</sup> In the United States special taxes may be levied for local improvements either by a general assessment or by a special assessment, called a “betterment tax,” on property contiguous to the improvement. The former tax is general in all the States as here, but the latter obtains only in Illinois, Minnesota, Nebraska, Arkansas, Louisiana, California, and the State of New York.

In Arkansas such betterment tax can only be levied with the consent of a majority of the property-holders in the locality or improvement area, and the tax must be *ad valorem* and uniform. And in Louisiana, when such consent has been obtained, not more than one-half per cent. per annum may be levied, and the loan must not be spread over a longer period than ten years. In Illinois and Nebraska the statutory rate must not be exceeded except upon a poll of the county electors, and in Western Virginia such poll must be declared by a three-fifths vote of such electors.

In America, as with us and in most other civilised communities, private improvement rates are levied. These rates are levied upon the owners of property for the making and sewerage, &c., of the roads upon such property. Now, this class of improvements must be carefully distinguished from those to be effected under the principle of betterment. There is no dispute that the landowner is the proper party to bear the burden of this class of improvements, since without them his property would be comparatively valueless, and since the whole of the increased value which is due to such improvements accrues to him; if the community bore the expense the landowner would reap the fruits in the higher rents he would

<sup>1</sup> Arthur A. Baumann, *Betterment*, 1893.

<sup>2</sup> T. M. Cooley, *Constitutional Limitations*, 1868, p. 386.

be able to exact. In other words, the landowner would secure the unearned increment.

The principle involved here is, however, precisely the same as that involved in the class of improvements to which the term betterment is more usually applied. It is the circumstances of the case and the manner in which the principle is applied that are different. It is with this class only that I propose to deal.

We may take the provisions contained in the New York City Consolidation Act, 1882, as the most advanced type of American law upon this subject. Under this Act, when it is proposed by the Municipal Council to open out any street, avenue, square, or public place, application is made to the Supreme Court to appoint as a Commission three persons, nominated by the mayor, the owners interested, and the Court respectively. This Commission then proceeds to estimate and assess the compensation for the compulsory taking of land and the injurious severance (if any), and to estimate and assess the improved value (if any) to the lands adjoining the proposed improvements; and the Commissioners shall not,

“in making such estimate and assessment of the value of the benefit and advantage of the said operations, be confined to any definite limits, but shall be and hereby are authorised to extend such estimate and assessment to any and all such lands, tenements, hereditaments, and premises as they may deem to be benefited by the said operation, and which they may judge expedient to include in the report in the premises.”<sup>1</sup>

In the case of streets, the betterment area is limited in some instances to half the distance of the next street, and in others to ends of streets proposed to be made or extended. And in the case of public squares or places the area may include not only the property adjoining and fronting such squares or places, but also any property outside those limits as the Commissioners shall deem to be benefited by the erection of such squares or places.<sup>2</sup> If any buildings are injuriously affected by the improvement, the Commissioners are required to estimate and assess the amount of compensation to be paid to the owners.<sup>3</sup>

In no case, however, must the assessment for benefit exceed half the rateable value of the property.

The Commissioners' Report upon the whole scheme must be completed within four months. An abstract having been lodged with the Commissioner of Public Works, objections in writing to the scheme may be filed by the parties interested. After a ten days' notice the Commissioners hold their inquiry, and unless a majority in value of the parties interested object to the scheme, the final application to the Supreme Court is made for confirmation, and the award, if confirmed, becomes binding.

Just as in the United States the City of New York furnishes the

<sup>1</sup> Sec. 970.

<sup>2</sup> Sec. 973.

<sup>3</sup> Sec. 974.

most complete example of the more thorough application of the betterment principle, so in the Dominion of Canada the Province of Ontario takes the lead in this branch of municipal law reform. In the Province of Ontario, then, the charge for local private improvements, such as sewers, drains, paving, lighting, &c., is levied upon the owners of the property fronting upon the improvements, by a special rate according to the frontage, and upon the ratepayers generally by a common rate.

To this there is one exception. In the case of a township any portion of which is situate within five miles of a city containing 50,000 inhabitants or more, the Council may, if it considers the betterment area ought to be extended beyond the frontage property, upon the petition of three-fourths in number of the owners representing three-fourths in value of the lands to be benefited, assess the proportion of the costs chargeable against lands so benefited.

And further, the Council may, instead of levying a frontage rate, impose a special rate, according to the benefits to be received.<sup>1</sup>

In the following account of betterment proper it will be seen how our ideas are totally reversed in Ontario. The sections are worth quoting *in extenso* :

“Where it shall, in the opinion of the Council of any township, city, town, or incorporated village, be deemed expedient and necessary to construct or repair bridges or culverts on any street, lane, or alley, or to open up and extend any street, lane, or alley within the limits thereof for the immediate convenience or benefit of any locality within such limits, and the Council is of opinion *that from any reason it is inequitable to charge the whole of the cost of the improvement on the lands fronting thereon,*”<sup>2</sup> the Council shall determine what lands are benefited by such works or improvements, and the proportion in which the cost thereof shall be assessed against the lands so benefited, and also the proportion, if any, of the cost of the improvement which shall be assumed by the city, town, or incorporated village as its share thereof, . . . and that all assessments made under the above provisions shall be subject to an appeal to the court of revision, and from the court of revision to the county judge, in like manner as in the case of other special assessments for local improvements.”

“If, in the case of the construction or repair of a bridge or culvert, or the opening up and extension of any street, lane, or alley, the Council shall determine that any real property other than that fronting or abutting on the street, lane, or alley, or the portion thereof whereon or wherein the improvement is made or to be made, is specially benefited, and ought to be charged with a part of the cost thereof, and shall determine the proportion in which the cost of the improvement shall be assessed against the lands so benefited, the Council shall assess and levy the proportion of the cost chargeable against the lands benefited, but not so fronting.”

“Or in the case of a township, the Council may by bye-laws provide that the costs of the works therein specified may be assessed and levied by a special rate upon the lands benefited thereby according to the proportion of benefit received therefrom, instead of by a frontage rate.”<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Statutes of Ontario, 56 Vict. c. 42, ss. 612-615.

<sup>2</sup> The *italics* are mine.

<sup>3</sup> Statutes of Ontario, 55 Vict. c. 42, sec. §21 (1, 2, 3).

“In any case when the Council affirms by a two-thirds vote thereof that the constructing, erecting, or making of any bridge, culvert, or embankment, benefits the municipality at large, and that it would be inequitable to raise the whole cost of such improvement or work by local special assessments, the Council may pass a bye-law for borrowing money by the issue of debentures upon the credit of the municipality at large.”<sup>1</sup>

Whenever in cities and towns an appeal lies from the Court of Revision to the County Court judge, the latter may inquire and determine what other lands (if any) than those included in the assessment appealed from are or will be specially benefited, and to add such lands to the assessment, although they may not have been specified in any notice of such appeal.<sup>2</sup>

And in addition, the Council of any city or town may construct and lay down a plank side-walk upon and along any street, lane, or alley, or other thoroughfare or park . . . and the cost thereof may be assessed against the properties fronting or abutting thereon, if such side-walk is, in the opinion of two-thirds of the members present at any regular meeting of the City or Town Council, desirable in the public interest.<sup>3</sup>

In Manitoba, however, the Council of a municipality is more restricted in its powers of applying the betterment principle. Local improvements can only (with the exception to be mentioned shortly) be undertaken in pursuance of a bye-law passed upon a petition of two-thirds of the owners of the property to be benefited, representing one-half in value of such property. But where the Council decides to contribute at least one-half the cost of the proposed improvement, the other moiety may be raised from the owners of the property to be directly benefited, without recourse to any such bye-law. The city or town engineer fixes the amount by which each property will be benefited, and upon this amount an equalised rate, also settled by him, is levied. From the engineer's decision there is no appeal.<sup>4</sup> I shall later on refer more particularly to this method of assessment.

The only other province which calls for special mention is that of Quebec. In this province the Council of any municipality, in carrying out any works of a public nature, may levy by direct taxation upon all taxable property, or only upon all the taxable real estate belonging to those who, in the opinion of the Council, are interested in such works, or belonging to those who are more directly benefited by such works, all sums of money required for the construction and even for the maintenance of such works.<sup>5</sup>

The Lands Compensation Statute of Victoria<sup>6</sup> is very instructive reading. This is more especially the case since this statute has been

<sup>1</sup> Statutes of Ontario, 55 Vict. c. 42, sec. 622.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* sec. 623b.

<sup>3</sup> Statutes of Manitoba, 53 Vict. 1890, sec. 289.

<sup>4</sup> Revised Statutes of Quebec, 1883, sec. 6104.

<sup>5</sup> Statutes of Victoria, 33 Vict. No. 344.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* sec. 623a.

subjected to the review of the Privy Council.<sup>1</sup> By section 35 of this Act compensation is to be given in addition to the purchase price for any damage arising by reason of severance or from the remaining property being otherwise injuriously affected. And the

“magistrates, arbitrators, surveyors, valuers and jury, in assessing such compensation . . . shall take into consideration the enhancement in value of the adjoining land belonging to the person to whom compensation is to be made, or any other benefit or advantage which such person may or shall obtain by reason of the making of such works or undertakings in reduction of such compensation.”

In the case referred to before the Privy Council the plaintiff claimed £3676 6s. 6d. for the compulsory taking of about fifteen acres of his land. The jury before whom the action was tried in Victoria found that the commercial value of the land was £61 1s. 9d.; the amount for compulsory taking, £15 4s.; the amount for a fence of plaintiff's, £113; and the amount by reason of severance, £60. In all, £249 5s. 9d.

The jury also found that the enhancement in value of 1182 acres of adjoining land of the plaintiff by reason of the works was £591.

Now there can be no doubt that it was the intention of the Victorian Legislature that the one sum should be set off against the other, and in fact their Lordships said as much, but found themselves obliged to hold that the enhancement in value of the owner's adjoining land could only be set off against the amount allowed for damage arising from severance, but could not be allowed against the compensation for the land actually taken. A verdict was ordered to be entered for the plaintiff for £189 5s. 9d., the £60 being set off against the £591. Their Lordships further remarked that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Victoria did “not seem to have considered that there would be lands adjacent to the railway which would be enhanced in value by the making of it, but no part of which might be taken by the Board. The owners of these might be equally benefited with the owners of land taken, or even more so, and would lose nothing.” This dictum, coming from such a quarter, is especially valuable, but is difficult to reconcile with the recent action of the House of Lords in their political capacity upon the betterment question.

It is clear, then, that at present the Victorian Legislature has failed to grasp the true principles of betterment. In the case quoted, the effect of its legislation was that a man who should, according to a jury, have paid £341 14s. 3d. in respect of the enhanced value of his property actually received £189 5s. 9d.

In New Zealand the application of the betterment principle is confined to drainage. By section 276 of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1886, in draining low-lying lands, the Council of any borough,

<sup>1</sup> *Harding v. Board of Land and Works*, 11 App. Cas. 208.

in making the necessary drains, may recover the cost<sup>1</sup> of such drains from the owners and occupiers of the lands thereby drained in such proportions as the Council thinks fair.<sup>1</sup>

One more precedent and I have done. By "The Sanitary Order in Council, Gibraltar, 1883," the Commissioners are required when it has been determined to widen, divert, or construct any road, to charge part of the cost thereof (being in no case more than one-half) upon the premises, the owners and occupiers of which will be benefited by reason of improved access or otherwise.<sup>2</sup>

It now remains to be seen what are the proposals for applying the principle of betterment in this country. The only definite schemes before the public are those of the London County Council, although I believe that Cardiff and other large provincial cities are about to ask from Parliament similar powers. Since the proposals contained in the Holborn and Strand improvement scheme have been abandoned by the London County Council it is unnecessary to refer to these, and I shall confine my remarks to the London County Council (General Powers) Bill, 1892, and the London Improvements Bill, 1893.

The former Bill is better known as the Cromwell Road Bridge Improvement Scheme. The cost of this scheme is estimated at £66,000 and it is proposed to raise this sum in three equal parts. A betterment area is to be defined of all lands situate in the parish of Fulham and within a radius of half a mile of the western end of the bridge. Within this area two-thirds of the cost are to be levied. One-third is to be by way of improvement charge on all lands and buildings within the said area, as in the opinion of the Council or of the arbitrator are directly benefited by the improvement, and the second third is to be by way of improvement rate under similar provisions. The remaining third is to be raised under a Metropolitan General Improvement rate, to be borne by the metropolis at large.

It has been objected that it is inequitable to compel the owners within the betterment area to pay two-thirds of the cost. But the reason for this is, that the bridge would open up a portion of the locality which is now a veritable *cul de sac*, and by this scheme it is possible to cast upon those more directly benefited—*i.e.*, those owners of property in this particular locality—a fair proportion of the cost and at the same time to throw upon those not so directly benefited—*i.e.*, those owners of property within the whole betterment area—their fair share, and to spread over the whole metropolis, which is more remotely and less directly benefited, a further share, which it may justly be called upon to contribute.

If the powers here demanded of Parliament are compared with

<sup>1</sup> Statutes of New Zealand, 50 Vict. No. 50.

<sup>2</sup> Cited by Mr. Charles Harrison, in *Memorandum of Assessments*, 29th May, 1893.

those which have been conferred upon the Council of every municipality, great or small, in the Province of Ontario, it must be confessed that the proposals under consideration bear on the side of moderation. For it has been pointed out that in this province a Municipal Council under similar circumstances may charge not only one-third, but the whole of the cost of the improvement upon the owners who are directly benefited.

The other proposal of the Council is better known as the Tower Bridge Approach Bill; the other improvements being the widening of Wood Lane, Hammersmith, the rebuilding of Vauxhall Bridge, and the widening of the southern approach to Woolwich Ferry. The total sum to be raised for these purposes is estimated at £927,800.

Clause 41 expresses the principle of the Bill :

“ And whereas the improvements (other than the said widening of Wood Lane, of which one-half the net cost is to be defrayed by the said vestry) will be effected out of public funds charged over the whole country, and will, or may, increase in value or benefit lands in the neighbourhood of the improvements which will not be required for the purposes thereof, and it is reasonable that provision should be made under which, in respect or in consideration of such increased value or benefit, a charge should be placed on such land.”

A betterment area having been defined on the plans, an assessment is to be framed describing such lands within the area as, in the opinion of the Council, ought to bear and pay the improvement charge.

This assessment is to contain a statement of the enhanced value in consequence of the improvements, and the charge is to be equal to 3 per cent. per annum upon one-half of this amount.

If any owner objects to the assessment within the specified time, an arbitrator is to be appointed by the Local Government Board, and his award is to be final. He may, however, state a special case to the High Court upon any question of law.

That these proposals of the Council should appear unreasonable or inequitable to any but the hired advocates of the Property Defence League and the Upper House of Landlords I should be loth to believe. And yet it is for these proposals that Mr. Baumann reserves all his spleen and indignation. They contain, he declares, all the vices and none of the safeguards of the New York system.

What do these vices amount to? Why, that the taxation is not uniform.

Now, taxation is based upon the principle of ability to pay, and this principle is of the very essence of a betterment scheme. Those who derive most advantage from a public improvement are those who can best afford to pay most towards the cost of such improvement. To impose a charge of so much per foot frontage would

certainly be uniform, but it would not always be equitable, since some properties along the line of improvement are more valuable than others.

And what are the safeguards? Why, that in New York the municipality is limited in its expenditure and the Commissioners' award must be confirmed by the Supreme Court.

But what were the reasons for these safeguards? These Mr. Baumann, even if he is aware of them, quietly ignores. At the time those laws were passed the municipality of New York was the most corrupt on the face of the earth.

The history of the Tweed Ring in New York City is graphically told in the *American Commonwealth* by Mr. F. J. Goodnow.<sup>1</sup> Although not more than \$25,000,000 might be raised for the year 1871, the ring had at its disposal for that year \$48,000,000.

Writing in 1887 on Municipal Development, Messrs. Alinson and Penrose state that, although by the Constitution of Pennsylvania the debt of a municipality must never exceed 7 per cent. on the rateable value, this provision is evaded in nearly every city of the State by increasing such rateable value fictitiously, "in some instances, incredible as it may seem, to the extent of 1000 per cent."<sup>2</sup>

It would appear, then, that this safeguard is almost entirely illusory. Such restrictions are imposed by Americans because they know that their municipalities are corrupt, and since there is not a breath of suspicion against the London County Council, these restrictions are unnecessary, and, even if this body were corrupt, would in all probability be as futile as is the case in America.

Then, as now, judges were elected to the Bench, and the three Improvement Commissioners appointed by one of the Supreme Court judges. The Commissioners appointed ultimately proved to be the tools of the ring. The ring and their friends having previously bought property along the line of improvement (this was the widening of the Broadway) proceeded by means of their nominees to award themselves damages on a liberal scale. "The assessments for improvements," says Mr. Goodnow, "showed the same singular inequality." Any appeal to the Courts was of course perfectly useless.

The debt of the city during the *régime* of the ring rose from \$20,000,000 to \$100,955,333. But although the government of the city is still substantially the same as in the days of the Tweed Ring, it is improbable that similar abuses will again obtain.<sup>3</sup> At the same time, however, all American writers agree that muni-

<sup>1</sup> James Bryce, *American Commonwealth*, c. lxxxviii.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* c. li.

<sup>3</sup> The recent conviction of "Boss M'Kane" for political corruption will have a further influence in purifying, not only municipal, but also national elections. It is only fair to add, however, that Mr. M'Kane has appealed from this conviction.



cial government in the States cannot compare in purity of administration with that which obtains in the Old World.

To compare, therefore, the London County Council with the Council of New York City is misleading. Mr. Baumann declares that in America the London County Council would speedily be tied to its kennel. It is not by cheap and vulgar sneers such as these that Mr. Baumann can hope to strengthen a weak case. And the reason for this corruption is well known and openly acknowledged by Americans. Every American city is subject to a continual influx of foreign immigrants. In New York, at the time of the ring, four-ninths of the population were of foreign birth. These immigrants are, as a rule, the dregs of European cities, without any inherent notions of local self-government, and necessarily ignorant of the spirit of American institutions. Mr. Baumann also objects to an arbitrator being appointed by the Local Government Board, and to his decision being final. It seems to me that a Government expert would make the most suitable arbitrator, and as provision is made for carrying disputed points of law to the High Court, I fail to see what will be gained by submitting highly technical facts as to valuations to a judge and jury. A judge and two expert commissioners would be far more likely to do justice than a judge and jury. I have pointed out that in Manitoba the city or town engineer is the supreme arbitrator, and there must be very little faith in the honesty and purity of our Local Government Board if its appointments are to be open to the charge of corruption.

Betterment, it is said, is correlative with worsement; in any scheme worsement must accompany betterment. At first sight this appears only reasonable. But what is worsement? The term is used to mean that property which is "worsted" shall receive compensation. There is, however, much confusion of thought shown by the opponents of betterment in the use of this word. By some it is used to mean property along the line of improvement which is injuriously affected. Now where part of a property only is taken and that which remains is injuriously affected, ample provision is already made for compensation under the existing law. And it seems impossible to imagine the case of a property, no part of which is taken, being injuriously affected by means of that which obviously enhances its value, but if any such case can be shown to exist, there can be no possible objection to following the Australian precedent, which enjoins compensation wherever any damage can be shown. By others the term is used of properties which are outside the betterment area but which in consequence of the improvement are injuriously affected. I will give an example. I am informed that, in consequence of the making of Shaftesbury Avenue, rents have been considerably reduced in Wardour Street. Such damages as these seem to me, to put it in legal phraseology, too remote. A

hundred and one causes other than the one alleged may have caused this reduction. But assuming such to be the case, under the law as it stands, what as a matter of fact happened? Why that the inhabitants of Wardour Street, by paying their share of the General Improvement Rate for the construction of Shaftesbury Avenue, actually contributed to the cause of their own loss.

As an alternative to betterment is the procedure known as recoupment. Under this method the property along the line of improvement is purchased outright by the municipal authority, and the improvement having been carried out, the new frontages are sold at such enhanced prices, if these can be obtained, as to partly cover the cost of the improvement. It was under this system that Northumberland and Shaftesbury Avenues and Charing Cross Road were constructed, and in the latter case especially the result has been anything but satisfactory to the Council.<sup>1</sup> The system is, in fact, most wasteful. Under the existing law of compulsory purchase, land must be acquired on the onerous terms of 20 to 25 per cent. over and above the market price; and when to this is added the compensation for the goodwill of those tradesmen who have to be permanently removed, it will be readily acknowledged by all business men that land cannot be advantageously obtained upon such terms, or, indeed, made to pay its way.

Mr. Adams asserts that the principle of betterment is a "new-fangled one." What if it is? If a principle is just and equitable, expedient and practicable, what need of precedents? And, moreover, Mr. Adams is not correct. If the statute of Charles II. is not of sufficient antiquity, I refer Mr. Adams to the statutes of Henry VI. (1427); 23 Henry VIII. c. 5; 3 & 4 Edw. VI. c. 8; 13 Eliz. c. 9; and 3 Jac. I. c. 4. All these contain the principle of betterment clearly and specifically.

In conclusion, I submit that I have shown that the broad principle of betterment has been recognised and applied in this country for centuries; that it is even more thoroughly recognised and applied amongst other English-speaking communities; that the House of Lords, in their judicial capacity, expressed itself in favour of the principle; and that Her Majesty in Council actually ordered the principle to be applied in Gibraltar. The House of Lords in its political capacity, however, saw fit to shelve the question on the idle excuse that such a principle should not be included in a private Bill. As a matter of fact, in every one of the colonial cases the betterment provisions are inserted in the Municipal Acts of the Province or State.

<sup>1</sup> Mr. G. L. Gomme has shown the saving that would have been effected had the property actually required for new streets only been purchased, and had no extra land been purchased for recoupment. The extra cost incurred under this system, exclusive of additional legal and other expenses involved in the acquisition of the extra properties, was, in the case of Gray's Inn Road, 25 per cent.; of Charing Cross Road, 17 per cent.; of Shaftesbury Avenue, 2 per cent.; and of Marshalsea Road, 19 per cent. (*London County Council Returns*, vol. iii. p. 291.)

The real motive of their Lordships is of course only too apparent. They represent nothing but themselves and the landed interests. In the metropolis alone the value of these interests has been increased by millions of pounds at the expense of the ratepayers. No doubt the ratepayer has been a helpless victim in the past; but he will only have himself to blame if, now that he sees the real facts of the case, and now that the power is in his own hands, he allows the great London landlords to continue to reap where they have not sown, and to garner what they have not reaped.

HUGH H. L. BELLOT.

## THE VICTIMS OF INDUSTRY.

It is now several years since the able pen of Mrs. Lynn Linton produced in the person of Joshua Davidson an ideal British workman, the conception of the authoress being to apply to the circumstances of a modern London artisan the rules of life and conduct taught by Christ to the Jews of Palestine some two thousand years ago. The hero of this work was obscure in origin and imperfectly educated, a free-thinker but not a free-liver, gifted with force of character and high-minded, a purist after a fashion, and an enthusiast—such a one as under certain circumstances might become a leader of men. Indeed, it might be on the whole well if the British proletariat had no worse leaders, for in that case a *modus vivendi* might easily be arranged between the contending parties in certain social conflicts now impending. But, as a matter of fact, Joshua Davidson has a very prosaic countertype, a man of much coarser fibre, not gifted with lofty or generous impulses, little embarrassed by nice scruples, who also wants to become a leader of men. What is more, such an individual as we have described finds at the present time close at hand a large and yearly increasing body of other men, who are perfectly willing and anxious to become his followers.

For convenience sake, suppose we divide the members of our social system into three sections :

1. That class which, having enough wealth for a comfortable subsistence without working, lives for the most part in idleness, having pastime in some sense of the word for its principal aim.

2. The workers of brain or muscle who become the victors or the vanquished in our perpetual fierce struggle for existence, having the hope of comfort or affluence for an ultimate goal.

3. Human drift. This division is composed for the most part of highly worthless types, those of low vitality, weak muscular power, feeble brain, unhappy ones, afflicted with congenital or acquired infirmity, the reckless, thriftless, improvident, the incapable and unfortunate.

In the ranks of the latter classes are found the desultory workman, the indolent, the beggar, the cadger, the criminal—all social failures or social outcasts.

There are forty-five Socialist clubs, including branches, in London,

and Socialistic feeling is spreading through the provinces, the holders of such opinions being almost exclusively confined to certain classes in our large cities and towns. This movement has its more or less educated leaders, its literature, its organisation, and there is not the remotest doubt that it will shortly have a palpable influence in the Legislature. At present amongst our town working men there is a deep sense of discontent with the prevailing order of society. This sentiment, which may be said to commence with the skilled artisan, becomes more bitter as it permeates through still lower divisions, and then there is a sufficiently formidable background of hate and a strong desire for social upheaval amongst the masses. But amongst those masses there is also a large element of what produces the real or potential criminal, the low-browed scoundrelism such as on certain memorable occasions, while burning with sans-culottic fury at the real wrongs of centuries, clustered in ignoble crowds through the streets of Paris, and shouted "aristo" as carriages passed by filled by occupants heedless of their coming fate; occupants not by any means invariably aristocrats, but who, on account of being prosperous and well-dressed, had incurred the hatred of sans-culottism in France, as property-holders in England have incurred the hatred and jealousy of sans-culottic London to-day.

The above classes compare their lot, which is generally one of squalid poverty, with the opulence and comfort of others. They are continually told by their leaders that they are oppressed by society, and they fully believe it, for what is more easy than to induce man, and especially uneducated man, to believe that he is in some way taken advantage of or oppressed by others? In fact, they long for a change which will give them idle comfort instead of daily toil with its precarious life, and this hope finds its outcome in Socialism. Therefore, as the town population of the United Kingdom increases (and it evinces a strong tendency to do so rapidly), the country must be prepared for a still further augmentation of discontent, which has already assumed proportions not to be regarded with indifference by those whose business it is to feel the pulse of public opinion.

Suppose the above premisses be admitted, it may now be asked, Can these growing needs be dealt with, and if so, how? We think they can; we believe that with proper management a great deal of the misery and poverty, and of that crime which is produced by poverty, could be dealt with, and in a large measure dissipated. In fact, while regarding the bitter feeling entertained by many of the lower classes towards those above them, we do not consider that the former have absolutely no case; indeed, we consider that, often wrong-headed and criminal as they are, yet up to a certain point they have got some *casus belli* in their warfare against society. For instance, the lower orders have neither the capacity nor the intelligence, the wealth nor the leisure, which would enable them to combat success-

fully certain evils to which they are subject, but to which other classes—the cultured, the wealthy, the leisured—might well direct their attention. There are orders in the lower strata who may properly be regarded as *in statu pupillaris*, orders to whom those representing intelligence and power have certain responsibilities, and to whom they owe certain duties, which are not required with reference to other and higher classes. No doubt, during the evolution of politics something has been done to ameliorate the condition of the working poor, but much remains to be accomplished, and we are of opinion that if certain measures were judiciously carried out, two great objects might be attained :

1. The diminution of a formidable amount of human misery, and with it a large amount of crime, and of more or less discontent with the social order.

2. A considerable check would be placed on the now rapidly-augmenting mass of human drift which forms so unsightly and dangerous a feature in our modern civilisation.

Amongst the mass of social failures there are many who, from no fault of their own, but, on the contrary, owing to the shortcomings of others, are condemned to an existence of sorrow, and are incapacitated from being numbered with the winners in the great race of life. Such unhappy creatures must have the strongest claims on our sympathy, and if society owes duties to them which have not been performed, it is clear such duties ought to be no longer neglected.

When the Legislature decreed that children under eleven years of age should not be employed in factories and workshops, an excellent principle was established, inasmuch as Government assumed the right to protect certain divisions of our population, who, living under specially adverse conditions, could not adequately protect themselves from the influence of greed united with power on the part of other classes. Now, we do not consider that all sections of our society have yet received the amount of protection and assistance to which they are entitled.

England has frequently been styled the workshop of the world, and to a certain extent merits the title, although it must be confessed many of our industries are taking wings and flitting away to other lands. If, however, our manufacturing enterprise has produced great national wealth, it has also opened a veritable box of Pandora, full of the most noxious influences, which, like a swarm of disasters, are spreading through our population and leaving a blight on their track, which are seriously injuring the constitution of our people, which are causing widespread suffering to the present generation, and are bound to leave a legacy of impaired vitality for other generations to come. It may be said that few trades employing artisan labour are healthy ; many ~~at~~ ~~at~~ present carried on entail consequences which

are simply deadly. We cannot even hope that science will ever completely dissipate the hurtful results of all unwholesome occupations; but we do maintain that science directed by intelligence can do much: it may erect very efficient safeguards in the case of some, it may greatly mitigate the baneful effects of others now endured by the English sons and daughters of toil in search of their daily bread.

In 1892, Dr. Arlidge published a valuable treatise, *Diseases of Occupations*, the general scheme of the work being directed to set forth the various maladies engendered by certain industries, and also to show how science and legislation, properly directed, might arrest or considerably modify influences which are at present acting so injuriously on the national health. Truly the work alluded to is well worth perusal by those who are interested in the well-being of the working classes, although the humanitarian will not find it pleasant reading, revealing as it does horrors of industrial life little suspected by those who are not brought into contact with the factory or workshop. Our bread, our clothes, the decorations of our houses, our linen, cutlery, glass and china ware—almost every article, in fact, of utility or ornament produced by the demands of our present artificial existence—represent each some special disease. As day follows day the great English army of male and female labour goes forth to occupations entailing shortened life, chronic ill-health, and enfeebled offspring at the mandate of modern civilisation.

Stating the matter broadly, the four principal factors producing industrial ill-health are: noxious vapours, dust, poison—*i.e.* occupations in which poisonous materials are dealt with—and the habits of the workers. Experience has amply proved that the working classes become singularly reckless in dangerous occupations; they neglect the ordinary rules of cleanliness; in order to avoid trouble, they refuse to adopt preventive measures against palpable evils; while intemperance is very prevalent.

It may be said that there is not a single employment which, if followed with intensity, is not provocative of some form of disease. This fact being established, it is obvious that medical science should be carefully directed to searching out the unwholesome conditions of industry and examining their results, with the view of providing a remedy where such could be discovered. The French and German physicians have for many years past systematically worked on these lines, though, strange to say, the subject has received comparatively little attention in England; consequently, the British student searching into the pathology of industrial complaints must derive the bulk of his most valuable information from Continental sources. The more the subject is examined, the more apparent does it become that if the genius of industry has for his temple the British workshop, he most ruthlessly exacts multitudes of victims as

sacrifices on his altar; and he also impresses upon his votaries certain very abhorrent trade marks, of which those below are but samples culled from many others: Stonemasons' lung, flock fever, chimney-sweeps' cancer, brass founders' ague, arsenical poisoning, grinders' rot, poncy, linen-workers' disease, printers' phthisis and eye complaints.

In the production of chloride of lime Dr. Arlidge thus describes what the workmen are subjected to:

“While working in the chlorine chambers they (the workmen) envelop the neck, mouth, and nose in several folds of woollen cloth, wear huge goggles, and bandage their legs with folds of thick brown paper fastened by string. In a very brief period these protecting investments become completely rotten and fall to pieces. The dense wraps over the nose and mouth almost completely prevent breathing, and it is only by practice that the men can carry on sufficient respiration to sustain life. Even as it is they can remain only a brief time within the chamber, and have to seek for fresh air outside. On their exit they are seen to be sweating profusely and greatly exhausted, gasping for air, with inflamed eyes and highly reddened skin, whilst mucus streams from the mucous membrane of the nose and air-passages, accompanied by cough. They are, in short, in a state of partial suffocation, with congestion of the lungs, induced not only by the gas, but also by the impediment to breathing from the dense protecting bandages over the face. For a few seconds the necessity for admitting air within the lungs precludes speech; but after a short period, by the action of outside air and diligent wiping away of the sweat, they get sufficiently refreshed to return to their painful labour.”

Few industries are so deadly as the preparation of lead, or the occupations in which that metal is largely used. The unwholesome results are comprised under the name of plumbism or lead-poisoning, giving rise, amongst other symptoms, to colic, paralysis, loss of sight, epileptic convulsions, &c. The noxious conditions of this industry, however, could be largely combated by proper ventilators, cleanliness on the part of the workers; by their avoiding eating food in rooms where lead is being used; by their wearing while at work a special dress, gloves, and respirators, which some manufacturers are careful to supply; and by the frequent use of the bath.

Special regulations have been made by the Home Department relating to lead factories, but there is only too good evidence that, however excellent the original intentions, the measures are in many cases not enforced, or are carried out in a loose and irregular manner. Owing either to there being too few inspectors, or to their time being taken up with other duties, some of the workshops are rarely visited, and when this is the case men often work in an atmosphere filled with fumes so dense as to obscure the light and produce in a short time all the symptoms of aggravated lead-poisoning. It must be admitted also that the fault is not in every case entirely with the factory-owners, who are confronted by recklessness, ignorance, and obstinacy on the part of their workpeople; and,



strange as it may seem, it is a fact that both men and women, often from the fear of ridicule, a sentiment of false independence, or in order to avoid a slight inconvenience, refuse to avail themselves of precautions which are placed within their reach.

Dr. Arlidge demonstrates conclusively in his work that, as regards factories and workshops, architectural arrangements in some cases and mechanical or chemical appliances in others can to a very large extent diminish the deadly effects of unhealthy trades, or render them practically harmless. Thus, greater space, a different quality of light, scientific ventilation, ventilating fans and certain lavatory arrangements, &c., are questions which are attended to by some employers at greater or less expense to themselves, others neglect these precautions, and carry on their business under the most unwholesome conditions and at a terrible sacrifice of human life and health. It follows, therefore, that the Factory Act is in itself insufficient, or that there are no proper means of setting it in motion, and consequently amendment is urgently called for; but we believe that much more than development of the present Act is indicated. We consider that a great advantage would be gained if there were attached to the Home Office a permanent staff of experts in sanitary engineering, chemistry, and toxicology; this staff should also be partially composed of experienced medical men, and the number should be fully adequate to the duties required.

The functions of this Board should be much more extended than are those of the present factory inspectors; it should take cognisance of all industries, and investigate any baneful conditions under which each might be exercised; it should also be empowered to collect statistics relative to noxious dust, poisonous gases, duration of life and disease in different occupations. With this view, factories, workshops, and bakeries should be liable to visitation at certain times by the members of the staff, who would thus be in a position to secure full information, and present it to the Home Secretary, besides suggesting remedies for his consideration. Periodical reports, coming from such a body as we have suggested, would also, if published, contain information on a subject which is of national importance, but relative to which our present knowledge is very obscure.

Indeed, it is not only the operatives who suffer from causes which are easily remediable, for victims to faulty legislation may be found amongst the general public to an extent little imagined, as may be inferred by the following extract from the *British Medical Journal*, describing the condition of a West End bakehouse:

"In one of the 108 bakehouses the conditions were disgraceful: the walls of the 'prover,' where the dough is put to rise, and, indeed, the walls generally, were clothed with cockroaches; a closet communicated almost directly with the bakehouse; the drains were of brick, and

defective; the flour was stored in a damp, musty vault; and the place was filthy."

In order to illustrate how beneficially legislation might interfere for the protection of different sections of the population, without in the slightest degree retarding national industry, we present the following cases. Shop assistants and omnibus conductors suffer from a peculiar form of spinal complaint, consequent on standing for many hours; and in the case of women the same cause is productive of other serious functional disorders; clerks in banks are liable to serious injury to the sight, owing to their been required to work in improper artificial light. In some shops the proprietors supply seats to the assistants, but the majority do not. On one or two lines of omnibuses seats are arranged for the conductors under the roof ladder; the majority have none. In a few, very few, establishments where artificial light is used, some attention may be paid to the quality of the light; in the vast majority, flaring gas or naked electric light is used. Now, be it observed, the workers in each of the above cases can individually take no initiative step, for any remonstrance would be met with a gruff and unsympathetic recommendation to go elsewhere if they did not like their employment. These helots of civilisation, moreover, may be, and generally are, in the power of their employers. Loss of work often entails absolute destitution, or these modern helots, having others depending on them, may be practically as much in bondage, with far less of the sunshine in their lives, as were their prototypes in Greece 2500 years ago. Further, these classes not being effectually combined in a manner to defend themselves, continue to suffer in silence and unmarked.

The above questions are not to be argued simply on the grounds of humanity and justice, for there is another point to be observed, which is distinctly one of national importance. Although the working classes of our towns are rapidly increasing in numbers, owing to the depletion of the rural districts, the physique of the town worker is sensibly degenerating. The above is proved by the fact that in the case of army recruits chiefly drawn from the town population, it has been found necessary to reduce the standard height and measurement of the chest, the offspring of the town workers, besides, showing a strong tendency to become small-boned, round-shouldered, badly developed, with inferior stamina, weak sight, rickety bones, and low nervous energy. As our national security depends essentially on the quality of our defences, it follows that the material of which our army is composed ought certainly to be not of a worse description than that of forces with which we may at any time have to contend; but, as a matter of fact, it is much worse, being considerably below the average of the rank and file of Continental armies. The plain truth is often not agreeable to contemplate, but, if so, there is only the

more reason that it should be faced and dealt with as common sense suggests, and it is obvious that, with such interests as we have at stake, the application of unmistakable remedies ought not to be delayed longer than necessary.

Of all the terrible calamities to which our race is subject, deprivation of sight is amongst the most lamentable, and more especially when the loss of this sense occurs after the years of early childhood have passed. Cut off from nearly every kind of recreation, deprived of a sense which more than any other gladdens life and brings us into contact with all that is loveliest in nature—in the world, yet not of the world—the afflicted one passes his or her days in hopeless darkness, never to be lightened on this side of the grave. But we have in our population more than 20,000 men, women, and children in this state who should not be so, and who are thus improperly deprived of the most joyous gift which Nature can bestow. For we can daily see those who, at various periods of their lives from childhood to old age, incur the misfortune of partial or total blindness, which would not have occurred had remedial measures been applied in time, or which the exercise of a very little elementary knowledge might have prevented from the first.

Most men and women are born with good eyesight. When there has been deterioration or loss of this most precious of Nature's gifts, the evil has come amongst the poorer classes from ignorance or neglect on their part or of their parents, and, the truth must be told, from carelessness, indifference, or avarice on the part of the employers of labour.

There are approximately 32,000 blind people in the British Isles, but, sad to say, two out of every three of these unfortunates are in this state owing to preventable causes. So it is stated in a Report published by the Society for the Prevention of Blindness. It thus appears that there are, as we have just said, more than 20,000 of our fellow-countrymen and countrywomen who, from want of vigilance or care, from ignorance, or defect in legislation, have lost that precious gift which, once lost, can never be regained, who are more or less useless and disabled, instead of being happy and useful members of our society.

In dealing with this subject, we classify the blind under three heads :

1. Those who have lost sight in childhood or adult life.
2. Those who have become blind in infancy owing to a special cause, to be explained further on.
3. Those who have been born blind.

As regards the first class, it should be observed that injury to the eyes in males is chiefly due, first, to accidents occurring while at work ; second, over-straining the sight, especially when it has shown symptoms of weakness. In the case of females and children the

cause is generally accidental or owing to wilful violence, and also as in the case of males, to over-straining the eye by long-continued work. Under the direction of Dr. Roth, 48 Wimpole Street, a most useful society (the Society for the Prevention of Blindness) was established some years ago, the object being to distribute by means of short publications in plain language, general instruction regarding the preservation of sight. From a publication issued by the above Society it would seem that the following are very fertile causes of blindness: Living much in impure air or in air impregnated with animal or vegetable emanations; air impregnated with smoke or in which mineral dust is floating; abuse of alcohol and tobacco, and especially the latter, as it has a decidedly baneful effect on the optic nerve. Insufficient, unequal, too glaring, unsteady, flickering light. The light should fall from above or from the left side, in all schools, workshops, and wherever the eyes are constantly at work. Light opposite the eyes or reflected from whitewashed walls, white blinds, white writing-paper, straining the eyes by constant looking at small objects, prolonged reading of small type, reading by fire-light or in the dusk, mental and eye work immediately after meals, as well as sudden and repeated changes of light and darkness, very quick reading, writing, and counting, or watching objects which pass our eyes rapidly, as in a railway train, reading in bed or in a horizontal position, and finally, reading while the body and hands shake, as in quick driving, riding and marching, or during a railway journey, are all calculated to injure the sight.

It is unfortunate that, with a view to economy, schoolbooks are in many cases printed on white, thin, semi-transparent paper with small type, very close letters, and insufficient interval between the lines. But a very heavy price is paid in deteriorated sight, and generally increasing short sight, as is evidenced by the number of children who are at present to be continually seen wearing spectacles.

In printing, tailoring, and shoemaking establishments, bankers' offices, counting-houses, and generally where clerks are employed or fine work is executed, the light supplied is for the most part that of naked gas, or unshaded electric light. That is to say, during the long winter evenings, for hour after hour, men and women are employed under conditions, when using their eyes, which in the course of time are highly injurious to the optic nerve. Partial or total blindness must after a given time be the result; and for this fact we have undeniable medical testimony. We consider, therefore, that here the law might well step in between the workers and the employers, and for these reasons: Those whose services are hired are generally in the extreme of poverty, they may have others depending on them, and no work might mean starvation or beggary for themselves and others. Experience shows that employers of labour are usually callous in matters regarding the comfort or health

of their employés; a mere remonstrance would be unavailing, and consequently hard necessity makes the former masters of the situation. In order to avoid what is called grandmotherly legislation, it may not be always expedient that the law should interfere even in the direct interests of humanity, but in this case it must be remembered that those amongst the poor who are incapacitated from earning their living must become in some sense or other a charge on the community, and therefore, taking the mere cold matter-of-fact view of the question, the community must have a direct interest in restricting the numbers of the incæpable, and consequently a palpable right to legislate in that direction. It would be out of place here to discuss which particular description of light might be best adapted for offices, schools, and workshops, but scientific opinion on that point might easily be procured, and once the information were gained, employers of labour and directors of schools should be required by law to use in their establishments only that light. Nor do we think the question of expense would present any serious obstacle in carrying out our suggestion; the question would probably resolve itself into one connected with the best species of shade or of coloured ground glass.

As regards the second class—*i e.*, those who have lost sight during infancy—certain facts should be understood. A very frequent cause of blindness is a species of inflammation in the eyes of newly-born infants, owing to circumstances connected with the mother's health. This form of eye-complaint is easily preventible, and can always be cured *if taken in time*, but every minute lost increases the danger; and if the disease be not immediately attended to, the eyeball is attacked, and incurable blindness or permanent weakness of the organ is the inevitable result. Unfortunately, however, ignorance or that extraordinary apathy and carelessness so common amongst the lower classes, is responsible for a great deal of disastrous consequences; it is the expressed opinion of several eminent oculists that half the blindness of Europe is due to infantile inflammation, and in the United Kingdom no less than 7000 persons are now hopelessly blind from that easily preventible cause. In Germany the matter is considered so important that specially trained midwives are appointed by Government to certain districts, and they are furnished with clearly expressed codes of instructions as to how to act in cases of purulent ophthalmia making its appearance. Medical men having official positions are also appointed to certain localities, and to these functionaries the midwives are required to report immediately on the first appearance of the eye being affected. We think that the German system, or a development of it, might with great advantage be adopted in this country; and were the measures properly carried out, a source of considerable mischief might in time be extinguished.

The number of those actually born blind is only three per cent. of the total number of blind persons in the British Isles.

We have endeavoured in the foregoing pages to indicate the far-reaching and dangerous effects which are even now working in connection with certain social problems, and especially the labour question. We have endeavoured to demonstrate that the great industries of our country can on good authority be carried on under comparatively safe and wholesome conditions, but that they are largely carried on in a manner which shortens life, decreases vitality, inflicts long suffering, produces revolting bodily ailments, and encumbers our future population with a mass of enfeebled wretched beings brought into the world under peculiarly unfavourable circumstances. Between the lines, therefore, of things as they are and things as they might be under intelligent legislation, there exists a lamentable amount of human degradation and sorrow which could be annihilated. Even apart from the labour question there is much to be done, and which should be done, to ameliorate the condition of those in the ranks of poverty; sanitation, better housing of the poor, a pure water supply, properly directed relief for the absolutely destitute—these, and other questions besides, become every year more urgent. It follows that the patriot, the philanthropist, or the statesman, may find full scope for his abilities in the solution of the above problems, and he who succeeds in solving these, or some of them, will perform an act which, while giving him the strongest claim to national gratitude, will also materially lessen the burden now endured by many an overtaken and weary one in the never-ceasing struggle called forth by the battle of life.

CHARLES ROLLESTON.

## TO THE GRAND OLD LIBERAL.

*“Ave atque vale!”*

LEADER farewell! What is it we have lost?

A name to conjure by, a voice to still

The din of discord with the words “I will”:

A heart to venture, counting not the cost:

A spirit ever youthful, quick to feel

A nation's needs, still foremost in the fray;

Not blindly wedded to thine ancient way,

But facing what the hour might reveal:

A servant of the people, giving ear

To every utterance of discontent;

Not driven to and fro thereby, but bent

On meeting no man's anguish with a sneer.

His steady hand shall hold the helm no more:

Our pilot leaves us—drifting—witherward?

Storms are ahead. If thou art not on board

What hope that we can reach the distant shore?

But memory lives and grows, the mighty spell

That thou hast wielded cannot die, the thought

Of thee shall lead to victories yet unsought

The troops that now are sighing—Chief, farewell!

R. BRIMLEY JOHNSON.

March 6, 1894.

## SOME 'ASPECTS OF UTILITARIAN PHILOSOPHY.

THE philosophy of human life is the central system of all speculation upon which the mind of man can employ itself. All sciences, of either animate or inanimate things, run out from this main system, and all studies bear a greater or less proportionate value as they come near to or recede from it. The study of mankind must ever hold the first place in the human mind. Other studies are but the side issues of the one great question of human happiness. It can never lose this position in our thoughts, though circumstances should be unfavourable to its development, but as time goes on it will rather engage more and more of popular attention. It has fostered civilisation as nothing else has, and it is developed by civilisation. Its importance is insisted on by every fact of our modern life. As communities become enlarged, and systems of commerce more complicated, and as man's relation with man becomes of a closer and more involved character, the necessity for its study will more and more enforce itself. Studies or sciences, such as astronomy, mineralogy, and botany, though all adding their quota to the sum of human knowledge and so entering into the province of science, bear a weaker and less imperative claim upon our time and attention. All sciences have one common object, that of increasing our immediate happiness. Those which most directly accomplish this object deserve the highest place in our esteem; those which contribute less to it are accorded a lower place. No question can be raised as to the justice of this judgment; utility gives the casting vote here as it does in all questions of a like nature. Botany is connected with the science of medicine, and medicine is immediately beneficial to man; mineralogy furnishes man with implements of use and ornament, and is beneficial to man, though in a less degree; of the two, therefore, botany holds the first place, and, because of its utility amongst sciences, one of the first places. Anatomy is the study of the structure of the human body, and is of vital use in both medicine and surgery; it is perhaps the most studied of all the sciences. Conchology is a comparatively trifling study, remote from man, bringing little to the sum of his happiness, except the gratification of individual taste, and so amongst sciences conchology holds but a



tenth-rate place. Men who study moths and butterflies bring us less useful knowledge than those who study the habits and ailments of horses and cows; of the two studies, therefore, the latter holds precedence in public attention. All sciences, arts, occupations, whatever, are the more acceptable because of their utility, and the less acceptable because of their inutility. Utility will be found in the end to sway both the moral and physical worlds. \*

The study of philosophy, therefore, is of the *greatest* importance to man, since it deals directly with his interests and the problems of his existence. Philosophy is the application of reason to the difficulties in our way for their removal and for the general advantage of humanity. The advantage of the individual is, speaking generally, the advantage of the mass, though occasionally the few may have to suffer for the many. This result is, nevertheless, perfectly justifiable; it is better that one man should suffer than two, how much more that one should suffer instead of twenty. The aim of philosophy is to bring about *generally* beneficial results. Philosophy is fearless; it bows not at all to accepted theories, unless these theories can stand the test of its own methods. It proves all with which it comes in contact; it is never satisfied to take for granted. It is scientific in the accuracy of its results; it is no mere system in which every man holds forth his own opinion in contradiction to that of every one else, for its laws are rigorous, and the least learned may detect the fundamental difference between philosophy and sophistry. It has almost mathematical tests, and seizes the truth out of a mass of falsehood with unerring certainty. We will not assert that philosophy cannot err, but if it err, it is in its nature to right itself. Its benefits are manifold and it is forever unfolding new resources, since it is in no wise dogmatic, and readily accepts and approves of advancement and the rejection of worn-out theories. It cannot be stationary but must be ever moving on, assimilating, accepting, rejecting, ever busy; it has no time for loitering; the philosopher must *think*, he cannot have his thinking done for him. It is one of the faults of theology that belief is insisted on rather than thought, as though the latter should not in all intelligent minds precede the former. Philosophy approves of belief after long, patient examination. There is, after all, no belief without the exercise of reason; a man cannot believe what he cannot form some adequate conception of; the assertion of the possibility of belief without such reason for it is simply the assertion of an untruth or at best of an illusion.

Many men fancy they believe certain things which a little self-examination would prove they do not believe. Philosophy is destructive of all forms of self-deception. It asserts that either a man believes or he does not believe, and it has tests to show whether he believes or not. It is accurate, therefore satisfying; it is reason-

able, therefore agreeable ; it has no cast-iron principles into which a man shall vainly endeavour to crush his obdurate nature, but it takes into account the infinite variety of the human constitution and characteristics. It is borne lightly because it is so little dictatorial ; it rules no man, but rather teaches a man how to rule himself. He feels the dignity of being his own master, but feels also that it is incumbent on him to rule his own soul wisely. In this manner it frees him from a slavish and abject obedience to rigorous rules which are often at enmity with every fact of his being. He employs every faculty of his mind, critical and emotional, and whilst these faculties are improved by exercise, it brings to him the benefit of self-knowledge and clear-sightedness. He regards with new interest every circumstance of life. No true philosopher will ever be blind to the fact that, as he owes to his fellow-men the clothes he wears and the food he eats, he has a duty to each and all of them—a duty of courtesy, of gentleness, of kindness ; and where they are in less favoured circumstances of life than himself, a duty of practical charity. Utilitarian philosophy is no selfish system for the discovery of whatever is convenient for one's own personal comfort irrespective of the welfare of others. The true utilitarian will be of all men the least wrapped in self ; his thoughts are employed for the benefit of humanity in general, for he is aware that the world requires for its improvement just this attitude of mind ; he will know that as minds act and re-act upon each other, as thought flies like thistle-down and takes root in any favouring soil it lights upon, so it is necessary for him to be careful that the seed his mind scatters shall be seed of good fruitage.

True philosophy is simple, calm, straightforward. It does not involve itself in remote brain-perplexing regions of metaphysics. The best philosophy is indeed the least metaphysical. Metaphysics often serve as an elusive will-o'-the-wisp to lead the inquirer into wild chases over heather and bog amidst impenetrable obscurity and entanglement. Philosophy of the better sort deals with it as little as may be ; it bases its reasoning on *experience* and indubitable *fact*. Let the theologian fly to metaphysics to defend theories which will not stand these practical tests ; philosophy insists upon having the ground under its feet. Again, then, true philosophy is essentially simple.

To discover what is best for man within the sphere of what we *know* is the real task which the philosopher, imbued with a proper love of his system, will always labour for. If it can be proved good for man to believe unsubstantiated tales, philosophy will accept them. It will even accept a palpable fallacy if the happiness of the human race is increased by the acceptance of it. But we know that this will never be required, for the truth must ever prove best for humanity. Truth triumphant will mean man happy and

tranquil; for is not misery like disease, "the punishment for our ignorance"?

Utilitarian philosophy, as opposed to dogmatic theology, has this to recommend it: that it is flexible, yielding, adjustable, fitting all cases; that when it threatens, it threatens with palpable cause; that the punishments for the violations of its common-sense laws, administered by Nature, are comprehensible and corrective; that it rejects no side of a man's nature, and that it has its strong foundations on so comprehensible a thing as reason. Dogmatic theology, on the other hand, is strict and immovable; it threatens mysteriously and incomprehensibly, it threatens punishments which are not corrective, nor indeed just, and in this, as in many other ways, offends reason.

Yet Utilitarianism will lay no rough hands on Faith, so long as Faith will keep within her own province, but when she oversteps the boundary of her dominion, she will be immediately confronted by it in implacable antagonism.

Philosophy teaches patience and the quiet suffering of unavoidable evils. How much and how great is the testimony to this truth which has been borne by philosophers of the past! It is like a bracing breeze to the soul of man, which strengthens it in adversity, and enables him to bear the hardest strokes of fate with a noble fortitude. Every truly wise man finds it easy to bend to the unavoidable, and submit to its dictates without complaint. But he is not like the men of some sects, who seem to seek suffering for its own sake. It is good to bear suffering quietly when it comes upon us, but it is the utmost folly to seek it, or impose it upon oneself as though it were intrinsically a good. Good it is, like everything else, when turned to good account, but more often than not it is harmful, destroying hopefulness and natural gaiety of temperament, souring and embittering life. That all of what we call evil is really good in disguise is a somewhat rash and too daring flight of religious sentiment, which, no matter how easily we repeat it, is sooner or later belied by our natural feelings and actions. It is better for ourselves in the end to look on evil *as* evil, and misfortune *as* misfortune, for any twisting of this natural view only mocks us with its hollowness. What good shall we do to the sufferer by pretending that his affliction should be a source of joy to him? Will such poor sophistry bring him any real comfort?

Temperance and a balance of passions and emotions are the first principles of a sound philosophy of life. A man given over to self-indulgence can never be a true philosopher, nor can the slave of any habit ever lay claim to that title. It is a distinction which many hold who like to be classed otherwise. On the other hand, some have held it who were not entitled to it in the fullest sense.

Plato is a true and beautiful yet scarcely wide enough philosopher. Epicurus, laying all stress on a different side of the mind, was not wholly deserving of the title. The perfect philosopher insists on all human facts alike. Philosophy looks with clear eyes on all things; she will not be led by the hand, she will have the bandage off, no matter what comes of it, and, using neither heaven-searching telescope, no atom-magnifying glass, nor even the mildest pair of rose-coloured spectacles, will look blank and straight at Nature. Her scrutiny will be searching and unshrinking, and she will guide her own fearless feet from the thorns and thickets in the utmost assurance and quietude.

THOS. E. MAYNE.

## INDEPENDENT SECTION.

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

### OUR COLONIES AND FREE TRADE ; OR, A PLEA FOR A CUSTOMS UNION OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

τὸ πολλοῖς ἐξηγούμενον ἀληθοῦς τινὸς μετέχει.

WE pride ourselves upon being the only country in the world which has Free Trade. But it would be equally true to say that we are the only country which has *not* any Free Trade. The distinction lies in how we understand the meaning of the words "having Free Trade." Whether they are to mean giving Free Trade to others, or enjoying it oneself by receiving it from them. If we accept the former definition, then it is true that we are the only nation who has Free Trade, for we alone extend it to other nations. If, on the other hand, we accept the latter definition, that having Free Trade is to mean enjoying and receiving it in return ourselves, then it is absolutely true that we are the only nation in the world which does not enjoy any measure of Free Trade, for every other nation enjoys it to this extent that it has one open market beyond the limits of its own territory, namely, England, whilst we have no free market in any foreign country.

Any one who has been born and bred in North-east Lancashire, seeing towns doubling their population, villages becoming towns, and new villages springing up, if he ever thinks about or interests himself in the welfare of this veritable bee-hive, must ask himself, Whence is the demand to come for all this ever-increasing supply? And when he inquires further into the question he finds to his discomfort that instead of the markets coming to us, we have to go further and further afield in search of the ever-retreating markets.\*

\* I believe I am correct in stating that one-half of the cotton trade of Lancashire is with China, and the greater part of the remainder with India.

The dictum of Aristotle that a widely prevalent opinion must contain some measure of truth seems applicable to the present subject of consideration. For must there not be some truth in the universal acceptance of protective tariffs by the civilised nations of the earth? They have had sufficient time to see the boasted advantages of our one-sided Free Trade, and yet have not been convinced of its merits sufficiently to adopt it.

When Cobden advocated Free Trade, it is acknowledged that he did so under the belief that before ten years were passed every nation in the world, seeing the great advantages of Free Trade, would adopt it, so that we should gain the prestige of having been the leaders in a movement so eminently beneficial to the human race. It is, therefore, not for one moment to be supposed that he would have endorsed the policy of his would-be followers in this movement, or have persevered in a policy which so far from bringing about universal Free Trade, seems more calculated to retard its ultimate adoption, for by unconditionally extending it to others, we have no inducement left to offer them in return for their giving it us, *which is what we really want.*

What England, and what any large industrial community wants, is Free Trade, open markets for the sale of the products of their industry, the necessities of life cheap, and the raw materials for their industry cheap. All this Free Trade gives them, and therefore I say, let us try and get Free Trade, for we do not get all this at present. We have at present the raw material used in our industries and the necessities of life cheap, but how are we off for the other equally important desideratum of an industrial community, the open markets for the sale of the products of our industry.

Here our present Free Trade, falsely so called (from being given and not received in return), forsakes us, and what I wish to suggest is that a different policy which would not have the name of Free Trade would probably lead more quickly to the obtaining of that genuine and real Free Trade of which no one sees more clearly than I do, I will not say the benefit, but the absolute necessity to us in England.

And if we would obtain this we must make foreign nations feel that this inestimable benefit which we have been bestowing upon them must now receive some return on their part or it will be withheld. I should advocate a Customs Union of the British Empire as a nucleus, and I would have real Free Trade within it, and no spurious or counterfeit coin. I believe that this would really do what Cobden dreamt of, but which started upon so narrow a base as he started it upon was not calculated to bring about the result he anticipated.

He hoped to allure the other nations to adopt Free Trade by an

example, as one individual might be inspired by some noble and self-sacrificing act of one of his fellows.

But it is a very moot point how far a State is justified in carrying on a self-sacrificing policy or whether, to a country being herself composite and having to consider her duty to her own subjects before her duty to the subjects of other nations, a policy which in the individual might be considered selfish is not justifiable and even imperative self-preservation.

At all events such is the view taken by all the other nations, especially America, who is so often held up to our imitation by the party in England who have Free Trade for their watchword.

And therefore, whereas Cobden said, let us set the other nations a good example of what is best for us all and they will follow us, and we shall have the merit of having been the first to take this course, subsequent experience seems rather to suggest that if we desire to bring about universal Free Trade, we must begin by instituting a large system of imperial Free Trade on our own account, which will be so powerful that others suffering from exclusion will hasten to join it.

For it seems to me that Cobden, in his prognostic that in ten years every other nation would be Free Traders, ignored one most important point—*i.e.*, that Free Trade whilst being the ideal from a commercial standpoint is in some cases prejudicial from a political point of view. Nationalism is (to borrow a Darwinian term) the natural check to Free Trade, and for this reason, that whereas Free Trade would commercially benefit the human race probably more than any other measure, if universally adopted, it would correspondingly interfere with the national principle or idea. For what would be the result of it? The gravitation of population towards those centres where the conditions were most favourable to each special industry, with the result that each industry would be carried on under the most favourable conditions, and the human race would benefit by having all the products of the earth and of human industry at the least possible cost. Every one would be proportionately richer, and the working classes would have better opportunities of earning what they require. But what would become of the national idea?

Take a country like Germany, hemmed in as she is on both sides by two formidable Powers (France and Russia), of whose intentions she is always apprehensive, and suppose that she were to exist under the conditions of universal Free Trade, it is more than probable that the protection laws for her home industries being removed, a great part of her population would emigrate to some country where the conditions either of agriculture or manufacture were more favourable to those particular industries, as is indicated by the fact that even in spite of the protection of her home industries a great number of

her population emigrate every year. But the result of this would be a diminution in the men capable of undertaking military service, and fighting in her battles possibly for the very existence of that political unit—the Fatherland of Germany—which the national idea causes them to look upon from a political point of view as the supreme good.

Thus it is obvious that the national idea (patriotism, or whatever it be called) militates against the adoption of universal Free Trade. The desire is felt to nurse home industries with the object of keeping as many persons as possible employed, and so provided with subsistence within the boundaries marked out by this political unit.

Lord Salisbury, in a speech at the Mansion House shortly after the partition of spheres of influence in Africa between Germany and England, declared the object of the development of our Colonies and Protectorates to be the necessity of having markets for our industrial products, and this seems to be the true method of arriving at any measure of Free Trade by the enlargement of the national idea to a proportion adequate for the enjoyment of sufficient Free Trade.

The British Isles and India, which constitute the entire area we have at present for Free Trade, are manifestly insufficient for the volume of our trade. In the British Empire and its dependencies, however, a sufficient area would be found for a nucleus which would quickly grow. And in this establishment of Free Trade we should not have the national idea in conflict with us to act as a check. We should, on the contrary, have it acting in our favour. For the national idea, instead of taking fright lest there should be a loss of population towards the centres outside the national boundary more favourable to certain industries, would be gratified by the prospect of a protected area capable of affording sustenance for an overwhelming military force. And although I do not need to dwell on this point, considering how obvious it is, the very close commercial ties which could be brought about by this Customs Union of the British Empire would be of inestimable service in knitting together the scattered portions of our Empire by one indissoluble bond—that of real community of interest. What I should like to see is a Customs Union of the British Empire which would possess absolute Free Trade within itself, and which would have a differential tariff for all nations outside the Union. This would form such a strong commercial unit that self-interest would induce the smaller units to join this powerful Customs Union.

In order to illustrate the unsatisfactory working of the present system, let us take two instances—France and Canada. Canada is at present a part of our Empire, but receives no commercial advantages on this account. France, geographically and traditionally our rival, both from the political and commercial point of view, yet receives just the same treatment that Canada does. What is the



result? France profits by the free and open markets which we extend to her, but does not give us any corresponding advantage in her own markets over the nations which have taxed her in theirs. On the contrary, she offers them more favourable terms in her own markets on the give and take principle, by a differential tariff, and the more favoured nation clause in her commercial treaties in order to get more favourable terms from them. We, having no tariff to relax, have no basis upon which to bargain for what we so much require—the admission of certain or all of our products into other countries at a free or reasonable rate in return for the admission of certain or all of their products into our country on similar terms.

And now to consider the other instance—Canada. Here the case is worse, owing to the number of French-speaking inhabitants, who have a very strong political leaning towards the United States, from the fact of that country having gained its independence in a great measure through the instrumentality of the French. The French Canadians are also drawn towards France by the tie of common blood, in the absence of any commercial bond of interest with England. *Let us make this common tie of interest with Canada.* As a member of the Customs Union of the British Empire, annexation to the United States would be a serious step for her to envisage, carrying with it, as it would, a loss of those privileges which membership in our Union conferred, whereas, at present it would not be easy to demonstrate that annexation to the United States would be disadvantageous to her, either from a financial or commercial point of view, since she suffers so heavily in being excluded from the United States Customs Union, and since she would equally, as now, if a member of that Union, enjoy free markets in England for her products.

Therefore, broadly, it appears that there are two important advantages to be gained by this Customs Union—1. The binding together our Colonies with us in the firmest and most enduring political bond possible for the preservation of our Empire in case of war, and a necessary outcome of that—our own self-preservation; for, once we lose our outworks, our own existence as a nation will be endangered. 2. The ultimate bringing about of that commercial ideal—Free Trade. For I am convinced that a Free Trade union of the British Empire would not end there; other nations would soon seek to be admitted to the benefits of so powerful a confederacy. The spectacle of a confederacy mutually profiting by a commercial bond of this kind would, I think, be a far more powerful incentive to other nations than the Cobdenian method of setting an example of isolated Free Trade, expecting that they would be ready even at the expense of their own national preservation to follow us in a course of action which would be in the end beneficial to the human race, but which in its operation might almost depopulate certain national unities and

greatly swell and add political importance to others. This would almost amount to a Quixotic national unselfishness, into which England may drift should she too long ride the hobby-horse of single-handed Free Trade.

I should like to take a comparison from disarmament. It seems to me that it would be as reasonable to expect that other nations would follow our example in disarming as to expect them to dismantle their national commercial defences because we have done so. It is certain that in case of our setting the example of disarmament, so far from following it they would at once take advantage of our helplessness to procure for themselves every political advantage just as they have already profited commercially by our having dismantled our commercial defences—*i.e.*, a differential tariff which acts as a basis of a give and take understanding.

And here I do wish to enter a protest against that most popular fallacy that our prosperity as a nation has its origin and owes its continuance to our policy of Free Trade. It seems to be due to the fact that we were the first in the field when those discoveries were made which revolutionised commerce—the steam cotton mill and the railway—and that having our railways and mills built first and being engaged only as outsiders in the great European wars, and thereby not requiring to keep up an overwhelming military establishment, we had an accumulated capital which enabled us to enjoy for a long time what amounted almost to a monopoly. But this monopoly is now at an end. Our former customers are now our rivals in trade, English workmen are foremen in foreign firms, to which they have taken our inventions. Hence the one-sided Free Trade, which at first was powerless to stop the successful rush of our commerce, is, now that the wave has passed, acting as a serious hindrance to us in the struggle for commercial existence.

I will mention one typical instance of the unfairness of the working of the present so-called Free Trade. It is this, that our home producers are, by the taxation which they pay as contribution to the Imperial revenue, absolutely allowed to be undersold by the foreign producer. This disadvantage will be still further accentuated by the increased taxation of the home producer to meet the impending outlay on the Navy. Why should not this opportunity be taken to equalise rather than accentuate the burden, and put the home producer at least on an equal basis with the foreigner, by making the latter pay his share of contribution to the Imperial revenue? This would be better than the present method, by which the home producer has to bear the whole burden and the foreigner escapes it altogether.

But it is always objected that the foreigner does not pay the duty, it is you, the consumer, who pay it. This argument is, however, fallacious, for where there is sufficient competition among

home firms the tax on the foreign article will not raise the market price of it but will tend to drive the foreigner out of the market, as he will not (whilst paying the tax out of his competition price) be able to compete with the low price ruling in the home market as fixed by the severe competition among home producers. But if, on the other hand, the price does rise slightly, this will be due to a lack of sufficient competition among home firms, and will soon be rectified by the increased competition among them which will result from the expansion of their business directly the foreigner pays his share of taxation. And where this lack of competition among home firms exists it is due to the foreigner practically having the market to himself, and so he will have been making a very handsome profit before the duty was imposed; he will, therefore, have to lower his margin of profit in order to be able to compete with the home producer when the tax has to come out of his competition price, and so it will be seen that in neither case is it true to say that the foreigner is not affected by the duty.

And this most important point must not be overlooked in reference to the above objection—namely, that in the rare case of an increased price for a foreign article having to be defrayed, what the home consumer pays more he pays as contribution to Imperial revenue. Is it not better that the unpatriotic consumer who will close his eyes to the merits of home products and buy foreign ones should be made to pay rather than the home manufacturers and workmen? Is it not better to tax the consumer in this case than to hamper the body of men who by their brains and sinews as manufacturers and workmen are making the wealth of the country? for the taxing of raw materials for manufacture or the necessities of life for the working classes is not here advocated. We are considering manufactured goods and luxuries.

And what is the result of making home industries bear the brunt of taxation, and not allowing them to be helped out as they are in all other countries by the duties on foreign goods? The result is to benefit the capitalist, not the working man; to benefit the man who may put his money into foreign securities and live on the income of these, and at the same time get all his luxuries cheaper than in any other country. The man who suffers is the benefactor to his country, and to the working classes especially, who is taxed in proportion to the benefit he confers, namely, the amount of money which he has risked in home industries.

Adam Smith advocated a tax on foreign beer equivalent to the amount paid by home brewers as excise duty, and I ask for a tax on foreign manufactures equivalent to the amount paid as contribution to the Imperial revenue by our home manufacturers. I do not advocate any tax whatever on raw materials, although the agricultural interest might claim, with some show of reason, that the same

principle in some very modified form might be applied in their case (*e.g.*, foreign cattle) without hurting the poor working population of our large industrial towns. Such a measure, although I do not venture to advocate it, would undoubtedly relieve the farmers of the terrible handicap under which they labour in the form of property, land, and income tax, and many other burdens which were more or less reasonable in the days when land held, as is undoubtedly did at the beginning of the century, the premier position in the country, but which are quite out of proportion to the present condition of agriculture.

To show how reasonable is the demand for a tax on foreign manufacturers equivalent to the contribution paid by home producers to Imperial revenue, I will call attention to the attitude of the Free Trade party in America. I have heard from most reliable sources that the most enthusiastic advocates of Free Trade in America never recommend anything further in the direction of Free Trade than leaving a tax on foreign imports sufficient to relieve the home producer of the burden of subscribing to the State revenue. Hence it will be seen that Free Trade to the extent it obtains in England appears indefensible to the American Free Traders, and the measure of protection for which I ask appears to them not only salutary but necessary.

It is sure to be objected that import duties add to the cost of manufactured goods, and so are prejudicial to the consumer, and that our home producers would at once raise their prices to the level of that of the foreign goods, *plus* the import duty. But owing to the vast amount of money already sunk in our home industries the competition among our producers is so great that this would not be possible. The above objection would only have weight in a new country where there were very few firms, in which case these few firms could establish a monopoly. But we, on the contrary, are suffering from an excess of invested capital which produces an absolutely suicidal competition. This is notably true in the case of our ironworks, many of them having to be closed altogether, whilst others are obliged to accept contracts where there is no profit in order to provide work for their skilled artisans, whom they cannot afford to turn away.

Besides, our working classes and their powerful organisations must sooner or later awake to the fact that they are having the bread taken out of their mouths by the workmen of foreign countries, and call out for more equal conditions. The English workmen possess only one free market, and that is England; but this one free market is absolutely packed with goods manufactured abroad. Let us take one instance.

Pianos. If in even a remote provincial town you go to a piano dealer to purchase or hire a piano you will find perhaps two English

pianos to every ten German ones. You go to a piano dealer in France or Germany and you will not see one English piano. Then another piano which is very fashionable in England is the American piano. Will you find any English piano in America? The import duty is quite prohibitive. If the English piano manufacturer wished to supply the markets of France, Germany, or the United States, he would have to invest some of his capital in buying land in those countries and building a factory in those countries, and thereby pay revenue to those countries, as many English firms in other lines of business have done; and although they take their English workmen with them at first, those workmen either become naturalised foreigners or are succeeded by workmen of the country in which the firm has set up its foreign factory.

It would be tedious to enumerate the whole list of foreign products which oust the English in our shops, for no shop is exempt. The Conservative Government have done good in calling the attention of the home consumer to these facts by means of the Merchandise Marks Act, by which all foreign goods have to be stamped; but unless the public themselves realise the wrong that is being done to home industries, this Act will not be sufficient. And this wrong is most accentuated in a case where fashion favours the foreign goods, as in the case of the piano, where the foreign teacher will so much insist upon the merits of the piano made in his country that the purchaser, his pupil, will not even visit an English piano warehouse to try the comparative merits of an English piano before purchasing a foreign one. But I am convinced that English piano manufacturers could, by home competition among themselves, produce as good and cheap a piano as the German or American, given equal conditions. But at present the conditions are not equal, for these foreign firms have a preserve of their own, in which they have the monopoly (*i.e.*, their home markets), and anything which they send on to England is only so much beyond this, so that they could afford to send pianos to England at a fabulously small sum. *Our own manufacturers, on the other hand, with foreign markets closed against them by the heavy import duties, cannot even do themselves justice in the home market.*

Railways and telegraphs at the end of the nineteenth century have made us all so near together that it seems almost as preposterous that what appear now as the small limits (in comparison with America) of the European States should be cut off from free commercial intercourse with one another as it would formerly have been that Liverpool and Manchester should have that inestimable privilege denied them to their mutual prejudice. In a word, the improvements in the means of commercial intercourse and the art of war seem to have made the European national unities too small to stand isolated from one another in commerce and war. Let us set the example of a

larger national and commercial unity, and, recognising the spirit and condition of the time in which we live, show a broader conception of the national idea.

For I am convinced that, whereas the spectacle of an isolated country, not even enjoying Free Trade with her Colonies, and suffering from the hallucination of an imaginary Free Trade, was calculated to make other nations hesitate to adopt Free Trade, a large confederacy joining together to practise real Free Trade on a workable scale would, by the quick adhesion of smaller units, soon assume such proportions as would in all probability ultimately result in the universal adoption of Free Trade. And this in its turn would be the minimising of the national idea to such an extent as greatly to facilitate an understanding between the States of Europe for some European Congress to decide all commercial questions between the various European States, and finally, it is to be hoped, to decide national differences, and so render possible the reduction of those vast armaments which, next to Free Trade, would be the greatest boon to Europe.

W. PEART-ROBINSON, B.A.

BALLIOL COLLEGE. OXFORD.

## CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

### PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

THE Ethical Library, of which Mr. J. H. Muirhead is the general editor, seems likely to meet a felt want. Serious minded persons, who are no longer satisfied with the ordinary religious teaching to which they have been accustomed, often have a difficulty in finding anything exactly suitable to take its place. They need some food for the mind, especially in its moral relations, and some guidance, like that which religion offers to its believers, in the practical path of life. This want such a book as Mrs. Bryant's *Short Studies in Character*<sup>1</sup> seems exactly suited to meet. It deals plainly with matters of great importance, and in a calm and persuasive manner calculated to satisfy a thoughtful mind.

Mrs. Bryant attaches great weight to the influence of the intellect over the moral nature, and, therefore, naturally presents principally the intellectual aspect of her subjects. She recognises no less the importance of the emotions, but because this is more generally admitted she lays less stress upon it. A great deal of moral evil arises from stupidity, ignorance and want of systematic training, and it is this kind of evil which Mrs. Bryant seeks to correct. The book is divided into two parts—Ethical and Educational—but they are very closely connected. The essays or lectures are not offered as a system of ethics, but there is a certain strain of unity running through them. Some of the subjects in the Ethical part of the book will give our readers a fair idea of its purpose. They are—the Cardinal Virtues; Justice; My Duty to my Neighbour; Friendship; the Influence of Ideals; Types of Moral Development; &c. We were very much struck with the essay on “Types of Moral Development,” the two first types described showing a considerable knowledge of human nature, as indeed does the whole book. The first type is that of the “other-conscious,” or “emotionally-sympathetic” man, who is disposed to regard his actions relative to the feelings or necessities or expectations of others. The other type is that of the man whose moral impulse is conscience, dignity, self-respect. Men of these two types will act in very much the same manner towards others, though the conscious, or perhaps almost unconscious, impulse

<sup>1</sup> *Short Studies in Character.* By Sophie Bryant, F.Sc. Lond. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1894.

is very different. This is but one instance of the way in which our author penetrates beneath the surface, and shows her sympathetic understanding of human nature. It is scarcely needful to say that Mrs. Bryant's papers on Education—that is moral education—are invaluable, and should be read and studied by every one who is in any way responsible for the training of the young. There is so much insight into the nature of children and youths in these essays that they may be taken as a safe guide by those who have their highest welfare at heart.

An ardent admirer of Mr. Spencer's writings, Miss Julia R. Gingell has put forth a very elegant little volume of selections—*Aphorisms*<sup>1</sup>—from his books. We learn from the preface that the selection has been seen and approved by Mr. Spencer himself, which is, of course, sufficient recommendation. The selections are arranged under certain heads, as Education, Evolution, Justice, Liberty, Happiness, &c., so that they may serve as aids to thought, or perhaps provide apt quotations, or texts for ethical sermons. They do not profess to give even the barest outline of the synthetic philosophy; but many of the passages give some idea of its general tendency, and all will be found calculated to provoke reflection.

There is no need for us to refer at length to Mr. Firminger's translation of M. de Molinari's work on *Religion*,<sup>2</sup> as in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW for April 1892, there appeared an extended notice of the original work on its first appearance, to which we may refer our readers. As the translation is made from the second and enlarged edition, it contains the additional second part in which the author discusses some of the obstacles to the separation of Church and State, and some of the probable consequences of the establishment of economic liberty in religious bodies. In this last chapter M. de Molinari combats the idea that if Churches, especially the Roman Catholic Church, were allowed full liberty to acquire property they might become dangerously powerful, a fear which he thinks is groundless, as the spread of knowledge and the competitive results of liberty would exercise an effective restraint, and the withdrawal of State aid to the Churches would act as a wholesome stimulus. The translation fairly represents the original, and deserves attention alike from Churchmen and Nonconformists in England. The translator unfortunately is not altogether in sympathy with the author, and there is much in his introduction with which we do not agree. It appears to be written from a High Church point of view, and Mr. Firminger, with other Anglicans, appears to desire greater liberty for the Church without any curtailment of its peculiar privileges. The reference to the "Political Dissenter" is uncalled

<sup>1</sup> *Aphorisms*. From the Writings of Herbert Spencer, selected and arranged by Julia Raymond Gingell. London: Chapman & Hall. 1894.

<sup>2</sup> *Religion*. By G. de Molinari. Translated by Walter K. Firminger, B.A. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1894.



for, for the Established Church is as much a political engine as anything else, and Disestablishment would relegate the clergy to their proper sphere, and if the bishops were not in the House of Lords the Church would be preserved from the scandal which their anti-popular action causes.

Another translation of a work already noticed in our pages is before us in A. Delano's rendering of Tolstoi's *The Kingdom of God is Within You*.<sup>1</sup> In November last we called attention to the French (original) edition under the title of *Le Salut est en Vous*, and ventured to prophecy that the book would attract considerable attention. This has happened, though we are not satisfied that the impression created is equal to the striking character of the book. The work may be regarded as of a threefold character—firstly, it contains an exposure of the superstitions and unchristian character of the Christian Church; secondly, a denunciation of our modern civilisation, especially its military features; and, thirdly, an exposition of the author's own views of Christianity "not as a mystical doctrine but as a life-conception." It is this last feature, to which the others are only introductory, that the modern world finds it difficult to accept, however readily it may endorse much of Tolstoi's criticism on existing institutions. It may even be admitted that the employment of violence is a cumulative source of evil and yet the doctrine of "non-resistance to evil by violence," which is Tolstoi's conception of the ethical essence of Christianity, will find few believers. Our own sympathies are so largely with the great Russian writer that we are inclined to say he almost persuades us to be Christian in his own sense of the word, and we can be thankful that at least one man in this hypocritical and self-seeking age has the superlative honesty of saying without reserve all he thinks. Whatever reception the book may meet with we are sure it is one that will bear fruit.

Mr. Bonwick, who has been a fairly prolific writer, and as he tells us in the introduction to *Irish Druids and Old Irish Religions*,<sup>2</sup> has reached his seventy-seventh year, has succeeded in adding an interesting book to the long list he has produced. The author has never explored a more curious and out-of-the-way corner of the world, though it lies so near at home, than in investigating legends and relics connected with religion in Ireland. The book is a veritable storehouse of curiosities, though unfortunately they are heaped together without much plan, and the author has no theory of his own to sustain, except so far as he maintains that evidences of Druidism are to be found to a much larger extent in Ireland than in England. This may not seem extraordinary to some people, but he

<sup>1</sup> *The Kingdom of God is Within You*. By Count Leo Tolstoi. Authorised Translation from the original Russian MS. by A. Delano. London: Walter Scott, 1894.

<sup>2</sup> *Irish Druids and Old Irish Religions*. By James Bonwick, F.R.G.S. London: Griffith & Farran, 1894.

runs counter to a common supposition when he affirms that Wales has no right to claim the Druids as peculiarly her own, for there are fewer traces of Druidism in Wales than elsewhere in the United Kingdom. The resemblance between many of the myths and legends and relics of Irish religions and those of the East point to a very probable Oriental origin, subsequent isolation and altered environment accounting for the natural variations. Leaving debateable theories on one side the book is as entertaining as the contents are curious and the facts often inexplicable.

*The Spirit of God*,<sup>1</sup> by Mr. P. C. Mozoomdar, is an exposition of a highly refined spiritual theism by a native of India who has come under the influence of liberal Christianity. The book is hardly one to criticise, as it is religious rather than theological, and it is more likely to be judged according to the taste of the reader than by any recognised standard. It is eloquent, not to say rhapsodical, and may be found stimulating by those who are predisposed to fall in with the views of the author. If there is any fault to be found with the book it is that there is too much of it; upon such a subject very little can be said that will produce a deep impression—and the less said the deeper the impression; a few lines from a Psalm or from a Gospel or from Goethe, or Emerson, or Wordsworth seem to exhaust the subject, and so in Mr. Mozoomdar's book a few sentences seem to be better than the whole. "Behind the seen and known there is the presence of something unseen and unsearchable." "Behold the Spirit has no altar erected to him in all Christendom." Of immortality he says: "Not all the reasoning against a future life has made man a whit less believing, not all the arguments in its favour have made men's belief more sure."

Mr. Mozoomdar's doctrine is summed up in the brief proposition that the Spirit of God is the Life of all things, a creed which it is inspiring to accept and needless to deny.

The Archbishop of Canterbury has issued the addresses delivered to the clergy of his diocese on his third visitation under the title of *Fishers of Men*.<sup>2</sup> The addresses deal with such subjects as Education, the Social Question, the Critical Movement, but the treatment is brief and superficial. There is a certain audacity about the archbishop's views of things which is sometimes almost amusing. For instance, he says "That impediments to Parliamentary legislation on moral and religious subjects do in some respects make the Church's work greater and broader, not more contracted." We are inclined to think that the less Parliamentary legislation we have on moral and religious subjects the better; they are not the business of Parliament; while other matters with which

<sup>1</sup> *The Spirit of God*. By P. C. Mozoomdar. Boston; George H. Ellis. 1894.

<sup>2</sup> *Fishers of Men*. By Edward White, Archbishop. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1895.

Parliament is properly called upon to deal are impeded by the archbishop and his colleagues. Again, on the Critical Movement the archbishop takes the weakest position possible when he says: "It is impossible to turn the point of such arguments by minimising to ourselves the value of the Old Testament, by saying that the Christian Creed does not depend on the exploits of Judges or the errors of Kings. If there is no Old Testament there is no New." This is very obscurely expressed but the meaning is clear; but it is a wholly short-sighted and helpless position. Such a defence of the faith only courts defeat. There is one sentence in the addresses with which we cordially agree. Speaking of the Parish Council he says: "It is intended to 'educate' the parishioners. The clergy will get 'educated' too," which will be a very desirable result of the Local Government Act.

As sermons the *Village Sermons*<sup>1</sup> of the late Dean Church are as good, perhaps better, than the average. The language is well-adapted to the class of hearers to whom they were addressed, but the theology is about on a level with the language. It is as uncritical as that of the dissenting village preacher, but as it is still that of most bishops and deans and other dignitaries of the Church it is useless to criticise it. The religious thought and moral teaching of these sermons are on a higher level than their theology.

#### SOCIOLOGY, POLITICS, VOYAGES AND TRAVELS.

"LOVE, Courtship, and Marriage have been, and ever will be, part and parcel of a nation's life, no matter how rude or barbarous that nation may be." Such are the words in which Isidore<sup>2</sup> begins his preface. We suppose "his" is right; but we have a strong suspicion that grandmother is writing under the semblance of a male. We are reluctant to be unkind, but we do not think a great deal of the little book. It is full of rather ponderous platitudes. The fact is that it will not really suit any class of reader: it is difficult to make out to what class it is addressed; it is far too crude for those who are even moderately advanced in intellectual development; it is not simple and direct enough for the working man; it is hardly likely to suit even the clerk and the shop-girl. Isidore should have realised that love and romance are intensely relative: they by no means present themselves in the same way to different

<sup>1</sup> *Village Sermons*. Preached at Whatley. By the late R. W. Church, M.A., D.C.L. Second Series. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1894.

<sup>2</sup> *Love, Marriage, and Happiness*. By Isidore. London: Digby Long & Co.

sorts and conditions of men ; there is as wide a variation in the conception of love amongst the various classes in England as there is in the status of woman in Europe and the East.

A sketch of the rise of what we call democracy would probably be useful even if indifferently done. M. Borgeaud's<sup>1</sup> work, which is very fairly translated by Mrs. Hill, reaches a high level of merit. It is in its conception historical and not empirical : it is clear in statement and pleasant to read. It makes the religious idea the dominant factor in the evolution of the democratic spirit, and finds the source of democracy in the Puritan document known as the *Agreement of the People*. It traces the influence of this document in the constitution of England, and its direct fatherhood in the written constitutions of some of the American States.

Our own criticism upon the idea of the work is that "modern democracy," like many other things, is the product of many influences ; that it is unsafe to assign any one source to the rise of the idea, perhaps even unsafe to earmark a Puritan revival as the leading factor in its evolution. The history of all movements is a tangled skein of various threads, and in following up and unravelling one, however strong, however prominent, we must not forget the part played by the others. But with this warning we can safely leave the reader to pursue a very suggestive and interesting study in constitutional history.

Not the least interesting part of the book is the second essay, dealing with the origin of the democratic constitutions of the New England States. The theory here comes into conflict with the more obvious explanation of the origin of those constitutions. "In an article published a few years ago, Mr. Brooks Adams endeavoured to prove that the origin of the written constitutions on which the American Republic is founded was to be found in the Royal Charters. . . . If my views are accepted we shall go beyond the Charters granted to the Corporations, and find the origin of the present constitution rather in the Statutes which received the free assent of the Corporations." The difference is not obvious. Besides, in several cases the Crown resumed the government from the original company, and laid down a colonial constitution of the ordinary type, which in part survives in many British colonies to-day. We come back to our former criticism. M. Borgeaud has not discovered a new origin ; he has given prominence to the influence of an important factor.

Signor Brentano claims to have been the first who embodied in writing the proposition that higher wages and shorter hours produce better work ;<sup>2</sup> the germ of the idea he attributes to his teacher,

<sup>1</sup> *Rise of Modern Democracy in Old and New England*. By Charles Borgeaud. Translated by Mrs. Birkbeck Hill. London : Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1894.

<sup>2</sup> *Hours and Wages in Relation to Production*. By Lujo Brentano. Translated by Mrs. William Arnold. London : Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1894.

Von Helfferich, to whom he dedicates the work which lies before us. In the course of his text, however, he shows that others had earlier glimpses of the same idea; it is, indeed, one of those facts which is slowly borne in upon the thoughts of the age. But however the credit of the discovery may be divided, there are many who have yet to learn the lesson, and to these we recommend Signor Brentano's little book. It is indeed remarkable that with so much testimony to the economic advantages of shorter hours there is still a large body of opinion which is absolutely uninformed on the subject, which instinctively resists any enlargement of the workman's leisure, in fear of the longer hours kept by competing foreigners. Signor Brentano's essay (for it is hardly more than that) is interesting from first to last, particularly in its comparison of English with German work and results—almost invariably to the advantage of the former. But the most suggestive considerations are those on the "Absorption of the Unemployed," with which he concludes. It is customary to praise the shorter working day on the ground that it will let in a greater number for employment. This is neither invariably nor necessarily so. Of some fixed employments it may be true; over the wider field of labour the existence of "the unemployed" arises from far deeper causes. The remarks made on this head by Signor Brentano are very sensible.

*The Englishman at Home*<sup>1</sup> sounds very light and charming, and the volume before us looks very attractive. But inside it is at any rate more serious and businesslike than we expect. The book is a study of English political life by one who, if not an American, has knowledge of the States. Its genesis, as set forth in the preface, is interesting. Mr. Porritt describes himself as a journalist who began to interest himself in matters of local self-government through reporting the proceedings of town councils, sanitary boards, &c., and so he went on to work in the centre of political life and reported debates in the House of Commons. The journalist who thinks has a particularly good training in all sides of a nation's life, and we are willing to welcome Mr. Porritt as a competent authority on his subject. As the experience of his life framed itself, so Mr. Porritt arranges his book. His first chapter deals with municipal government, and gives a very clear and concise account of the public life of a moderate-sized town, the duties of the mayor and councillors, the method of raising and the process of expending money. A good chapter on Poor Law administration is followed by one on Elementary Education, which covers rather more than the ground suggested by that term. The chapter on the Law Courts descends to such details as the marking of the counsel's brief. That on Imperial Taxation gives precise directions for filling up the form of assess-

<sup>1</sup> *The Englishman at Home. His Responsibilities and Privileges.* By Edward Porritt. London: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

ment for income tax. Certainly the amount of detail embodied in the book is remarkable; it is rather overloaded. Naturally there are errors—*c.g.*, making the Excise a separate department from the Inland Revenue, whereas it is merely a subdivision thereof; calling Cyprus a colony, and classing together, as regards constitution, Ceylon and Newfoundland. By the way, we certainly accuse Mr. Porritt of taking a gloomy view of the Inland Revenue official. According to his account they are about our path, and about our bed, and spying out all our ways; but we really hardly think it fair to reveal us to our cousins over the water as such a tax-ridden nation as all that. The chapter on the ways of Parliament is full and good; that on the Daily Press is slight; and one of the later chapters has a suggestive sketch of the way in which the laud is held in England, the size of holdings, and the status of the holders. Speaking generally, Mr. Porritt's book is not of a kind where we expect originality. It is very full of useful though familiar information, and the width of the area which it endeavours to embrace makes it inevitable that there should be a good many small inaccuracies, and some rather serious ones. Perhaps we go too far in saying "inevitable," but it requires labour and patience which few possess to cover much ground and yet be accurate.

We accept Mr. White's book<sup>1</sup> as intended to have political significance, and place it in this section as a contribution to Irish political history. "In publishing these memoirs," writes Mr. White not very grammatically, "it is believed that they convey in a simple and direct form valuable information on the Irish question." So they do; they show what a good and wise landlord can do with Irish property, and how he can win Irish hearts: nevertheless, both Memoirs and Introduction belong rather to the region of biography. They are decidedly interesting simply as such, for Hamilton had connections which brought him into relation with interesting men and scenes. On the other hand, diaries are very apt to have an aroma of egotism and priggishness, and we must admit that this is present here; and while we treat with reverence Hamilton's strong religious convictions, we cannot but often weary of the fervency and ecstasies of his devotions. It would perhaps be more valuable from our point of view to have an expurgated edition devoted to Hamilton's successes as a landlord pure and simple.

In the *History of the English Landed Interest*<sup>2</sup> we have the work of a scholar and a practical agriculturist. It is evidently the result of immense industry and considerable research. The mass of materials is well handled and systematically arranged. But the book as a whole is extremely disappointing. Mr. Garnier exhibits

<sup>1</sup> *Sixty Years' Experience as an Irish Landlord: Memoirs of John Hamilton, L.D.* Edited, with Introduction, by Rev. H. C. White, M.A. London: Digby Long & Co.

<sup>2</sup> *History of the English Landed Interest (Modern Period).* By Russell M. Garnier, B.A. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1893.

a striking absence of that breadth of view and philosophic thought which a cursory examination of the work led us to expect. For instance, a whole chapter is devoted to showing "that the Teutonic family, though more capable of adaptation to feudalism than the Celtic, is not so wedded to it as to be absolutely inseparable." We should hardly have thought that fifteen pages were necessary to prove the assertion contained in the latter portion of this statement, and if the author had consulted Sir Henry Maine's *History of Early Institutions* he would probably have found reason to hesitate in asserting that the Teuton is more capable of adaptation to feudalism than the Celt. In the chapter on Minerals and Mines, although Mr. Garnier points out how the "popular rights" in minerals, dating from Anglo-Saxon times, have survived to our own times, and although he also shows in coal mining how all "popular rights" are absent, owing to the later introduction, yet he refrains from drawing any inference, and in the last chapter actually considers that the verdict of the Royal Commissioners, that mining royalties were not detrimental to the public interest, settles the whole mining question! "Surely," he says, "after the verdict of so impartial a tribunal this danger to seigniorial interests is past." The "Story of the English Woodlands," the "Husbandry of the Period," "Amateur Farming," and the "Scientific Agriculture of the Period," are the titles of the chapters that are best worth reading. Here the author is on safer ground. Here he has the courage of his opinions, and he has many valuable suggestions to offer. In treating of the woodlands, Mr. Garnier advocates "a National School of Forestry like that of Nancy in France, and a Government Forestry Board as recommended by the Parliamentary Committee of 1887."

Although all the defects of the present land system are clearly shown, the author refrains from going to the root of the land question. Whilst admitting the depth of the agricultural depression, the only solution he can offer is some such scheme as Lord Winchelsea's for the union of the landowner, tenant-farmer, and labourer! "Already we hear," he exclaims, "the joy-bells of the marriage between agricultural capital and labour; a union, it is to be hoped, almost as loving and lasting as that which knits together man and maid." This is pretty sentiment enough, but it is not common sense. Whenever he approaches the political side of the Land Question, Mr. Garnier, by his anti-democratic leanings, spoils an otherwise most interesting work. A more appropriate title would have been "A Plea for the Landed Interest."

*Land Revenue in British India*<sup>1</sup> is intended to supply a want hitherto felt of a general outline of the land revenue and its administration in India, together with such a succinct account of the various

<sup>1</sup> *Land Tenure in British India*. By H. Baden-Powell, C.I.E. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1894.

land tenures as is possible in a short and readable form. The author states that his *Land Systems of British India* is too detailed for this purpose. His object is "to provide such a book as shall answer the purposes of the ordinary student of Indian affairs, and shall yet give sufficient practical information to serve as a text-book for forest officers and others outside the Land Revenue Department." To achieve such a result required a writer with a complete knowledge of his subject, and in Mr. Baden-Powell we have perhaps the greatest living authority upon the complicated and perplexing systems of Indian land tenures, with their almost infinite variations. For those systems differ, not only from province to province, but from district to district, and in endeavouring to present the chief features of the principal systems, there is the danger of reproducing such loose and generalised sketches of the "village community," and the "land-tax of India," as to be entirely inadequate and even positively misleading. We have no hesitation in saying at once that the author has succeeded in avoiding this danger, and he has supplied, not only to the student and the Government officials, but to the general reader, a work which, for lucidity and briefness, grasp of principles and complete mastery of detail, leaves little to be desired.

Without further evidence before us, we cannot, however, subscribe to Mr. Baden-Powell's subversal of the old "village community theory"—viz., that a joint, or undivided, tenure comes first in point of time. According to Mr. Powell's new theory, "there is every reason to believe that the earliest tribal movements in India resulted in the distribution of territory into areas for clans and tribal sections, which were further subdivided into village or even smaller groups. But the family-holdings inside these small groups were separate; the jurisdiction of the village or hamlet headman alone held the group together. There is no evidence of any pre-Aryan or other really primæval holding 'in common,' or of a joint holding of land as a general practice." In other words, the joint family is the result of individual ownership, "rather than a primæval institution, which goes back beyond all the earliest customs that we can actually trace." But the fact that a large number of joint families trace their descent from a common ancestor who acquired the land by conquest, occupation, or grant, is surely not sufficient to warrant us in closing our eyes to the indisputable evidence we possess of the universal appearance of the village community as succeeding the tribal community in every civilisation which has been examined?

Mr. Powell, however, is supported in these views by M. Fustel de Coulanges and Professor F. W. Maitland, and in answer to such high authorities we refer the reader to Sir Frederick Pollock's three possible explanations of apparently archaic institutions:

"1. *Survival*.—The institution is really ancient and continuous.



"2. *Imitation*.—It was more or less consciously framed within historic or recent times on an ancient pattern.

"3. *Parallelism*.—Like conditions have independently given rise to like results."

We cannot but admire the aptitude with which Mr. Spalding, at the nick of time, has shot out a really useful work<sup>1</sup> on one of the questions of the hour. We are aware that this is the high art of journalism, and even of literature, at the present day, and we are accustomed to find the results hardly equal to the intentions. But in Mr. Spalding we are not disappointed. His work has body, research, and finish, and we can give it our imprimatur with little hesitation. He recognises the historical side of the question: he would "mend," not "end"; in this he is wiser than most of the speakers and writers who are tackling the question at meetings or in the press.

Mr. Spalding's book is divided into four parts—Introduction, Historical, The Indictment, The Proposed Reform. Let us briefly review some of the points which it suggests.

First of all, there is the statement that the existence of an enormous preponderance of hereditary peers is not an ancient or integral part of the British Constitution. With a proper amount of diffidence as to any too rapid generalisation, Mr. Spalding points out that down to the Tudor period the House of Lords was gradually built up out of three elements—the feudal baron, who was summoned to the King's council in virtue of his large landed responsibilities, but without any hereditary right to the summons; the experts, who were occasionally summoned *ad hoc*; the peers, created by patent. Doubtless there are those who find the hereditary right early developed in the first two classes, just as it was inherent in the third. But we agree with Mr. Spalding that the original basis of the House did not go beyond life membership. The consequences which flow from this view are important to the reformer: he is no longer engaged in reform, but in restoration, which is nowadays always considered a far more respectable task.

The attempted abolition and reconstruction of the House of Lords under Cromwell's auspices is, we believe, usually forgotten. The circumstances are interesting, but we do not lay too much stress on it as a lesson. It is true that the Rump of the Long Parliament made a declaration that Acts were valid without consent of either King or House of Peers. "It is curious" also "to notice how soon the abolition of the Monarchy and of the Upper House was followed by the practical abolition of the House of Commons." But the circumstances of the time were peculiar. While Mr. Spalding's fourth

<sup>1</sup> *The House of Lords: A Retrospect and a Forecast*. By Thomas Alfred Spalding, LL.B. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1894.

chapter may be read with much interest, it must not be made the basis of an argument for future use.

The Wensleydale Peerage case has very properly a chapter to itself. It will be remembered that in 1856 Baron Parke was elevated to the dignity of Baron Wensleydale for the term of his natural life. The immediate object of the creation was to strengthen the Law Lords in the final Court of Appeal. As soon as Parliament assembled Lord Derby attacked the patent as a breach of the privileges of their Lordships' House, and (save the mark!) "especially affecting the constitutional liberty of the country." Lord Lyndhurst, then an old man, took something the same view, and obtained the reference of the question to the Committee of Privileges: an attempt to refer the matter to the Queen's judges was defeated: the Committee eventually decided against the patent: the Government did not contest the matter, and Lord Wensleydale ultimately received his patent in the usual form. It is clear that the decision was unsatisfactory: it even suggests the consideration that where a matter affects the Lords and is fought through the Courts till it comes to the House of Lords, this court is not a satisfactory final court of appeal. The circumstances referred to are therefore fairly reopened when the question of reconstituting again arises.

There have been two other attempts to deal with the question at issue—that of Earl Russell in 1869, and that of Lord Rosebery in 1884—and a few words from the latter occasion we must quote as raising an important question. "I believe one reason of our relative weakness, when compared with the House of Commons, is that we have no representative of the labouring classes." Later on in his book, when Mr. Spalding is making suggestions for the recruitment of the reformed House, he follows this lead of Lord Rosebery, and includes "Labour, Agricultural and Urban" in the categories which require some representation. "If the ideal be," he continues, "to create a Second Chamber which will fairly represent all classes and interests, it would surely be a great absurdity to exclude the representatives of those who constitute the vast majority of the nation." We admit this conclusion, but we do not grant the premises: the ideal described is not what should be aimed at. Lord Rosebery in 1884 was wrong—or, rather, we should say he was merely rhetorical. With a House of Commons tending year by year to become more democratic and to be composed of younger men, what is required of the House of Lords is that it should adequately represent the intellect, education, and ripe experience of the nation. There are stout Radicals who have the courage to indicate the daily increasing danger of swamping the educated minority. The danger is a serious one, and a reformed House of Lords might reduce it to slight proportions. At present we think, as some one lately said, the majority

of the Peers "represent no one but themselves"; there is no reason why they should not completely represent the education and intellect of the country: manual labour of all kinds is effectually represented by the Commons.

In his "indictment" of the Lords, Mr. Spalding seems to us at times to be unfair in his comments and conclusions. We do not agree with him that most of the great reforms in English political life were the product of slowly awaking thought and mature consideration. On the contrary, they have usually been carried "not wisely but too well," and we have suffered from the results of hasty legislation. On occasions, the Lords might, if they had only been more modest, have conferred a lasting benefit by the application of the drag. That they have not done so is partly due to the incontinence of their opponents. This, however, comes too near praising them.

Finally, the chapter on Method of Reconstruction is interesting. Broadly, the proposal is to summon to the Privy Council representatives of all classes of the community, and gradually select these for the enjoyment of life peerages. The proposal does not satisfy us. We should prefer to work upon a historic basis, and we are not sure that life peerages and the Scots representative system combined are not the best solution.

Unless the United States had a written constitution Mr. Coxe's posthumous book<sup>1</sup> could hardly have existed. It is an effort to prove that the legislative power of the Republic is strictly limited by its constitution. This is a thesis which could not be maintained of the British Constitution, which, like Topsy, merely "grewed"—which, if limited in a few points, has indefinite power of expansion in many others. But in any case it is obvious that such an inquiry as Mr. Coxe's requires great care and acumen, and affords numerous pitfalls. So his "essay" becomes a large volume full of subtle inquiry. It retains its essay form chiefly in its want of adhesion and arrangement. The book is on that account a difficult one to read, but it has much which will repay a serious student of constitutional law.

Of the three Australian Blue Books<sup>2</sup> noted below we have not space to say much. We have several times in this section referred to the excellence of Australian statistical works, and these are no exceptions to the rule. Indeed, if all countries were as accurate and complete as Australia in this respect, we should hesitate whether to congratulate the statistician on the excellence of his materials so much as to condole with him on their immensity.

<sup>1</sup> *An Essay on Judicial Power and Unconstitutional Legislation.* By Brinton Coxe. Philadelphia: Kay and Brother. 1893.

<sup>2</sup> *Statistics of New Zealand for 1892.* Wellington. 1893. *Report of Minister of Public Instruction (Victoria) for 1893.* *General Report of the Census of Victoria, 1891.* Melbourne. 1893.

Mrs. Nugent has given us a book<sup>1</sup> on Algeria and its surroundings which most of us will like. Her style is a little stilted, and her descriptions sometimes a little too detailed; but we nevertheless place her book on the library table with much satisfaction and the recollection of a pleasant hour or two. It contains some sound information as to Moorish life, and some interesting references to the history of Northern Africa.

The yellow flower-wreathed volume on the French Congo<sup>2</sup> has apparently been some time in finding its way to us. Probably few English people know where the colony is, or even that there is a French possession of the name. The book very wisely begins with a full account of the boundaries and situation, which we need not repeat. North of the great Congo, on the west coast of the African continent, lies this district of over 500,000 square miles. Of this M. Latour gives a very readable account, dealing largely with the explorations which led to the French occupation, talking about gorillas, chimpanzees and elephants, with other natural inhabitants and features. There are a few rather rough woodcuts and a gruesome frontispiece. There is no very fresh or original feature in the book, which quotes M. de Brazza pretty freely. The remarks near the end, in which French missionary work is compared with that of the (English) Protestant, are worth consideration.

## HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

A COMPLETE history of Japan has yet to be written. We have read some charming books about that most interesting country; but the attempts to make Japanese history intelligible to the European reader have hitherto been sad failures. Dr. David Murray's *Japan*,<sup>3</sup> in The Story of the Nations Series, is one of the most laudable efforts recently made in this department of historical research. Having regard to the vague and legendary character of the earliest Japanese records, and the seclusion in which mediæval Japan has been buried, it is no easy task to present anything like a reliable account of the momentous changes through which the Japanese empire has passed. In the *Transactions of the Asiatic Society*, Dr. Murray had certainly a mine of valuable information, and some excellent material was also contained in Chamberlain's *Things Japanese*. In the opening chapter of the present volume we find a

<sup>1</sup> *A Land of Mosques and Marabouts*. By the Hon. Mrs. Greville Nugent. London: Chapman & Hall 1894.

<sup>2</sup> *Le Congo*. Par Emmanuel Latour. Tours: Mame et fils. 1892.

<sup>3</sup> *The Story of the Nations: Japan*. By David Murray, Ph.D., LL.D., late Adviser to the Japanese Minister of Education. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

very clear and accurate description of the Japanese Archipelago. The first knowledge of Japan was brought to Europe by the celebrated Marco Polo after his return from his travels in China in A.D. 1295. He said that he had heard while in China of an island called "Chipangu," towards the east in the high seas, 1500 miles from the continent. "The people," adds Marco Polo, "are white, civilised, and well-favoured." The name "Chipangu" appears to be a transliteration of the Chinese name, which modern scholars write "Chi-pen-kue." Europeans altered the Chinese name into Japan.

The Japanese empire consists of four large islands and about three thousand small ones. Some of these small islands are large enough to constitute distinct provinces, but most of them are too small to have a separate political existence. The principal island is situate between Yezo on the north and Kyūshū on the south. Measuring in the direction of the greatest extension, this island is about 1130 miles long; and its width is nowhere greater than 200 miles, and for much of its length not more than 100 miles. Among the Japanese the island has no separate name. It is often called by them Hondo, which may be translated "Main Island." Yezo is the next island in size, its greatest length being 350 miles. The third island, Kyūshū, is about 200 miles in length. The fourth of the large islands of Japan is called Shikoku, which is about 170 miles in length.

From time immemorial the Japanese islands have been infested with earthquakes. The last severe earthquake was in the autumn of 1891, when the central part of the main island was disturbed, the town of Shimoda having been almost destroyed by a previous earthquake in 1854, and a considerable portion of Zedo having been injured in 1855 by a similar disturbance, which caused much loss of life. The entire archipelago bears evidence of volcanic formation, and the picturesque mountain of Fuji-san, which may be seen on entering the Bay of Tōkyō, has manifestly been thrown up by a volcano.

Turning to the facts of Japanese history, we find that the population includes two distinct races, the Ainos, who are probably the original race, and the Japanese. The military forces of the empire were in early times constantly employed in suppressing the disturbances caused by the barbarous people of the North, known as the Yemishi, or "Prawn Barbarians," so-called from their long beards, which made their faces resemble prawn's heads. This race is probably identical with the Ainos, or "hairy people." The Ainos at present inhabit the valley of the Ishikari in the island of Yezo, the Kurile Islands, and the southern part of Saghalien. They are rather rude, practising few arts, the making of pottery being quite unknown amongst them. Their fishing is conducted with the primitive apparatus used by their forefathers. They have no written language, and their religious ideas are of the most vague and incoherent character. They worship rivers, rocks, and mountains. They con-

veal the burial-places of their dead, and foreigners rarely have access to them.

The Japanese race is composed of different elements. In the south more than the north, and principally among the ruling classes, there are specimens of a refined type, with oval face, oblique eyes, and slightly aquiline nose. In the north is found another type, with broad face and prominent cheek-bones; the nose is flat and the eyes horizontal. These may be described for convenience as the aristocratic and plebeian types. This twofold character of the Japanese race may be explained by two extensive migrations from the Asiatic continent—the first from the Korea by a barbarous Mongolian tribe; the second by a somewhat similar route on the part of a more civilised portion of the same branch of the human family.

The mythical character of early Japanese history is mainly due to the fact that the art of writing and printing was not introduced into Japan till A.D. 284. The oldest book of Japanese history which has come down to us is the *Kojiki*, or *Records of Ancient Matters*. This work was undertaken by the order of the Emperor Temmu (A.D. 673–686) and was completed under the superintendence of the Empress Gemmyo, and finally presented to the Court in A.D. 711. Another work—the *Nihongi*, or *Chronicles of Japan*—was brought out in A.D. 720. The *Kojiki* has been translated into English, but the *Nihongi* has not. Besides these two historical works, the student of primitive Japanese history finds his chief assistance in the Shinto rituals contained in a work called *Yengishiki* (*Code of Ceremonial Law*).

According to the Japanese legend, there were three deities in existence when heaven and earth began. These three were the Master of the August Centre of Heaven, the High August Producing Wondrous Deity, and the Divine Producing Wondrous Deity. Having come into existence without creation, these three deities, after a term of existence, died. Then two other deities were born from a reed-shoot when the earth, still young, drifted about like floating oil. These two deities likewise died. Together with their three predecessors they are called the Heavenly Deities. Next came two earthly deities, also uncreated, who likewise proved mortal, and they were succeeded by five pairs—the latter, with their two terrestrial predecessors, being called the Seven Divine Generations. The next step is the creation by Divine command of the Japanese Islands. To this mythological narrative is added a somewhat poetic account of the Sun-Goddess, who appears in some way to preside over the destinies of Japan.

The first emperor who emerges out of this twilight of fable as a real personage is Jimmu, who, with his brother, passed over the entire country, and compelled all the inhabitants to yield obedience to their authority. Prince Itsu-se, who was the elder brother, having received a fatal wound in battle from an arrow,

Jimmu now completed his subjugation of the people, crushing even the formidable barbarians known as "the pit-dwellers," because they lived in pits dug out of the earth in the sides of the mountains, and established himself in a palace built for him at Kashivara, in the province of Yamato. He is said to have lived one hundred and twenty seven years. He was succeeded by his son, Suizei, who reigned thirty-two years. The enumeration of the kings who came after these, with varying fortunes, may be found in the volume, of whose contents we have already presented a fair sample. The reign of the Emperor Suinin, who flourished in the seventh century of the Christian era, is memorable for the abolition of the cruel custom of burying with the deceased members of the imperial family the living retainers and horses who had been in their service.

The adventures of Prince O-usu, better known as Yamato-dake, exhibit a very daring and romantic type of character. A trait of ferocity in his disposition is shown by the fact that, when ordered by his father to make his brother attend to his duty, he improved upon these directions by slaying his somewhat slothful relative. In the disguise of a woman he went to a feast where a band of outlaws were revelling, and, drawing from under his garments a hidden sword, killed them one by one. He also subdued the Ainos—the "hairy men" of the Japanese legends.

The history of the Shoguns of Japan is rather curious. The first of them, Yoritomo, appears in his way to have been a kind of Japanese Napoleon. He fought and conquered all the enemies of the empire, and was rewarded with the title of "Shogun"—a position only second to that of the Emperor. His son, Yoriige, succeeded him, and thus a line of Shoguns wielded power side by side with their Imperial masters down to 1867, when the office was abolished.

The account given in the volume of the restored Empire and the new Japanese constitution will be read with lively interest ; for it indicates that the day is not far distant when Japan will take her place as one of the civilised and progressive nations of the world.

The first volume of a *History of Trinidad*,<sup>1</sup> by Lionel Mordaunt Frazer contains a vast quantity of information, commencing with the discovery of the island by Columbus in 1498 and bringing the narrative down to 1813. The early conflicts between the Spaniards and the Indians are described very graphically ; and, though the author has no extraordinary gifts of style, he has the great advantage of being thoroughly acquainted with his subject. The attempt of Ogé to establish the rights of the free people of colour, his trial, and execution, are sympathetically treated. The author, too, vindicates the character of General Picton, to whose virtues history has done scant justice.

<sup>1</sup> *History of Trinidad (First Period)*. From 1781 to 1813. By Lionel Mordaunt Frazer. Vol. I. Trinidad : Government Printing Office. Port of Spain.

Mr. J. H. Wylie's *History of England under Henry the Fourth*<sup>1</sup> is a marvellous example of laborious research. The second volume of the work, just issued by Messrs. Longmans & Co., deals with only a period of two years (from 1404 to 1406), but this short space of time was singularly eventful. Mr. Wylie has consulted all the available authorities on the subject. We must, however, express a doubt as to the propriety of writing history in the mode adopted by Mr. Wylie. Style, lucidity, and dramatic effect are all sacrificed to a spasmodic endeavour to achieve accuracy by reproducing the substance and the now obsolete phraseology of old documents. After all, history should not be served up to the reader raw. We may view the past with modern eyes as long as we realise the fact that we are dealing with bygone days. With this qualification we must acknowledge the book to be a praiseworthy achievement and a respectable contribution to historical literature.

*Les Français du XVII<sup>e</sup> Siècle*<sup>2</sup> is one of those books which may be said to lie on the borderland of history; we suppose that as a study of social life at a given period there might be some reason to claim it for sociology. Anyhow, it is an excellent work; it is of the best method of history writing; it shows us the French of the last century as they appear in their literature and contemporary prints. Molière, Montaigne, Boileau, Tartuffe, and many more are brought before us as in the flesh. We have life-like presentments of "les grands gens" the bourgeois, "les gens d'église," avocats, médecins, &c. There are excellent chapters on the newspapers of a century ago, and on the education of the women. The last is worthy of careful attention. It will be found a light and appreciative sketch of the ruling spirit of gallantry which dominated the century; but it presents it in its best form, and minimises the darker side. The conclusion to which the author commits himself is that the French of to-day may find a great deal to imitate in their great-grandfathers and great-grandmothers. The book is a good one in every respect.

#### BELLES LETTRES.

AN unobtrusive volume on our table, bearing the quiet title, *A Grey Romance*,<sup>3</sup> is soon discovered to be a collection of short stories, each by a different hand, and each signed by a well-known name. Such a book of specimens is of the nature of a challenge to the critical faculty, and every reader who respects himself will feel it necessary

<sup>1</sup> *History of England under Henry the Fourth*. In Three Volumes. By James Hamilton Wylie, M.A. Vol. II. London: Longmans & Co.

<sup>2</sup> *Les Français du XVII<sup>e</sup> Siècle*. Edition nouvelle. Par Charles Gidel. Paris: Garnier Frères.

<sup>3</sup> *A Grey Romance*. By Mrs. W. K. Clifford. And other Stories. London: W. H. Allen & Co., Limited.



to give a vote for one or other of the competitors. For ourselves, we feel that Mrs. W. K. Clifford has spared us the trouble of any laborious comparison, for her contribution (that which gives its title to the book) is a finished and truthful, if sombre, piece of work, and renders a quaint, though *triste*, situation with great delicacy. Mr. Frank R. Stockton's *The Watchmaker's Wife* will be found amusing even by those who have but little taste for American humour; and M. W. Earl Hodgson's *The Candidate for West Drum* contains some clever writing, though, as a *conte*, it hardly complies with the rules of the game. Mr. Gilbert Parker has an imperturbable American, who plays pitch and toss with his own fortune and that of a friend in a manner that is somehow more ridiculous than exciting; and the other writers represented are not seen at their best, although each tale adds to the interest of the book as a sample of differing method.

The recent visit to England of the Hungarian patriot and author, Maurus Jókai, has stimulated an interest in his writings, and Messrs. Cassell are now bringing forward a translation, made two or three years ago by Mr. F. Steinitz, of one of his romances, *Dr. Dumány's Wife*.<sup>1</sup> Jókai, we are told in a prefatory note, was born in 1825, and, commencing to write at the age of twelve, is now said to be responsible for several hundred volumes! He married a fellow-countrywoman, an actress, Rosa Laborfalvi, and a year later joined the revolutionists of 1848. Being taken prisoner, he was sentenced to be shot; but Rosa, having sold her jewels, contrived to bribe his guards, and escaped with her husband into the birch-woods, where they hid in caves and slept on leaves, until they could reach Buda-Pesth. In that city Jókai now makes his home, and takes an active part in the affairs of his country. As a writer he is impressive, even when translated, his scenes being very vividly realised—*e.g.* the striking account of a disastrous railway accident in the present volume. The history of the strange marriage of Dr. Dumány, the Silver King, though too diffuse, is related in a simple personal style which holds the interest, and, as dealing with the manners of a comparatively little known country, the book has that exotic flavour now so popular with English readers.

Mrs. Lovett Cameron in *A Tragic Blunder*<sup>2</sup> is not happy in her choice of incident, for the device of a strong likeness between two cousins, leading to one suffering accidentally in the other's place, is no doubt a trifle stale. The "blunder" consists of a ruffianly and murderous attack on the one cousin, a poor man, through a confusion of identity with his rich relative, Lord Netherville, who was known to be carrying a valuable necklace to his betrothed bride. The

<sup>1</sup> *Dr. Dumány's Wife*. A Romance. By Maurus Jókai. Translated from the Hungarian by F. Steinitz. London: Cassell & Co., Limited.

<sup>2</sup> *A Tragic Blunder*. By Mrs. Lovett Cameron. London: F. V. White & Co.

resemblance, in fact, stands throughout in the poorer cousin's way, leads the girl he loves to mistrust him, and earns him an undesirable reputation for cutting his dearest friends. Mrs. Cameron's book is, as usual, brightly, if not very carefully written, and, apart from the hackneyed character of the incident, is capable of affording enjoyment.

Mr. Hume Nisbet's *A Bush Girl's Romance*<sup>1</sup> is a more than ordinarily readable and well-sustained story, and his descriptions of Western Australia are interesting and excellent. A gastronomic bushranger, with original recipes for the preparation of such native delicacies as snake soup, stewed *muurang*, cockatoos, and parroquets, and devilled grubs served with roasted fernroot, is the most notable character in the book; and, epicure though he be, Captain Wildrake leads his gang with spirit and daring, frames the most ingenious and wide-reaching schemes, and carries them out with coolness and courage. His atrocious massacre of a native tribe after toiling unselfishly to procure for the half-starved blacks the unknown satisfaction of a well-cooked meal, is absolutely fiendish, and for the credit of Western Australia it is to be hoped that the sketch of Crocodile Station and the Brothers Denver is overcharged, and that no such den of wickedness and tyranny has ever been suffered to exist.

Mr. Frederick Boyle's *The Prophet John*<sup>2</sup> is cleverly conceived, and has also no lack of romantic incident. The hero, Hugh Upcombe, has a fine property left to him by an uncle, who in his last years had joined an eccentric sect, the Anointed Brethren, and fallen under the influence of their violent and murderous "Prophet," John Thurlby, who preaches the comfortable doctrine that no member of the body that he leads can do wrong, even when committing the most atrocious crimes. To obtain his inheritance, Hugh is required to offer marriage to this man's daughter, Mabel Thurlby, and previously, to make her acquaintance by spending six months at Upcombe Manor, then the headquarters of the Brethren, to whom the estates will revert in the event of his refusal of the terms. Rather than forfeit the home of his ancestors Hugh decides to fulfil the conditions of the will, and, given the peculiar views of the unscrupulous "Prophet," it may be inferred that the period of probation passed by the young man in his power were not allowed to go by without desperate efforts to prevent the fortune from passing from the coffers of the sect; but for the details, and for the part which Mabel Thurlby herself plays in the drama, the reader must be referred to the book itself.

*Upper Bohemians*<sup>3</sup> is a brightly-written sketch, often crisp and

<sup>1</sup> *A Bush Girl's Romance*. By Hume Nisbet. London: F. V. White & Co.

<sup>2</sup> *The Prophet John*. A Romance. By Frederick Boyle. London: Chapman & Hall, Limited.

<sup>3</sup> *Upper Bohemians*. By F. G. Walpole. London: Digby Long & Co.

epigrammatic in dialogue, and with some fairly good character-drawing. The book has now reached a second edition, and, though slight and unequal, has many of the elements of a popular success.

Mr. Vernon Kirke<sup>1</sup> is disposed to paint the colony of Demerara in unusually favourable colours, as a land of sunshine and idleness, of scarlet hibiscus blossom and lovely creoles, and to touch lightly upon the slow sapping of the forces of the constitution by the most unhealthy climate. The early pages dealing with the fair Sarnia's girlhood in British Guiana and her married life are amusing, but the later scenes of her parting with Kenneth and abject return to her forsaken husband have little verisimilitude. Sarnia is, however, a striking portrait, and her vivid figure to some extent lights up a not otherwise very noticeable volume.

The plot of *Deferred Pay*<sup>2</sup> is a somewhat clumsy piece of farcical melodrama. For a girl's sake the hero holds his peace as to a murderous attempt upon himself by a treacherous friend, and ultimately receives "deferred pay" in the shape of his enemy's widow, dowered with his revenue and estates. This somewhat weak-minded Major is, however, haunted by remorse and apprehension through a vague impression that while in India he allowed his men to bury alive an insubordinate garrison clerk; but, since the man eventually turns up uninjured, we are inclined to believe that the Major, while conducting that impromptu funeral, must have heedlessly exposed himself to a touch of the sun.

#### ART.

THE monographs on artistic subjects, edited by P. G. Hamerton, and published monthly under the general title of *The Portfolio*, are too well known to need any special description. Paper and printing, and the quality of the illustrations, leave little to desire as a rule—something of main importance in this kind of literature, where the pictorial element leads the text. Mr. Bedford's *Malta*<sup>3</sup> (78 pages) has all these advantages—four carefully engraved plates and twenty-four illustrations, large and ample (for the most part photo reproductions), in the text. To all this, by an inestimable piece of luck, has been added a complete index of proper names, and of all subjects treated technically.

<sup>1</sup> *Zorg*. A Story of British Guiana. By Vernon Kirke. London: Digby Long & Co.

<sup>2</sup> *Deferred Pay; or, A Major's Dilemma*. By Lieut.-Colonel W. H. McCarsland. London: Digby Long & Co.

<sup>3</sup> *Malta and the Knights Hospitallers (The Portfolio, No. 2, February 1894)*. By W. K. R. Bedford, M.A. London: Seeley & Co.

Malta has always been a station in the hurrying to and fro of mankind through that Mediterranean Sea which indeed marks out the mid-earth in the history of civilisation. Our author makes his work radiate, before and after, from the occupation of the island by the Knights Hospitallers, who are commonly known by its name. The Knights of Malta, from their forced abandonment of Rhodes in 1522—a direct consequence of the taking of Constantinople by the triumphant Turks—to the French Revolution, which sapped their life by stripping them of their revenues, gave the island the only individual political existence which it has had in the world. But the great commercial and conquering races of the world, those which communicate civilisation and art, even if they do not create it, passed here from the beginning of history. Mr. Bedford's plan of stringing his description of artistic remains chronologically along his narration of history gives a view of this progress of the races of men through Malta that is at once clear and comprehensive. In the short space he has taken for his monograph he is naturally obliged to suppose that the bearings of the artistic details, which he gives conscientiously, are already known. But even the general reader will end the book with a sense of mental uplifting and wider historic vision.

Thus the Phœnician occupation, which was the first in historic time (somewhere about 1500 B.C.), has left its mark in caves, tombs, dwellings, and temples. The latter are of the Sidonian period of architecture, and relics of the worship of Astarte have been found connected with them. It is a pity that our author, following Professor Sayce, should speak of this as "pre-historic"—an adjective that ought to be reserved for the relics of races that have left no definite trace of their action in human history. It is true that the history of the Phœnicians remains to be written; but enough is known of their decisive influence over the progress of mankind, their colonies and commerce bearing the products of industry and the knowledge of the arts to Greece and Rome and the Gates of Hercules and the seas beyond, to make them as fundamentally as Greeks and Romans an historic race, and more so than the Egyptians or any of the Semite races like themselves before the advent of Christianity and Mahometanism. They were the first race to find the secret of civilisation in what Macaulay makes a discovery of Lord Bacon—in the increase of the material well-being of the races with which they came in contact. That this was a matter of trade with them is no worse than a like state of things with the chief civilising race of modern times—unless, indeed, we are still ready to believe that England civilises by her missionaries and not by her commerce. It is curious that the final occupation of Malta should be by a trading race for the protection of its world-wide interests.

But all this speculation our author does not indulge in as he passes

through the island's early history : its great siege by the Turks, who threatened all our Western civilisation ; the conventual church of St. John, which gathers within its walls the relics and memories of the knights ; and the old town of Valetta, where present day Malta displays its living survivals of the past. Greeks, Romans, and Vandals, Saracens and Normans, crowd the pages with the remnants of their art, or destruction of art, before we come to the long list of relics of the knights—churches and paintings and decorations and the costly Flemish tapestries, with the splendidly embroidered robes of the Grand Masters. The book should be of special interest to the English readers who visit this most curious of their country's possessions.

Not the least curious issue of the season is *The Book-Plate Annual and Armorial Year Book*.<sup>1</sup> Even the advertisements of the cover are taken up with *ex libris*, the only exception being in favour of a book on *Edinburgh in the Olden Time*, doubtless because the traditions of heraldry do most linger round the Scottish capital. The intellectual flavour of the book and the arts which it copiously illustrates is, in fact, like nothing so much as the disquisitions of Tully-veolan in *Waverley*. Of the coats-of-arms not a technical detail is spared, although the general text is very comprehensible, reaching from bookworms and the colouring of the edges of bound volumes to the collection and conservation of book-plates—"these charming personalities and conceits that are every day becoming more rare as 'antiques,' or more beautiful from the art or *poésic* expended upon them." There is much pleasant information by the way, which enhances the value of this unpretentious *brochure* for those who cannot afford the elaborate many-guinea books which treat of this reviving art. The illustrations are excellent, both as specimens and for themselves. The giant book-plate, designed by John Leighton, F.S.A., and presented as a wedding gift to H.R.H. the Duke of York and the Princess Mary of Teck, in July 1893, has an instructive instance of symbolism in the heart as an emblem of charity. This, in form and in meaning, is a direct derivation from a French religious symbol that divided Jansenists from Jesuits for a century and a half.

The curator of the collections at the National Manufactory of Sèvres has given an important guide to the collector in his *Dictionnaire de la Céramique*.<sup>2</sup> The book, however, is addressed to *gens du monde et amateurs*, and much of it is of general interest, while the man who despises its coloured plates of decorative designs must have a soul dead to other things than crockery. The volume, of 258 pages, comprises a lengthy and lucid historical summary by way of

<sup>1</sup> *The Book-Plate Annual and Armorial Year Book* (1894). London : A. & C. Black.

<sup>2</sup> *Dictionnaire de la Céramique* (Faïences, Grés, Poteries). Par Édouard Garnier. Paris : Librairie de L'Art.

introduction; extended notices, in alphabetical order, of the men and places, the processes and technical names connected with the manufacture of earthen and stone ware; an illustrated table of marks and monograms; and an index of the twenty coloured plates not included in the text. The latter reproduce 150 decorative *motifs*, and there are 550 marks and monograms in the text after designs of the author. His connection with the great museum at Sèvres has afforded him advantages which he has put to great use. His own thorough knowledge has also allowed him to explain clearly and interestingly the processes and historical progress made in modern times in this most ancient art of the potter. Without accepting Semper's prehistoric derivation of all decorative art from pottery and weaving, we may at least be glad to have our ideas and words set in competent order about artistic objects of our everyday life, and our flowers will smell sweeter from their vases for it.

The collection of biographies, with critical notices and catalogues, of "Celebrated Artists," published by the French house of *L'Art*, has now passed its fiftieth volume.<sup>1</sup> Of the three lying on our table, the one devoted to Constant Troyon deals with subjects and schools of our own times. This artist, who only missed being great in landscape, and who actually excelled in animal painting, followed Rousseau and Dupré into that school of French art which was contemporaneous with the Romantic school of French literature. Like this, it caught its revolutionary spirit—its love of plain Nature, adorned only with sentiment, as against classic and conventionalised Nature—from the English, from painters like Constable and Turner, and poets like Scott and Byron (to be logical, this should have been Wordsworth; but art and genius have intuitions which are above logic). It is curious that Paul Huët, who brought back with him to France the ideas and practice of Constable, should have been connected immediately with Boucher and the Louis Quinze painters stricken with the sentimentality of Rousseau, which had so strong an echo in the Lake poets. These filiations in literature and art are a great charm of detailed monographs like these, where the reader seems to catch a glimpse of that interior march of ideas which determines a great part of human progress. A noteworthy thing in the biography of Troyon is a criticism of Théophile Gautier, who complained that "it was necessary to stand back several steps from his pictures to find out what they mean." Poor Théophile in a Salon of to-day! Bernard Van Orley, the friend of Erasmus and Albrecht Dürer, represents the half-century in Flemish art which leaped from the old Gothic into full Renaissance and stopped little short of the Reformation. Van Mierevelt, three-quarters of a century

<sup>1</sup> *Constant Troyon*. Par A. Hustin. *Bernard Van Orley*. Par Alphonse Wauters. *Michiel Van Mierevelt et son genre*. Par Henry Havard. Paris: Librairie de *L'Art*.

later, was a full-blown Mennonite in Holland, something which did not prevent his exercising an important influence on all the art of the Netherlands at a second turning-point. The historical bearings of all this are well brought out in the case of Van Orley by M. Wauters, the archivist of the city of Brussels, and in that of Van Mierevelt by M. Henry Havard, who is easily the first technical art-writer in France. Where the text is uniformly so good and complete, it seems a pity to be obliged to say that the reproductions of Troyon's designs could not well be worse, and that the half-tones intended for Van Orley remind one but faintly of the designer of the windows in Sainte-Gudule. On the other hand, the portraits of Van Mierevelt, numerous as they are, come out with a distinctness that makes the turning over of the leaves like a promenade among the great personages of the time—Gustavus Adolphus and Oxenstiern, Princes of Orange and the Duke of Buckingham, Grotius and Gaspard de Coligny, not to speak of the Elisabeth of England, who was a queen of Bohemia, and other noble dames. M. Havard remarks that a study of point lace and jewels might be made from the costumes. But a speculation of more general interest is naturally excited by the view of these strong-featured men and women of another age, so human and yet so unlike the common level of our own day.

Among the other numerous publications to help out the education and the inventive powers of French artists, the new series of *Documents décoratifs Japonais*<sup>1</sup> should be especially useful. The wind may no longer blow so violently as a few years since in the direction of Japanese art, but our decorators have still much to learn from its best period. So, it would appear from the examples here given, have the recent Japanese artists themselves. That catching of the vitality which is in the bend of a flower-stalk or the flutter of a bird's wings, is found much more vividly in the *Miyama-za*—"beings from the depths of the mountains"—the work published by Shumboku in 1715, than in the more recent designs. But in all there is seen a trained attention to line in motion which has until now scarcely marked the art of more civilised lands. The collection of designs, bound up in separate small pamphlets, so far deals with flowers and plants, and with birds. Animals and fish are to follow after. At the foot of each design the name of the Japanese work from which it is taken and that of the artist with his date are printed. The greater number are selected from the last century. The series has the additional use of furnishing beautiful samples of this strange art cheaply—something to be reckoned with, considering the very high price of complete works on the subject.

<sup>1</sup> *Documents décoratifs Japonais* (Fleurs et Plantes, Nos. 1, 3; Oiseaux, 2, 4). Paris Librairie de l'Art

Mr. Leo Claretie in his interesting book entitled *Les Jouets*<sup>1</sup> gives an account of the history and manufacture of toys from the time of the Romans until the present day.

This handsome volume is got up in beautiful style, and contains 300 drawings, six of which are coloured plates. In it the author gives a place to the most humble toys—toys varying in price from one penny to 50,000 francs.

From the perusal of its pages we learn many interesting facts concerning the toys and games of ancient France. A favourite game among the kings and nobles was the *Jeu de Paume*. “C'est en regardant jouer à la Paume—son jeu favori que Charles VIII. mourut.” *Bilboquet* also was much in favour since the caprice of Henri III. “At a fancy ball given at the Louvre in 1626 some noblemen disguised themselves as *bilboquets*.”

In the seventeenth century many costly toys of beautiful workmanship were made.

Regnault relates that amongst other marvellous curiosities he saw a microscopical game of *ninepins* which could be contained in a raisin.

Le Loyer describes another prodigy: “Un orfèvre de Paris fit une galère d'argent qui se mouvait d'elle même sur une table, les forçats ramant dedans. Quand elle était au bout de la table, elle tournait court de l'autre côté, ce qu'elle faisait 5 ou 6 fois.” One of the drawings represents a warship, fully manned, beautifully chiselled in gilded silver. We learn that Louis XIV., when a child, had a miniature cardboard army painted in the finest colours, which cost the king, his father, 50,000 francs.

The collection of Monsieur Bernard, the well-known antiquarian, contains many curious and valuable toys; amongst others we may mention a doll's bedroom, toys belonging to the *Princesse de Nassau*, an armchair in carved wood, Louis XVI. style, a carved bedstead, Louis XV. style, and several coaches in chiselled silver.

An interesting account is also given of large and small toy manufactories in Paris. Different views are given of the toy manufactory at the *Prison de la Santé*. A chapter is allotted to the description of the labours of the small artisan, whose work often begins before daybreak by searching for old sardine and preserve boxes, which he then melts and afterwards moulds into the cheap toys that amuse and instruct countless numbers of children.

Japan is represented by three drawings of dolls from the collection of M. Jules Adeline.

A dozen drawings show us some prettily-dressed dolls representing the costumes of *Queen Clothilde*, *Marie de Medicis*, *Anne d'Autriche*, *Duchesse de Bourgogne*, *Marie Louise*, *Empress Eugénie*, &c. This collection, belonging to *Madame Piogey*, figured in the *Woman's Pavilion at the Chicago Exhibition*.

<sup>1</sup> *Les Jouets*. Par Leo Claretie. Paris; May et Motteroz.



## THE DRAMA.

THE history of the month which comes under our notice might as well remain unwritten, for as far as the drama is concerned nothing has seen the light which is worthy of much comment. A sheaf of farcical comedies, good, bad and indifferent, the revival of a boisterous melodrama of the Drury Lane school, an attempt to drive the theatre further into the broad and irregular road of the music-hall, that is nearly all that can be said about recent productions.

Among the farcial comedies one was distinctly good, and will rival *Charley's Aunt* in popularity; we mean *The New Boy*, by Mr. Arthur Law. This play, like many successful farces, owes its success less to ingenuity of complication than to the freshness of the author's starting idea coupled with the drollery of a particular actor's personality. The actor in this case is Mr. Weedon Grossmith, who, married though he is in the play, has for certain reasons too multifarious and intricate to specify, to make his appearance in the disguise of a schoolboy, wearing a sailor's suit and knickerbockers. Mr. Weedon Grossmith is an undersized man, and to say that the stately Miss Gladys Homfrey plays the part of his better half, but is really taken for his mother, is sufficient to indicate in what direction runs the fun of the play. Nor does its gaiety ever flag, for there is not only the main action which amuses the public, but there are various collateral little incidents bringing the audience back to their happy schooldays, which render the play spicy and thoroughly diverting.

At once it caught the public ear, and to say that it is extremely well acted from first to last seems to be sufficient to encourage all lovers of a good laugh to go and see *The New Boy*.

A bad farce was *Mrs. Dexter*, by J. H. Darnley, produced at the Strand Theatre. It lived precisely eight days, although it had such actors to defend it as Miss Fanny Brough and Mr. Charles Hawtrey, while in the eleventh hour Mr. Willie Edouin "walked" in in an unprecedented way, "gagging" as he perambulated on the stage, livening up somewhat the dead business with his personality, though it had really nothing to do with the case. Credit must be given to Miss Fanny Brough, who carried the heavy fun of the play upon her slender shoulders, and through hard work and through her genial sense of humour succeeded in saving the audience from abso-

lute boredom. To be candid, there was but one single scene in the play which was worth one's attention at all: that was when Mrs. Dexter, sitting at the piano, gently reconquered her lord and master with the aid of popular music-hall airs, the refrains of which live in everybody's memory. This scene was delightfully played by Miss Brough and Mr. W. F. Hawtrey; but to Mr. Charles Hawtrey the part of an Irish colonel, whose brogue he could not even imitate, was totally unsuited. We sincerely hope that Mr. Darnley will soon give us something better than *Mrs. Dexter*, for from the author of the *Solicitor* and the *Barrister* we are wont to expect some good fun.

Not less disappointing than Mr. Darnley's latest experiment was Mr. Ralph R. Lumley's new play, *The Best Man*, at Toole's. Our readers will remember that Mr. Lumley's *début* with *Aunt Jack* at the Court Theatre about five years ago was brilliant; rarely did a firstling prove such a complete success and show so much promise. Then followed the *Volcano*, which was also clever in parts, but failed as a whole; and now the best that can be said about *The Best Man* is that it must be considered an indifferent specimen of farcical comedy. It has been contended that the play has particular merit, because, instead of being boisterous, it is quiet and not overlaid with the usual attributes of the rollicking farce. But we venture to say that what others praise in this case we should feel inclined to deprecate. The intention of the author was clear enough when he sat down to initiate us into the little adventures of Mr. Price Puttlow, chairman of a railway company, in whose trains the danger signal, contrary to all expectation, does work when it is set in motion. We were to have (such was unmistakably Mr. Lumley's scheme) a most lively, complicated, laughable comedy as *Aunt Jack* was, but somehow, although the plot was devised with some cleverness, humour was lacking to carry it out, and the result of it is that the story is somewhat confused and fails to interest. Nor does the play afford great acting opportunities. Mr. Toole works with heart and soul, and his quaint humour of course does not fail to cause some merriment; but in Miss Beatrice Lamb, charming, clever, and handsome though she is, he has not a partner whose manner is well matched with his own. It is evident that the part of the bride, who through having pawned a diamond collar given to her by her future husband, causes all the trouble, was written for Mrs. John Wood, and the vivacity, the versatility, the great experience of a Mrs. John Wood, not the stateliness and elegant style of Miss Beatrice Lamb, was required for it. Therefore the play on the first night scarcely roused such enthusiasm as one is wont to witness in Mr. Toole's little theatre. Moreover, nearly all the members of the company had to appear, but really nothing to do; and such fascinating young ladies as Miss Cora Poole, Miss Alice

Kingsley, and Miss Florence Fordyce had practically no other task than to exhibit the grace of their personality and their taste in selecting pretty dresses. However, Miss Poole and Miss Kingsley, though the words given to them were few, made a successful attempt to portray the modern young lady of *jeunesse dorée* proclivities. And Mr. Shelton, as the stationmaster in a small place, and Miss Eliza Johnstone, delightful as ever as his *fiancée*, contrived to make a little hit through a thoroughly original conception of their parts.

Criticism on such musical medleys as *Go-Bang*, by Mr. Adrian Ross and Dr. Osmond Carr, does not really come within our province, the music being of greater importance than the so-called play. However, we will say this, that in the book there is a good deal of such smartness as has become fashionable since Mr. Gilbert wrote his *libretti* for Sir Arthur Sullivan, and there is at least one song and dance, rendered by Miss Letty Lind in her inimitable style, which will make the fortune of the play if the pretty women on the stage and the catchy tunes of Mr. Osmond Carr alone were not powerful enough to do so. It will not surprise us at all if all London should hum within the next few weeks the charming words and air of *Di-Di-Di*, and when all London hums a tune it is certain to rush to see the performance of which it forms part or parcel.

## AGRICULTURAL DEPRESSION.

AGRICULTURAL depression seems ever with us : for many years things have been going steadily to the bad ; farmers have got further and further in arrear and spent larger and larger portions of their own or borrowed capital. Many have thrown up their holdings ; of those that remain a considerable number have not now sufficient capital to work the land. The tenants have struggled hard, the landlords have generally done what they could to help, yet the result is that land is depreciated in value, farms are badly worked, much land has gone out of cultivation, the rural population is drifting to the towns, and the agricultural classes are almost hopeless.

It was time that a Commission should issue to ascertain the cause of the present distress, and, if possible, find a remedy.

While waiting for the Report which is to effect a revolution in a great industry, we may with advantage spend a few minutes in considering some aspects of the subject.

Many people seem to look to State action as a remedy ; it would be wise to satisfy ourselves whether this is or is not by the condition of things impossible, whether accommodation of methods to altered conditions may not be the only way in which an industry continues prosperous.

Notwithstanding the gravity of the position, we have one sure ground of hope in the fact that agriculture has before passed successfully through similar periods of distress. In the past, good times have succeeded to bad times which seemed quite as hopeless as the present.

Yet, while it may be reasonable to believe that distress will not for ever endure, it should not be forgotten that prosperity does not come by chance ; on investigation it will in every case be found that change of method or of circumstance was the cause of change of state. A change of method assuredly is necessary, for English farming does not pay. English farmers are beaten in open competition in their own markets, and foreigners are selling in England, and by the same middleman, all kinds of agricultural produce at prices but little above what it costs the English farmer to raise them.

Many are the explanations which are given and the remedies which are suggested. Of the latter some are indeed wonderful. When

we hear the confident, unhesitating statements of some of the self-styled "farmers' friends" it is impossible to help the mind recurring to the Malt Tax. Then year after year we were told of the cruel injustice it inflicted on the farmer, and behold! when the desire of the farmer's heart was obtained, when the tax was abolished, it was found that the only person benefited by its existence was the farmer who had clamoured for its repeal.

Perhaps the explanation most frequently given is the appreciation of gold, and the remedy suggested, bi-metallism; as to neither do I express an opinion, beyond saying that it would be well if appreciation were more conclusively proved. For it may be reasonably suggested that if gold had appreciated the appreciation would have affected all trades alike, not agriculture in particular; trade is not generally so good as could be desired, but as compared with agriculture there is great prosperity. Appreciation of gold would have as injuriously affected the foreigner as the Englishman, yet it is foreign competition that is ruining the English farmer.

It is true that there has been a fall in the price of many things, which would be the case if gold had appreciated; but it must be remembered that many other causes may produce this result. Improvements in the means of production or distribution, rendering labour more efficient, the cheapening of carriage, the extension of electrical communication, and the use of more speedy modes of transit, these latter dispensing with large stocks, and making it possible to do the same business with a much smaller capital—all these affect prices, and all have been in operation in recent years.

If we judge the question by the surer test of the price of labour, we find that gold has apparently depreciated. For all labour, from that of the professor to the docker, increased rates are paid. The barrister, physician, merchant, vocalist, actor, author, and mechanic, all receive more than they did 100 or thirty years ago, and not only actually more money, but more money for fewer hours. In most instances it cannot be justly suggested that labour is more efficient, for no one really can think that a modern bricklayer, carpenter, or ploughman, personally, does more work in a day than was done by his predecessor 100 years since; and to turn to unskilled and domestic labour, there is the same result: labourers, cooks, house servants, all receive much higher wages.

Again, with regard to silver, whatever distress it might occasion in India, if the value or the purchasing power of silver there was to fall to the European level, and without interference, sooner or later this would have happened: Indian wheat could not be sold so cheaply in England as it now is, nor would the difference in value act, as now it does, as a bounty to the Indian cotton-manufacturer.

Among suggested remedies may be classed bounty and corn tax,

both respectable by reason of hoary antiquity, but as obsolete and as impossible as a coat of mail. The grip which our manufacturers have of the markets of the world is not so firm that we can afford to throw away by taxation the advantage of cheap food.

Fixity of tenure, a remedy imported from Ireland, is hardly likely to acclimatise here, the conditions are so different, and it certainly is not a remedy now. In Ireland there was fierce competition for land, thus artificially raising its rent and rendering it advantageous to evict tenants. Here at present there is not fierce competition, landlords are only anxious to retain their solvent tenants on almost any terms. The position of a tenant under a lease for twenty-one years granted ten years ago would be ruinous; fixity of tenure is of value to the tenant in good, not bad times.

Yet another proposal is the reduction of rates and tithes; but political economists tell us that, though paid by the hand of the tenant, these are really, where any rent at all is paid, borne by the landlord—a relief, therefore, to the landlord, none to the farmer.

Perhaps the most extraordinary proposal for the benefit of agriculture is the suggestion for the abolition of distress for rent, the landlord's chief security. The more secure the payment, the better terms the landlord can afford to give the tenant. Any way, the abolition cannot be an advantage to the agricultural interest. Distress practically only becomes available when the tenant cannot pay all his creditors in full; it can be no advantage to him that his tradesmen should be favoured at the expense of his landlord.

For many years investment in land has not been a commercial transaction, stocks and shares would have yielded a far larger income; considerations of position, influence, pleasure, and sport, not gain, have been the determining attractions. Now, no one but a rich man can afford to hold land. Some reformers desire much, to extend the number of landed proprietors, yet forget that everything that makes the ownership more onerous and less profitable must decrease the number of men capable and willing to become owners.

These are a sample of the remedies suggested; they all have the defect that they deal with what shall be done for the agricultural classes, not what shall they do for themselves. People cannot be made prosperous by Act of Parliament. There is considerable ground for believing that the only remedy is self-help, and self-help in dealing with the land and carrying on the business of a farmer.

The National Agricultural Union has been formed rather to support agricultural interests than to perfect agricultural methods. No doubt by bringing producer and consumer in closer connection, the former may obtain a larger proportion of the price paid by the latter; but this is only dealing with the fringe of the difficulty. The facts to be faced are that the foreigner produces cheaper; and the recent marvellous improvements in and cheapening of the means.

of communication enable him to sell at a price barely more than it costs the English farmer to grow.

Nor is there any probability of improvement in this respect. Freights may harden a little, but we have no reason to think that the development of means of communication will cease. Year by year larger steamers, with proportionate less coal consumption, are built; as India is more opened up, increased exports of corn may be expected. The frozen meat trade is extending enormously and will permanently lower the price of meat, rendering it less profitable to put land down for pasture. So we must expect that for some years at least, if not always, the prices of all produce will rather rule lower than they have done.

The simple question that has to be answered is—Can English farmers produce cheaper? Relief will come neither from the East nor from the West, but only from the exertions of the classes interested in the land.

Rents can hardly be lowered very much below recent abatements, nor will the general prosperity allow lesser wages to be paid the labourers; we must look to alteration of methods. The question in what way a cheaper production is to be obtained can only be surely answered by experts, but it may be well to refer to a few obvious facts.

Some have suggested small holdings, cultivated by the labour of the farmers and their families, content with the standard of comfort of peasants. For all petty culture requiring personal attention this may be successful; but we can hardly compete in misery with the Russian and Indian farmers, and it seems improbable that either corn or meat can be raised more cheaply on small farms.

The two countries that dominate the position are India with its low standard of comfort, and America with its enormous farms and extensive labour-saving machinery. Against these countries Russia hardly can contend. France and Germany evade competition by placing a duty on the importation of corn. It would rather appear that relief is to be obtained by adopting in some respects the American system.

It is obvious that a man farming 300 acres cannot live on so small a profit per acre as one farming 1200, and one man can efficiently farm a farm of 1200 acres; evidently, with our small farms, the cost of superintendence is excessive.

In increasing the size of our farms we should be doing in agriculture what it has been found necessary to do in every other trade. The tendency from small works to great has been universal—from the village smithy to the giant factories of Krupp or Armstrong, from cottage weaving and spinning to cities of great mills. The distributing agencies, wholesale and retail, are following the same lines.

In agriculture itself, not only in this country but on the Continent and in America, large butter and cheese factories are being multiplied and give increased profit to the farmer.

By having large farms not only would the cost of superintendence be reduced by two-thirds or three-fourths, but the cost of production is otherwise reduced: less capital per acre and less labour are required; one leading dairyman, shepherd, or stockman, instead of three or four, less expense in marketing, cheaper carriage, better terms for larger quantities, and so in every detail. It further renders the use of improved machinery possible. The principal reason why steam-tillage has not become general is the smallness of the farms. With large farms its economy is undoubted; and as with steam-tillage so with other labour-saving machinery.

The change, no doubt, cannot be effected without much individual suffering, but in quantity as nothing compared with that caused by the prolonged existence of bad times, and at least it would largely stop the migration of the rural population to the towns, and in most counties it would give full occupation to all labourers now on the land.

The cost of production would, of course, be lessened if, without additional expense, a larger yield could be obtained; this is hardly probable. English farmers already obtain a larger average yield than their competitors, but at great cost; the object to be attained is not much or little, but cheapness. Still, it is questionable whether full advantage is taken of catch crops and of the mildness of our autumn and winter months. Usually for two months, at least, vegetation grows here when the Continent is frost-bound.

In seeking for a cheap mode of production, the system of Jethro Tull, the inventor of the drill, should not be forgotten. That system should have particular value when so many landlords have land unoccupied.

Tull, having a farm unlet and not desiring to stock it, commenced a system of growing corn and other crops without manure, and continued it for many years successfully. Startling as this at first sight appears, its truth seems indisputable. From time to time his disciples, William Cobbett, Smith of Lois, W. Weedon, and others, have exemplified his method.

To take Smith's practice. Starting after a summer fallow, he drilled wheat in three rows, at twelve inches between each row, then, leaving three feet interval fallow, drilled another three rows, and so alternately wheat and fallow. Thus half the field was bare fallow, half under wheat. No manure was used, but the fallow portions were from time to time horse-hoed. For more than thirteen years wheat was grown thus continuously on the same land. The average crop per acre was thirty-four bushels and one ton and a half of straw. At the end of thirteen years the yield was



increasing, averaging thirty-six bushels, and the land in better condition. The whole expense of cultivation—*i.e.*, excluding rent and taxes—was £3 4s. per acre, and included digging by hand, which he subsequently deemed unnecessary.

Results anything approaching this would give a considerable profit with wheat at 25s. per quarter, and the use of some artificial manures might give the cultivator an increased assurance of success.

The system was said to be equally successful in raising forage crops.

Another point worthy of consideration is whether the tolls levied by insects and weeds—in the aggregate no small proportion of the total crop—cannot be lessened. Straw probably frequently contains the eggs and spores of pests—for example, Hessian fly, smut, &c. By using it for litter, and converting it into manure, we have no reason to believe that the vitality of these eggs or spores is destroyed; again, on every dung-heap we see swarms of insects which deposit therein their eggs. It is more than probable that frequently the farmer, by the common method of manuring his land, sows as carefully the pests that prey on his crops as he does his crops.

Under present circumstances the difficulty with regard to large farms will probably be want of capital. The obligation to provide this may, by the trend of things, ultimately fall on the landlord, and some modification of the metayer system be introduced. With good securities at famine prices and money daily invested in every rotten venture, it should not be impossible to find capital to cultivate our fields if their cultivation were once shown to be profitable.

E. LE RICHE.

## THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1894.

Now that the measure for the extension of local self-government of the present Liberal Administration has received the Royal assent after having been more or less successfully piloted through the opposition shoals of professed friendship in the Lower House and of avowed hostility in the Upper, a short and intelligible statement of the effect of the Act and the changes in rural life which it will bring about may be of service to the general reader. In order that the greatest of these changes may be better understood, and more clearly appreciated, I propose to pass in brief review the origin and history of the parish which is once more to form the unit of our political institutions.

It is now generally admitted that the primitive village community flourished in these islands for centuries before the Roman invasion.

We are told by Coke "that this realme was divided into shires and counties and those shires into cities, burroughs and towns by the Britains."<sup>1</sup>

\* Without going into the question whether the tribes which occupied the hill forts which are scattered throughout the country were pre-historic or Celtic there is sufficient evidence to show that the inhabitants of the country at the time of the Roman conquest lived in self-governing tribal communities. Upon examination these groups exhibit all the marks of the primitive village community.

It is now the better opinion that the effect of the Saxon immigration was not to exterminate the native Celt, but merely, in the majority of cases, to impose a layer of Teutonic custom upon the Celtic communities, just as the Celt had imposed his civilisation upon the prehistoric or pre-Aryan village community.

Thus the Celtic village became the Anglo-Saxon town, with its *tungemot*, or town meeting, which elected its chief officials—the "reeve," the "beadle," and the "tithing man," or petty constable.

But with the Norman Conquest a change once more comes over the scene. The old English township falls under the sway of the nearest neighbouring baron and its officials become responsible to the lord and the town itself is known as the *manor*. Although the town retained its *court leets*, meetings held for the election of the

<sup>1</sup> Co. Litt. 168a.

executive officials and for the trial of petty offences, and although it retained its *court baron*, or town meeting, held for general purposes, its old powers of local self-government gradually fell into disuse.

But this loss was partly made good by the creation of the parish. Upon the introduction of Christianity small country churches were erected and areas defined for each within which the priest had the administration of ecclesiastical affairs. These areas usually coincide with those of the old townships, sometimes it is true two or more townships are included in one parish, and since each town had its sacred place or building dedicated to its local deity the Roman policy was followed of interfering as little as possible with the heathen practices; and so the old shrine was converted into the church and the old township into the parish.

Throughout the Middle Ages then a silent but radical change had been taking place. The daily and weekly services, the celebration of feasts and other ecclesiastical functions had kept alive and fostered the feeling of union and brotherhood amongst the inhabitants of the parish. With the dissolution of the monasteries it was necessary to transfer the humanitarian duties of the Church (the relief of the poor especially, which was very inadequately performed) elsewhere. In the parish the Tudor sovereigns found a ready instrument.

The Tudor Poor Law legislation culminated in the famous New Poor Law Act of 43 Elizabeth,<sup>1</sup> which imposed upon the overseers of the parish the duty of collecting the rates and the administration of poor relief. Whether it was the intention of the Legislature to allow the parishioners to participate in this administration may possibly be open to doubt, but that the parishioners did so participate is beyond dispute. In open vestry upon the first Sunday in the month, or whenever circumstances required, in the church, after the afternoon service, the ratepayers met the overseers and churchwardens, to consider "the good course to be taken" in the "interest of the parish for the relief of the poor."

And, in addition to this duty, the ratepayers acquired in course of time the entire management of the highways, the police, sanitation, and, in fact, of all parochial affairs. Parochial administration thus conducted was for 150 years from the Statute of Elizabeth incontestably a complete success. So far as the Poor Law system was concerned, Professor Fawcett asserted that "it appeared likely that pauperism would soon be exterminated, owing to the remarkable influence exercised by the Elizabethan Poor Law." The reason for this success is obvious. In a parish every one knows every one else, and, since all are anxious to keep down the rates, indiscrimi-

<sup>1</sup> Act for the Relief of the Poor, 43 Eliz. c. 2.

nate charity was discouraged. A reference to the Vestry minutes of the last century will show how really economical the management was.

The first serious blow at local self-government was struck by 9 George I. c. 7, the effect of which was to weaken the authority of the overseers. From 1782 to 1810 further Acts were passed which entirely deprived the parish of its administration of the Poor Law, and it is in this very period that the system was created which caused pauperism to assume, according to Professor Fawcett, "such alarming proportions about the year 1832 as almost to threaten the country with national bankruptcy and permanent ruin."

Up to about 1782 then right away from primitive times every community had had more or less the direct control of its own affairs. Each had enjoyed a more or less complete measure of local self-government. But, with the rise of the landed interest, all this is changed. The control of local affairs passed gradually into the hands of the justices, self-elected representatives, who were responsible only to a highly centralised government, which was placed in power by their own class, and made subservient to their interests, and to their interests alone. The management of the highways passed from the parish, in the large majority of instances, to the justices resident in the district, and that of sanitation to a Board of Guardians which had jurisdiction over an area, on an average, forty times the size of a parish. This Board consisted, and still consists, of elected representatives and the justices who reside within the "union." But, owing to the distance of the place of meeting and the time at which it is held, it has been found impossible to obtain the best men as candidates for the post of representative members. And, owing to the unwieldy area, it has been impossible for the justices, however well intentioned they may be, to carry out their duties. In fact, there can be no doubt that these Boards, in respect of both the Poor Law and sanitary administration, have been a complete failure. And even if, as District Councils, they become thoroughly representative, these objections will still apply. The average union is composed of about forty parishes, and its jurisdiction extends over 100 square miles. If all attend a Board, this number would necessarily be impatient of petty local details; and, even if it had the will, would not have the time to consider them. But petty local details are frequently of vital importance to a parish, and, without a complete knowledge of such details, it is impossible for any administration to be sound or just.

Now, under the old parochial system described above, where parishes were large, it was the frequent practice of the ratepayers to divide such parishes into smaller ones for highway, Poor Law, and other secular purposes.

Acting in their sanitary capacity, these Boards, says Mr. Henry

C. Stephens, M.P., have "caused great loss and injury to localities, especially in matters connected with sewage disposal. In many cases the inhabitants have been forced, against their better knowledge of local facts and conditions, to carry out large and useless works and to incur an oppressive debt for them."<sup>1</sup>

The Board of Guardians, in districts where School Boards do not exist, also form the School Attendance Committee. As a School Attendance Committee, for the reasons given above—viz., the great size of rural unions, &c.—the Guardians have proved themselves to be totally incompetent.

As a proof of the present chaotic condition of local government may be mentioned the fact that in one rural parish there may exist at one and the same time as many as twelve different bodies exercising different authority over separate parts of the parish. The consequence of this is that there also exist an almost equally corresponding number of rating authorities.

The evil of this must be obvious. The interests of the ratepayers are divided by the conflicting claims of the different authorities. It might be supposed that the various authorities would compete with one another in keeping the rates down; but, as a rule, if one authority spends heavily with impunity, the others are encouraged to follow suit. And, further, such a multiplication of rating authorities means increased cost in collection, and thereby serious loss of public money.

What, then, is the present position. In England and Wales there already exist some 1100 Boroughs, Improvement Act Districts, and Local Boards, called Urban Sanitary Districts. Of Rural Sanitary Authorities there are some 574. The amount of the rateable value per head of the population of the former class for the year 1891 was £4 0s. 9d., and of the latter, £6 10s. The population, it is true, of the urban districts is double that of the rural districts, but then the cost of its requirements is also much greater, and this seems to point to the conclusion that the local self-government which already exists in the urban is much cheaper than the local government imposed from above in the rural districts.

For outside these urban districts local self-government cannot be said to exist. There is the vestry, certainly, but its powers are strictly limited, and it is usually held at such time and place that no one but the parson, churchwardens, and one or two large farmers can attend, and even if a resolution is carried, a poll may be demanded, which is taken under the Sturges-Bourne Act of 1818, by which cumulative voting is allowed, and consequently the decision rests with the few landowners and large tenant-farmers.

The principle of the new Act is broad and simple. Its object is

<sup>1</sup> *Parochial Self-Government*, p. 94.

to ensure to the people of a parish a direct voice in the management of their own affairs. It is an attempt to create in rural districts what President Lincoln called "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

In the words of the Act then "There shall be a parish meeting for every rural parish and there shall be a parish council for every rural parish which has a population of 300 or upwards." Where the population is 100 but under 300 then, if the parish meeting so decide, the County Council is to establish a council for that parish; and where the population is under 100 the County Council, with the consent of the parish meeting, may establish a council for that parish or may group it with some neighbouring parish or parishes. The parish meeting is to consist of parochial electors, who are the persons registered in such portion of the local government or parliamentary register as relates to the parish.

"The Act in this respect," say Messrs. Akerman and Ford,<sup>1</sup> "has removed some anomalies only to create others." A married woman, who if single would have been entitled to be placed on the local government register, may now claim under section 44 to be put on a separate list for the "purposes of this Act." The effect of which is that a married woman will be excluded from voting in the election of town or county councillors. The most important duty of the parish meeting is the election of the parish council. This election is decided by a show of hands, unless a poll is demanded, in which case such poll must be taken by ballot. Where a parish council exists its chairman is entitled to take the chair at a parish meeting, but if he is absent or unwilling to do so the meeting elects its own chairman. A parish meeting must be held once at least in every year, on or about March 25, and must not be held before six o'clock in the evening.

When the parish council has not any building in which a public meeting can conveniently be held, the parish meeting may use for this purpose any suitable room in a school supported by public funds, under certain specified conditions. This is only following the precedent set by the Allotments Acts 1887-1890 and the Local Government Act 1888, and yet this reasonable provision met with the strenuous opposition of the Lords spiritual and temporal. Seven days' notice, in the usual manner of a parish meeting, must be given, unless it is proposed to adopt any of the Adoptive Acts, in which case fourteen days is necessary.

The overseers are required to call the first meeting, but subsequent meetings may be convened by the chairman, by any two councillors, or by any six electors.

The parish meeting may discuss all affairs relating to the parish

<sup>1</sup> Akerman and Ford, *Parish Councils*, p. 22-23. Routledge & Son. 1894.

and pass such resolutions as it thinks fit. In addition to electing the parish council the consent of the parish must be obtained before the council can incur any expenditure involving a rate exceeding threepence in the pound, or which will necessitate a loan. The power of adopting any of the Adoptive Acts is given exclusively to the parish meeting. These Acts are the Lighting and Watching Act 1833, which provides for the lighting of streets and for protection against fire by supplying fire-engines and other appliances; the Baths and Washhouses Acts 1846-1882, under which parish lands may be appropriated or lands purchased or leased for the purpose of erecting baths and washhouses, and of providing swimming-baths and open bathing-places; the Burial Acts 1852-1885, which provide for the acquisition of burial-grounds, mortuaries, and cemeteries; the Public Improvements Act 1860, by which a parish may acquire or accept land for making or improving public walks and playgrounds; the application of this Act is, however, restricted to places of over 500 inhabitants; and the Public Libraries Act 1892, under which not only public libraries but museums, science and art schools, and art-galleries may be formed. This Act cannot be adopted except upon a poll being taken. Where, hitherto, under these Acts the consent or approval of the vestry has been required, the parish meeting is substituted for that body. Before the parish council part with any land or buildings, stop or divert any public right of way, or discontinue any highway, or let, sell, or exchange any workhouse, or appropriate parish land for a school site under the School Sites Acts, or for an institution for the promotion of literature, science, and the fine arts under the Literary and Scientific Institution Act 1854, it must obtain the consent of the parish meeting, and any application for the formation or dissolution of a school board may be made by such meeting. It will thus be seen that the powers conferred upon a parish meeting are very considerable indeed.

The constitution, powers and duties of a parish council may now be described. The number of councillors is to be fixed by the county council, not being less than five nor more than fifteen. Any parochial elector or other person who has during the whole of the twelve months preceding the election resided in the parish or within three miles thereof may be a councillor, and a woman, married or single, who possesses either of the above qualifications is also eligible for the office. If at the parish meeting for the election of councillors a poll is demanded, such poll will be taken by ballot, subject to the Ballot Act 1872, the Municipal Elections Act 1884, and Municipal Corporation Act 1882, under rules framed by the Local Government Board, and must always be open between the hours of six and eight in the evening. The term of office for a councillor is one year, commencing from April 15, except in the case of the

first elections for councillors elected next November who will remain in office until April 1896. Any person qualified for the office of a councillor, whether a member of the council or not, may be elected chairman; but a vice-chairman must be a councillor. The officers of the council are a clerk and a treasurer. A councillor appointed to either of these posts must not receive any remuneration, and in any event the latter official cannot be paid for his services. If a councillor is not appointed clerk, the assistant overseer or one of the assistant overseers will hold the office, and where there is no assistant overseer, the collector of poor rates or some other fit person is directed to be appointed.

Four meetings at least, including the annual meeting, must be held during the year by the council, and such meetings must be open to the public unless the council otherwise directs.

If the council is unable to provide a suitable room for its meetings it may enforce the powers given to the parish meetings described above. Every question before the council must be decided by the votes of the majority present. One-third of the council is the quorum, which must in no case consist of less than three.

The powers of a parish council are very wide, and in some respects present an entirely new departure in the law of local government. With the exceptions to be mentioned subsequently, practically the whole government of the parish rests with the council. The council assumes all the powers formerly exercised by the overseers and churchwardens, except such as relate to strictly ecclesiastical matters. These powers enable the council to protect the interests of the parish in matters relating to the assessment of property and to make provision for parish books, a vestry room or parochial office, parish chest, fire engine or escape, and for the holding and management of non-ecclesiastical parish property, village greens and allotments, recreation-grounds and gardens.

A most important provision is that which enables the council to complain to the justices and represent to them that the Housing of the Working Classes Act 1890 should be put into force in order that unhealthy dwellings may be demolished and insanitary areas closed. For it is a matter of common knowledge that in rural parishes this Act, owing to the neglect of officials and to the odium which would attach to any inhabitants who under the Act may make complaints, is practically a dead letter.

Under the additional powers the council may provide buildings for public purposes and acquire land for such buildings, public walks and recreation-grounds, and lay out and maintain such grounds, village greens and open spaces as are under their control; may utilise any existing water supply and deal with offensive pools, foul ditches and accumulations of refuse; may under Section 9 of the Commons Act 1876 call upon the Board of Agriculture to issue



directions by which application may be made for provisional orders for the regulation or enclosure of commons; may acquire by agreement any right of way which would be beneficial to the parish; may hold and accept any gifts of property real or personal and may execute any works and contribute towards the expenses in connection with any of the above powers.

Where any of the "Adoptive Acts" have been sanctioned by the parish meeting it is the council that puts these Acts into execution.

The provisions relating to the compulsory acquisition of land and to allotments and charities are so important as to deserve separate treatment.

In the purchase of land by agreement the former procedure under the Land Clauses Consolidation Acts is retained. But where land for the various purposes of the Act cannot be thus obtained on reasonable terms, the council may apply to the County Council, which may grant an order to enforce the compulsory purchase provisions of the Act. This order requires confirmation by the Local Government Board, but no further confirmation by Parliament is needed. If the County Council refuse the order, appeal may be made to the Local Government Board, which after holding a public inquiry may make such order as it thinks fit.

Compensation for disturbance is abolished, although compensation for severance will still be allowed. All questions of disputed compensation will be decided by a single arbitrator, and counsel or expert witnesses will only be heard in certain cases prescribed by the Local Government Board.

These provisions are equally applicable to the compulsory purchase and hiring of land for allotments. Hitherto, under the Allotments Acts 1887-1890, the procedure for compulsory purchase has been so complicated and dilatory, and the consequent legal expenses so serious, that there has only been one case of compulsory purchase, and that so disastrous to all concerned that no further attempt to put these provisions of the Acts into force has been made.

Under the Act, then, the parish council may hire land for allotment purposes by compulsory hiring for not less than fourteen years, nor more than thirty-five. A single arbitrator, appointed under section 3 of the Allotments Act 1887, determines the times and conditions of hiring, the amount of compensation for severance (if any), the compensation to any tenant upon the determination of his tenancy, &c., and in fixing the rent is not to make any additional compensation in respect of the compulsory hiring.

In addition to the special protection extended to the tenant-farmer, the rights of the landowner are fully safeguarded.

The Charity provisions, as they originally stood in the Bill,

suffered severely at the hands of Lord Salisbury and the Bishops, and it is a matter for regret that the Government did not see their way to stand firm on this question. The result is that the parishioners have lost that full control of their own charities to which they are rightly entitled. The provision enabling trustees of a non-ecclesiastical charity to transfer the charity is merely permissive, and consequently the more the trust is being mismanaged the less likely are the trustees to transfer the property. The trustees are, however, compelled to present annually the accounts of all parochial non-ecclesiastical charities to the council. Under the old law the trustees of all parochial charities were bound to send a copy of such accounts to the Charity Commissioners. "As a matter of fact," says Mr. Theodore Dodd, "this law is disobeyed by thousands of the trustees of parochial charities."<sup>1</sup>

Where the overseers are trustees of a parochial charity, the council may substitute for them a like number of councillors or other persons; but since the council will in future appoint the overseers, it will not always be easy to find persons qualified for the dual duties of trustee and overseer. And where the churchwardens are *ex officio* trustees of a non-ecclesiastical charity the council may in like manner substitute councillors or other persons.

The most important provision is where the governing body of a non-ecclesiastical charity does not include any representative member. In this case the council may appoint such additional trustees as the Charity Commissioners may prescribe, and in the case of a sole trustee, the number of trustees may be increased to three, one to be nominated by such sole trustee and one by the council or parish meeting, and where the vestry is entitled to appoint trustees, this power is transferred to the council. The draft of any scheme relating to a non-ecclesiastical charity must be first submitted to the council, which may oppose or support, as it thinks fit.

Trustees appointed by the council remain in office for four years, one-half retiring every two years.

Finally, the expenditure of a parish council remains to be noticed. Not more than 3d. in the pound may be levied in any one year, nor can any loan be incurred without the consent of the parish meeting, and the latter must also receive the approval of the County Council, and the total expenditure must not exceed 6d. in the pound. The expenses incurred under any of the Adoptive Acts are not, however, included in this limitation. The rates will be levied by the overseers, together with the poor rates; but the demand note must show the separate amount required for the expenses of the council.

It may be mentioned that where a parish has not a parish council

<sup>1</sup> J. T. Dodd, *The Parish Councils Act Explained*, p. 60.

or where it is "grouped" with another parish or parishes, it retains its own separate parish meeting, which must be held twice a year at least. Its powers are nearly similar to those of the parish meeting described above.

I pass now to the consideration of the district council. This body is the connecting link between the parish and the county councils, and theoretically completes the symmetry of the scheme of local government. I say theoretically, because I am inclined to think that this link is entirely unnecessary.

These district councils will be of two kinds, urban and rural.

The former class, as I have mentioned, consists of Boroughs, Improvement Act Districts, and Local Government Districts, called Urban Sanitary Authorities. These are now to be called "district councils."

The governing authority in a borough is the Town Council, in an Improvement Act district the Improvement Commissioners, and in a Local Government district the Local Board.

At present, the guardians for the poor also perform the duties of a rural sanitary authority. These bodies will now be united under the name of "district councils." To these rural "district councils" there will be transferred the poor law administration, the powers and duties of a rural sanitary authority, the powers and duties of surveyors of highways, and such other urban powers as the Local Government Board upon the application, not only of the council, but also of the parish or county council, may grant.

In both urban districts, which are not boroughs, and in rural districts, sweeping changes in the law are made by the Act. *Ex officio* and nominated guardians are no longer to exist. The present qualifications for members are abolished, and every person of either sex, being a parochial elector, or having resided within the district for twelve months previous to the election, may be elected a district councillor; the electorate is to consist of the parochial electors; plural and proxy voting is abolished, and each elector will only be able to give one vote to each of any number of candidates not exceeding the number to be elected. The poll will probably be by ballot. Councillors will hold office for three years, one-third retiring each year.

The chairman, if a male, will be a justice of the peace for the county.

In the case of rural districts, if the number of elective councillors is less than five, the Local Government Board may nominate sufficient persons to make up that number. Each parish will elect the same number of councillors as it now elects guardians.

It will readily be acknowledged how valuable these provisions as to the constitution and electorate of district councils are. Boroughs are excepted, because they already enjoy the privileges here granted.

But valuable as these provisions undoubtedly are I do not hail the creation of rural district councils with any great enthusiasm. For the reasons I have indicated in my account of the parish I believe the poor law administration would have been better left in the hands of the parish council. For sanitary purposes, I believe, a district council entirely unnecessary. In a large union with which I am acquainted most excellent by-laws, framed by the Local Government Board, have been promulgated by the rural sanitary authority. But it is within my personal knowledge that there is scarcely a sanitary by-law, or a building by-law, which is not every day broken with absolute impunity, and the insanitary condition of the dwellings of the poor is a scandal to the county. And this state of things is well known to the authority, for on one occasion, at least, it passed a resolution ordering the source of a pollution to be stopped, and at the next meeting, owing to representations made on behalf of the offender, actually rescinded the resolution, leaving the pollution existing to this day.

And even were a district council popularly elected as it will be, and anxious to do its duty, I believe the largeness of the area will prevent efficient administration. And I believe such councils to be unnecessary for the further reasons that where large sewerage works are required there a Local Board ought to be established, and where such works are not required a parish council, subject to the supervision of the county council, would carry out sanitary requirements much more efficiently and economically than a district council far removed from the sphere of action. The same reasons also apply, in my opinion, to the highways. The county council might take over all the principal highways in addition to the main roads, leaving the less used roads to the care of parish councils.

Although recognising to the full the wide and far-reaching character of this Act, the effects of which will be to revolutionise rural life, to give independence and a sense of citizenship to that most abject of persons, the agricultural labourer, and possibly to check that disastrous depopulation of country districts which has not yet ceased to exist, yet I am bound to admit, to our shame though it be, that even now we are far behind the majority of our self-governing colonies in local self-government. Neither in breadth of principle, in thoroughness of detail, nor in draftsmanship, will the Local Government Act 1894 compare, for instance, for a moment with that masterpiece of legislation, the Municipal Act of Ontario 1892.<sup>1</sup> And when we remember that this legislation was commenced in 1841, we may well pause before congratulating ourselves overmuch upon our superior legislative abilities.

HUGH H. L. BELLOT.

<sup>1</sup> The provisions of this Act relating to village councils have been already described. Vide *Local Self-Government: The Canadian Village*, WESTMINSTER REVIEW, September 1892.

## THE WOMEN OF IMPERIAL ROME AND ENGLISH WOMEN OF TO-DAY.

WRITERS have often drawn a parallel between the civilisation of the British Empire of to-day and that of Imperial Rome under the Cæsars—the latter a most fascinating period, appealing to the imagination by the strength, brilliancy and genius for government displayed, but wanting in all that makes a nation lastingly great, morality, or sense of right and wrong.

Just as Rome rose by small degrees, overtopped all other nations, and played a leading part in the affairs of three continents, then through internal weakness, engendered by gross vices and degrading self-indulgence, was unable to control the huge empire committed to its charge, and fell a prey to hordes of Teuton barbarians, so pessimists being struck by many points of similarity in the construction of the two greatest Empires of the ancient and modern world, search diligently for similar signs of decadence amongst ourselves as in the Romans. They say we are no better in many respects than they, that society is just as selfish, and in many ways as corrupt, and is slowly bringing on itself the ultimate fate of old Rome—annihilation—the only difference being that Rome was destroyed by barbarians from without, England will be destroyed by its barbarians from within.

Whether this will be so time only can prove, but while deploring the evil in our midst we should not be blind to the noble efforts of high-minded men and women around us in the cause of humanity, and when we compare them only cursorily with the men and women of the most masterful and powerful of all ancient empires we can but take comfort from the thought that whatever our national faults may be, personal enjoyment with a morbid craving for its indulgence and extreme licentiousness, the two leading motives of the lives of Roman women two thousand years ago, are not dominant characteristics of women of the superior classes in England to-day, superior not as regards rank and wealth, but in tone, mind, education in its best sense, and, last but not least, in physique.

In a thoroughly vicious and immoral State it is acknowledged that its women are always more corrupt than the men.

That such was the case in Rome, historians and satirists have clearly shown.

But in the British Empire of to-day what do we see ?

The greatest mental and moral uprising of English women the Empire has ever experienced. A complete social and bloodless revolution has been quietly effected in the condition of women, of probably as lasting and powerful consequences as were those to humanity of the great French Revolution a century ago, when, as Madame de Staël (one of the most "modern women" the world has ever seen) declared, "Twenty-four millions of people rose up and withdrew the privileges of two hundred thousand."

However complete the parallel may be in certain respects between the two Empires, in the most vital point of all, the morality, integrity and superiority of its women, the modern Empire is infinitely in advance of the ancient one.

To consider first the women of Rome.

During the period of the rich and stately Empire, amongst the upper classes, divorce, one of the most significant indications of a vicious and corrupt society, was terribly frequent. Whether the wife were guilty of great vices, or a want of pleasing, or from a desire on the man's part to obtain a richer or younger partner, a woman could be divorced by the husband at will.

In the old dignified days of the early Republic, when even a Senator had been punished for kissing his wife in the presence of his daughter, divorce was unknown. The virtues of a Roman matron, her chastity, discretion and goodness were acknowledged by all. Though subject absolutely to the will of her husband, and with no position in the State apart from him, she was not regarded habitually as a slave by any means, but was beloved and respected by her family and had complete control over all domestic arrangements. She received very little education, accomplishments being regarded as the perquisite of the courtesan. It was sufficient for the wife to ply the distaff and to look after the well-being of her household.

All this was very well during the first part of the Republic, when artificial wants were few and manners simple, but under the gorgeous Empire, the same small modicum of education, in most cases, was deemed sufficient for Roman women, with the result that the men could not fail to contrast their own uneducated wives with the accomplished women of conquered Greece and Asia, who became their slaves and mistresses.

The consequence was that, according to Juvenal, the Roman matrons rushed into all sorts of excesses in endeavouring to outrival the influence of those brilliant courtesans, but did not attain to the higher mental culture which formed the basis of their rivals' attractions.

After the conquest of the great nations of the East, when enormous wealth, and all the luxuries of the time, including slavery, were lavishly introduced into Rome, religion, and its concomitant,

patriotism, or duty to the State, ceased to have any hold on the minds of the people, and according to satirists and historians, the grossest vices and excesses were practised unchecked. The women naturally succumbed to the temptations spread out before them. Having little stable interest in their temporary husbands, who could divorce them, or from whom they could be divorced at pleasure, with no intellectual or public interest, and few duties, with an army of slaves at their beck and call, it is not to be wondered at that pleasure and amusement became the one sole aim and end of existence. Even the most profligate men had work to perform in the early part of the day. The business of the State was in their hands, and they had their own affairs and interests to promote; but the women of the rich upper class had none. It must be remembered there was no middle class in Rome, and that the poor had few rights except to bread and pleasure, and the sale of their suffrages.

Slavery, the most terrible of all sources of immorality, flourished to such an unprecedented extent that we are told slaves exceeded the legitimate population, and that upwards of 5000 of these hapless creatures were sold in the slave-market at Delos in one day. Thousands were employed in the country on the estates of their masters, but huge armies of them filled the houses of the rich in the cities, many of them having been of high rank in their own countries, and of the greatest beauty, culture and intelligence, although often steeped in all the blackest and most degrading vices of the East.

But whatever their attractions, whether good or evil, their masters and mistresses had absolute control over them.

Of the cruelty of the Roman lady towards her unhappy slaves, who were tortured for the smallest breaches of discipline, or from caprice, or bad temper, we read in Juvenal:

“There are who hire a beadle by the year,  
To lash their servants round, who pleased to hear  
The eternal thong, bid him lay on, while they  
At perfect ease, the silk man’s stores survey,  
Chat with their female gossips, or replace  
The cracked enamel on their treacherous face.

“The wretched Psecas, for the whip prepared,  
With locks dishevelled, and with shoulders bared,  
Attempts her hair; fire flashes from her eyes,  
And ‘. . . Why this curl so high?’ she cries;  
Instant the lash without remorse is plied,  
And the blood stains her bosom, back, and side.

*Sat. vi. 480.*

There was no moral consciousness as in our times to enforce duties to dependents.

The Stoic maxims of the “brotherhood of mankind” led to small practical results during the first century, although they paved the way for the doctrines of Christianity, and after centuries of blood and anguish for the final abolition of slavery.

Charity, that fruitful source of good works among our women to-day, played a very unimportant part in the lives of the Romans. Two hundred thousand people were daily fed by the state in Rome alone, not from love of humanity, but as a huge political sop to keep them quiet. Any one could be fed for the asking, and also amused. Horse-racing, passionately loved by all classes, the exciting and sanguinary fights of men and beasts in the amphitheatres, the utmost refinement of luxury in the magnificent baths, fitted up with silver taps and marble basins, the walls inlaid with mosaics and precious marbles; with their accompanying gymnasia, ball courts, lecture-rooms, and libraries, were open to every citizen either free, or for the smallest coin of the realm. Hence the private duty of the citizen to the poor as understood by us did not exist.

The numerous charities of to-day, such as hospitals, asylums, and institutions, were unknown, so that a Florence Nightingale, or Sister Dora and their many prototypes were impossibilities.

Feeling and sympathy were always rather lukewarm with the Romans. Their training had been stern in the early days of the Republic, when its position was precarious. Their religion and patriotism then were bound up in each other, "Jove and the City of Rome" being a creed that appealed to all. The State stood paramount above all private considerations and feelings. Hence a certain hardness or callousness of temperament originated in their very virtues. When the Empire was so vastly extended, the exclusive love for the State became weakened, as sacrifices were no longer necessary for the maintenance of its integrity; but the hardness of character remained.

The religions of the East flooded Rome with new ideas and modes of thought, which were certainly no improvement on the old ones. The excessive licentiousness of these foreign people acquired by the Romans sapped their sense of duty, the strongest and most admirable of their characteristics.

Their faith and their belief in immortality died out. Superstition alone remained. Here again the women surpassed the men. Fortune-tellers, astrologers, quacks of all kinds flourished enormously during the period of the Cæsars. They were consulted by the women on every occasion, small or great, and were often employed, not only to predict the future, but as philtre-mongers and professional poisoners, to remove a rival or a rich husband from whose death much might be expected.

"Abroad, at home, the Belides you meet,  
And Clytemnestras swarm in every street;  
But there the difference lies, these bungling wives  
With a blunt axe hewed out their husbands' lives,  
While now the deed is done with dextrous art,  
And a drugged bowl performs the axe's part."

Juvenal, *Sat.* vi. 655.



With religion ceasing to have any influence, with little intellectual culture within their means, and works of charity closed to them, the rich women of Rome seized with avidity upon the only resource left to them, namely, the most exciting amusements and pleasures the world has ever known.

Although we are horrified and disgusted by the ghastly scenes which were enacted sometimes for many days together in the amphitheatre, we can well understand the terrible fascination of such spectacles. Magnificent in the extreme, with every product of civilisation brought to increase the grandeur of the sight, splendid armour, costly clothing of varied forms and colours, beautiful horses and trappings, wild beasts from the Soudan or Asia, people of every nation and clime under heaven, perfectly trained bands of fighting gladiators, the nobility and even emperors themselves condescending to take part in the grand displays, all these formed a panorama, the brilliancy of which has never been equalled, and can never be surpassed.

Beautiful women of high birth often degraded themselves and their families by their intrigues with successful gladiators, who were the heroes of the hour. These men, though often very rich, and adored by the multitude, were of low social status, corresponding somewhat to that of our jockeys. We read :

“Hippia, who shared a rich patrician's bed,  
To Egypt with a gladiator fled.  
Without one pang the profligate resigned  
Her husband, sister, sire ; gave to the wind  
Her children's tears. Yea, tore herself away.  
(To strike you more) from 'Paris' and the play.”

Juvenal, *Sat.* vi. 82.

But above all this degradation and wickedness, one fact stands forth more prominently than any. Such was the lust for amusement and excitement, that women of noble birth even descended into the arena, and fought with the other combatants. We read “The bold fair tilts at the Tuscan boar, with bosom bare.”

Tacitus mentions the fact in his history of Nero's reign, and also Suetonius with reference to some of the shows in Domitian's reign. At last, such indecent exhibitions were forbidden by law, but not until the reign of Septimus Severus.

The theatres too, always an index of the morality of the times, were notorious for their gross indecency and profligacy. Actors, who ranked with slaves and provincials, shared the amatory favours of the most illustrious women of the day, who also took part sometimes in the theatrical and musical performances. There was always a feeling of disgust latent in the minds of the Romans for

<sup>1</sup> Paris was a favourite actor of the day.

such exhibitions and breaches of caste. The playing and singing of Nero in public did as much as his enormities to promote his downfall and destruction.

In Juvenal's time the women were entirely independent; they could do as they pleased, go where they liked without comment, and were mistresses of their own fortunes and estates. After the great civil wars, the religious rite of marriage was discontinued, and a new custom gradually arose, by which a woman on her marriage did not cease to belong to her father's house, to which she could return if she liked by divorcing her husband.

With such a loose state of morals, and divorce so easy, it seems to us it was scarcely worth while to marry at all. The Romans themselves were of this opinion. So many were averse from marriage, and so objected to the burden of children, that the old Roman stock was threatened with extinction, and was eventually superseded by that of freed-men and provincials.

"Wilt thou tamely drag the galling chain,  
While hemp is to be bought, while knives remain?"

asks Juvenal of Ursidious, on the eve of the intended marriage of the latter.

A rich Roman who married was regarded as a fool. Unmarried, and without heirs, he was courted by crowds of sycophants and legacy-hunters, who swarmed around him, on the look-out for gifts during his life, or for legacies at his death. He was an object of attention to and adulation from all.

Each Roman vied with his neighbours in his display of wealth. Ostentation became a passion. A feast was not considered a success unless the cost of it was a matter for discussion by "All Rome." Palaces and villas were built in the most splendid and costly style. Beautiful marbles, gold and silver and precious stones, were lavishly used, in order to show the wealth of their owner. Nero had several rooms in his Golden House studded all over with pearls. Goethe might well term the Romans the greatest parvenus in history.

The women vied with the men in reckless expenditure. Fabulous sums were spent on plate, jewels, dress, slaves, and retinue. The wealth easily obtained by their lords was poured into the laps of the women, and thrown away by them without enjoyment and without sense. The passion for spending like other passions grows by what it feeds on, until it becomes a morbid craving never satisfied or appeased.

That there were noble exceptions to the general depravity and extravagance of the period we know, but the shining light of the exceptions only seems to reveal the darkness of the general rule.

Merivale says, "The Romans long turned with fond regret to the memory of Julia," daughter of the great Julius Cæsar and wife of Pompeius, whose reciprocal devotion stood out in that dark age, and "deserved to be commemorated with unusual distinctions;" that Julia, if she had not been so untimely cut off in the height of her beauty and talents, "might have mediated between the father and son-in-law, and assuaged the personal rivalry which overthrew their (the Romans') national liberties."

The courage of Porcia, the wife of Brutus, one of Cæsar's murderers, and the devotion of the two Arrias, mother and daughter, to their husbands, are extolled by historians.

The beautiful Octavia, the wife of the great general, but weak and infamous Antonius, was a woman of rare personal integrity and moral worth. When Antonius for the second time, and this irremediably, fell under the sway of the incomparable fascinations of Cleopatra, Octavia not only maintained the dignity of her husband's house, and took care of her own and Antonius's children, but also those he had had by Fulvia, one of his previous wives.

Of this Fulvia, Plutarch slyly remarks, "It was her ambition to govern those that governed, and to command the leaders of armies. It was to Fulvia that Cleopatra was obliged, for teaching Antonius due submission to female authority. He had gone through such a course of discipline as made him perfectly tractable when he came into her hands."

Of the history of the women of the lower orders we know nothing. We may conclude that they led the ordinary, uninteresting, sordid lives passed by most poor women in all countries, tempered by the warmth of a genial climate, and indulging in the spectacle of the public games; their chief occupation being that of bringing children into the world to follow the Roman Eagles, or to rot at home in coarse idleness and indigency.

When the Empire was firmly established, the influence of women in the State, up to that period quite unheard of, became a power, and in almost every case was exercised for evil.

Livia, mother of Tiberius Cæsar, and wife of Augustus Cæsar, who had compelled her first husband to divorce her B.C. 38, so that he, Augustus, might marry her himself, was an unscrupulous woman, although chaste and dignified in conduct. She obtained complete ascendancy over the mind and affections of Augustus, and used her influence to remove all obstacles to her crowning ambition—the succession to the throne of her son, the morose and cruel Tiberius. She died at the age of eighty-six, having accomplished every object in life upon which she had set her heart.

Julia, the only child of Augustus, eventually married the soured Tiberius, he being her third husband. She was fondly loved by

her father, who delighted in her wit and beauty, and who seems to have been the only person ignorant of her extreme licentiousness. When this was at last revealed to him, he was so deeply wounded in his love as a father and his pride as emperor that he never forgave her, or saw her again. She was banished to a dreary island, where she died miserably B.C. 2. Her daughter Julia inherited her mother's licentious character, and met with an almost identical fate.

But of all the names of Roman matrons handed down to posterity as notorious under the Empire for profligacy and cruelty, none stand out so prominently as those of the two Empresses Messalina and Agrippina, whose hideous rivalries, Merivale says, "ended in the violent overthrow of the former and rise of the other, but equally in the eternal infamy of both."

Wife of the weak Emperor Claudius, who was ruled by women and freedmen, Messalina, although indulging openly in scandalous intrigues with men of all classes, nobles, freedmen, and slaves, was able to convince her husband almost to the last of her love and devotion to himself. Her fascinations made her many friends, in spite of her murderous cruelties and treacheries. Her public marriage with the noble Silius, during the lifetime of Claudius, was the final act which drew upon her his vengeance, and she was put to death A.D. 48.

Her death cleared the way for Agrippina (mother of Nero), who then married her uncle Claudius, this being the first occasion of the marriage of uncle and niece in Rome. Agrippina soon equalled, if not surpassed, her late rival in presumption and wickedness. Her assumption of equality of rule with Claudius, her murder of the latter, with the aid of another woman, the infamous poisoner Locusta, A.D. 54, the accession of Nero, and murder of the young Britannicus, son of Claudius, followed each other in quick succession.

Nero was only seventeen at this time, and Agrippina fondly imagined she could still play the Empress as she had done in the reign of Claudius. With the help of one of her paramours, the wealthy freedman Pallas, she essayed to rule Nero, who, becoming alarmed, disgraced his mother, and deprived her of all political influence. Her strife with Poppæa Sabina, the mistress of Nero and wife of Otho, the future Emperor, eventually caused her death. Poppæa, who was the most beautiful and most dissolute woman of her day, aspired to marry Nero, and could only succeed in this by the removal of her opponent, Agrippina. Nero tried to have his mother drowned, but the attempt being unsuccessful, soldiers were despatched to kill her, the deed being accomplished A.D. 59, five years after Nero's accession, when he was twenty-two years of age.

In A.D. 62 Poppæa induced Nero to divorce and murder his

innocent and virtuous wife Octavia, daughter of Messalina and Claudius. The head of the poor young girl was cut off and carried to the triumphant Poppæa. Even the hard and brutalised Romans were touched at the tragic fate of one who had "known no happiness." But the cruel Poppæa did not long enjoy her triumph as Empress, a kick from Nero when she was in a delicate state of health causing her death A.D. 65.

We see by these examples to what degradation, in a highly civilised State, women of wealth, without moral consciousness and intellectual pursuits, and with noble ambitions and aspirations denied to them, can descend. The truth of Madame de Staël's saying is amply demonstrated :

"In the idle class of society it is almost impossible to have any soul without the cultivation of the mind. It is necessary to have a great deal of knowledge to have any sentiment."

What a contrast in every respect do the cultured women of to-day in England present to the women of old Rome !

Owing to the means of higher education open to them during this generation by Universities, Hospitals, Schools of Art, Science, and Technical Instruction, the mental and material improvement in the condition of English women has been marvellous.

During the last generation, teaching, then a most poorly paid career, and withal unsatisfactory as regards social position, was almost the only one open to gentlewomen. The only thing that was firmly impressed on a girl's mind was that she must marry. No matter whether tastes, dispositions, educations, ideas assimilated or not, if a man were in a good and respectable position in life, a girl would have been considered absurd and faddy to an extreme degree if she had allowed other considerations to weigh with her. To be an "old maid" was to be branded with a species of ignominy. She was regarded as a most uninteresting if not objectionable person, her very existence being a source of latent irritation to her immediate circle. In order to avoid this terrible title, the bait of matrimony was swallowed with avidity, the life afterwards left to chance. For how many miserable, ill-assorted marriages was this responsible, and how many names were subsequently dragged through the slime and filth of the Divorce Court, through the dread of being stigmatised "old maid" !

If the higher education of women have done nothing else, it has in a measure eradicated this ridiculous fear. Girls are now taught to think. They pause and reflect before taking the final vows of marriage upon themselves, if they are not fully assured they are doing right. We also see the outcome for good in the higher culture as regards the fact that, when married, its votaries rarely, if ever, figure in the Divorce Court. The names of many merely

fashionable, frivolous, or foolish women may be constantly read in the annals of that unhappy court, but those of the women of the higher culture are conspicuous by their absence.

While participating in the pleasures of society open to them, very many women in the highest positions in England endeavour to reserve a margin of time for cultivation of the mind and soul, and for good works in the cause of humanity.

Her Majesty the Queen has ever been deeply interested in the improvement and condition of all her subjects, and she has always accorded the most generous and special appreciation of the talents of her own sex; her sympathy, too, in their sufferings has never been lacking. She has always "delighted to honour" those to whom honour is due, whether it be the most successful scholars of their day, or artists, sculptors, musicians, authoresses and nurses. In the Jubilee year of her reign, she founded "The Institute of Nurses," with the money which the women of England of every class poured into her hands as a personal gift. It was also owing to the Queen's direct initiation that "the scheme for supplying medical aid to the women of India" was inaugurated by Lady Dufferin, to whom the Queen communicated her ideas before that lady left England for India, when Lord Dufferin was appointed Viceroy. The crying need for such medical aid is apparent when the fact is realised that out of 100,000,000 women in India, two-thirds are debarred from seeing men doctors, whatever the nature of their illnesses and sufferings.

But on the vast philanthropic work of the women of England to-day it is impossible to dwell at length. We have only to take up the book edited by the Baroness Burdett-Coutts (one of the greatest philanthropists of all time), entitled *Woman's Mission*, to see the extent of this. This book comprises a series of papers by women on almost every branch of their philanthropic work, specially written in connection with the British Section of the Chicago Exhibition of 1893. These papers give us an excellent idea of the immense amount of earnest work effected by English women, of their powers of organisation, their initiative, ability, and their self-sacrifice in the cause of philanthropy, which, as Lady Burdett-Coutts says, is "the truest and noblest because the most natural part of woman's work in the development of the end of this century." Perhaps the most interesting articles in this deeply interesting book, which should be in the hands of all women who can afford to buy it, are those by Miss Annie Beale and Miss Weston, relating to the immense work for good carried on amongst our soldiers and sailors. Miss Beale describes eloquently all Miss Robinson's untiring efforts in her glorious achievements at Portsmouth, and the many splendid institutes, halls, homes, and "welcomes" originated there by her for

the comfort, well-being, and improved spiritual condition of our soldiers, which have led to like institutions being founded elsewhere.

Of the similar work performed by Miss Sandes and other ladies in Ireland, Lord Wolseley said: "We thank God for the earnest band of voluntary lady-workers He has sent us. They visit systematically in barracks and hospitals, welcome the men who come to the homes, and hold nightly meetings for those who wish to attend."

As regards Miss Weston's equally grand "work amongst the sailors," at Plymouth, in conjunction with her friend, Miss Wintz, and the noble buildings which have sprung up there owing to their efforts, we can only re-echo the wish of the former that "Sailors' Rests on broad principles may be started all over the world." Thanks to Miss Weston's example, there are already many dotted about the globe, and these doubtless will increase as time goes on.

Miss Weston's account of her fights with the drink-fiend for the body and soul of poor Jack, and all the good done for him and his, during the last sixteen years, are of deep and thrilling interest to English women and men who take a sincere interest and pride in that greatest and most important of our national institutions, the navy.

To the many other able papers on sick-nursing, work for children, clubs for girls and young men, art needlework, agricultural entomology, &c., we can only allude in passing, and hope that the opening words of Mrs. G. A. Sala in her paper on women's "Working Guilds" may be endorsed by most of her readers:

"The majority of nineteenth century Englishwomen are industrious, resourceful, unaffected, sensible, amusing, amiable; they are good-looking and charming companions."

Among a certain class of acrid and narrow-minded writers, it is somewhat the fashion to decry English women of to-day, to hold them up to contempt, to sneer at their desire for mental culture, to ignore entirely their high standard of right, their nobility of thought, and their endeavours to improve the conditions of others as well as their own, and to brand such women with opprobrious epithets, or, if not, studiously to deny their aims and misrepresent their ideas. Honest criticism is healthy and bracing in its effects, but unkind remarks made in a bitter spirit of ill-will do only harm, as they produce a burning sense of injustice, of all things the most hateful and hardest to bear.

As women are ever the bitterest enemies of their own sex, sad as it is, it is not surprising to see the names of some appended to these wilful misrepresentations. The present is always wrong with a certain order of minds, so the "modern woman" is now attacked,

just as the "girl of the period" was twenty-five years ago, and as doubtless the Sophias, Lydias, and Belindas were of a previous epoch. Seneca remarks *à propos* of this in ancient Rome, "Do not let the blame fall all on our own age. It is a common complaint that the present age is deteriorating. We lament; our descendants will do the same."

We know that there are plenty of bad women in our country, some bad from inclination or hereditary viciousness, others from weakness, vanity, or idleness, many more from want, or lack of proper education in its highest sense; but these do not form the class attacked by the decriers of the women of to-day.

There are plenty of men of low calibre who do not object to women being frivolous or immoral if they are young and good-looking, or amusing; against these they say nothing, but strongly deprecate any intellectual or moral effort on the part of women who protest at being regarded as mere toys and amusements for the brief period of youth, and afterwards put on one side as lumber. The censors and decriers of our sex do not deplore the ignoble qualities and faults of women (caused often by the vices and brutalities of men), but pour the vials of their wrath on the cultured woman of the day, who merely aspires to live her own life free from prejudice. She is called unwomanly, a monstrous growth of the age, the "Wild Woman," a member of the "Shrieking Sisterhood," whatever this may be; no term is too harsh for her, no expression of hatred and disgust too severe. If she dare clothe her thoughts in words, and have the courage to express her opinions in public, whether on temperance, morals, art, Egyptology, politics, and so forth, she is sneered at and treated to more abuse by these unjust and short-sighted people, than if she had broken the seventh commandment.

A beautiful writer of our times—George Meredith—has remarked that, of the only two sources of originality displayed in England during this generation, one has been demonstrated by its women.

If it be true that "in all ages the women have matched the men," it speaks well for the future of our Empire, that such a band of high-souled women has arisen as of late, to help the noblest men in preserving all that is worthy in our glorious institutions, and to urge their husbands and brothers on to further efforts of self-sacrifice in the cause of all that promotes morality and integrity, the only sure foundations of permanent greatness.

While women fight the evils in our midst with moral weapons, endeavour to conquer vice, ignorance, drink, and incapacity, and to substitute in their stead goodness, beauty, and truth, and while loathing the sin do their utmost for the sinner, we need not fear the fate of old Rome will overtake us.



All who are not with us are against us.

If Englishwomen nowadays are fighting on the side of purity, justice—in one word, goodness—it behoves those who indulge their bad temper, jealousy, or narrow-mindedness, which they mistake for wisdom or righteous wrath, to pause and consider whether by their hostile criticisms they are not ranging themselves on the side of the powers of evil.

To quote a wise and merciful saying appreciated by all: it would be as well for them “to cast out the beam” from their own eye before trying to “pull out the mote” from the eye of their neighbour.

M. DALE.

## OUR VILLAGE BANK."

"OUR Village Bank" is not in England. We have as yet nothing of the sort among ourselves. To see it we must go abroad. I want to ask leave to act as guide in respect of one such institution which ought to possess some little interest, as being the first bank of its kind established in Italy—in that sunny Venetian plain which stretches out from the Carnic Alps to the swampy marshes of the Romagna. To tell the tale of the first village bank of all, which was founded in Germany in 1849, would appear like going back to ancient history. In Italy we find ourselves moving in modern times. This infant Nestor of Italian banks, indeed, is now but little more than ten years old. It was founded on June 20, 1883—born, so to speak, of the same "depression" which has impressed its mark so painfully upon our own rural economy. To some extent, accordingly, the story of the throes which brought it into life, and of its subsequent growth to health and strength, ought in England to touch a sympathetic chord. And there is also another feature commending it to our notice. For in its country, Venetia, we see a rural population, in some respects, at any rate, resembling our own. They are not little freeholders, like the Germans. They are tenants, yearly tenants, living scattered over their parishes, since most buildings are put up on the holdings they belong to. There is a village, of course, in Loreggia, a cluster of houses with a central street, from the midst of which rises up that picturesque *campunile* which tells you at the first glance that you are in Italy. And at one end stands, shady with welcome foliage, what we should call the "Hall"—old-fashioned in style, old-fashioned with its generous hospitality, its quaint old ways, and its trusted old servants, who seem in truth to form part of the family. Here lives the founder of this bank. Signor Wollemborg owes his fortune to banking of the capitalist type. He has shown his gratitude to Providence for its blessings by making banking accessible to his poorer neighbours.

They needed it. The Venetians are industrious and careful husbandmen and thrifty livers. But adverse circumstances conspired to keep them poor. There was the absentee landlord, grasping and grinding, as we have none to grasp and grind in England. And to meet his claims and those of the tax-gatherer,

the poor *contadino* had no one to look to for a semblance of help but the usurer, one of the worst pests of Italy, who fleeced him most mercilessly, growing rich upon his misery. The usurer had in Italy so securely established his sway that his calling had come to be looked upon as quite respectable. There is nothing on which he will not lay his hands. If the poor peasant wants money, he can have it at rates varying from 50 to 1200 per cent.—often with a Sunday dinner thrown in as a prescriptive condition. Or he may have it from a bank in the town, at which, in consideration of a heavy fee, the usurer consents to act as surety. Should the peasant want a sack of maize—as he sometimes does—he can have that in kind, of inferior quality, at the rate of 24 lire for what in the market costs only 12 lire, but at three months' credit—a matter of 400 per cent. per annum. Should he require live-stock, there is the same friend in need to provide it by an arrangement called *soccida*, which throws all the risk and cost of keeping upon the hirer, while securing a sure half of the profits to the lender. Should he want goslings for his wife to rear up and fatten for the market—as favourite an industry in Venetia as chicken-cramming is in Sussex—the usurer will let him have his £2 wherewith to buy fifty goslings, claiming back as interest, at the close of five or six months, five fat geese, representing a value of £1.

That has proved merry business for the usurers, but it kept the peasantry in abject poverty, especially when hard times came and either the earth refused to yield her fruits or the market its prices. Their condition was worse than mere poverty, for it crushed all hope and elasticity out of them. After the year 1880 had brought on the critical period of depression, there seemed scarcely anything left to work for. Cattle, implements, furniture were all pledged to the usurer. And feed as badly, clothe himself as badly, live as badly as he would, all the peasant's toil went but to enrich his oppressor.

Signor Wollemborg had heard of the astonishing success of village banks established in Germany by Herr Raiffeisen. And in 1883 he decided upon starting his own little pioneer bank in Loreggia. Loreggia is a biggish parish, with something under 3000 inhabitants, mostly devoted to agriculture and small trade. It was at the time a typical "depressed" parish, because, barring Signor Wollemborg himself; none of its landlords ever came near it, contenting themselves with drawing their rents—which were heavy for land not naturally fertile and poorly developed. Signor Wollemborg had some difficulty in making his neighbours understand his scheme of starting a bank without capital, a bank which would lend money without asking anyone to take up shares. The whole thing was as strange to the Italians as it is to ourselves in the present day. However, he succeeded in enrolling about thirty members for his new institution—all of them, except himself and

the vicar and the doctor, poor—that is, small tenants or petty freeholders. His first work proved very uphill. There was no good fairy to stand by him. Every inch of ground had to be conquered. To provide the first funds, Signor Wollemborg himself opened his purse, advancing £80—besides, I presume, paying in the bulk of that £280 of deposits which the bank managed somehow to attract in its first term of business of four and a half months. Later, the public Savings Bank of Padua consented to lend £160—but Signor Wollemborg must lodge the rules with it, give it the name of every member, and keep it carefully informed of the state of affairs. Now the Bank numbers somewhere about 130 members. It is not actually embarrassed with cash; it has to study strict economy in all things; many of its transactions seem humble and small. But it raises all the money that it wants; it has no occasion to send any borrower away; the Savings Bank of Padua and other large institutions lend to it willingly. It has a little reserve of 1500 lire laid up, which has grown very slowly, but promises, now that it has reached such a point, to increase more rapidly. To do them justice, the members are anxious to increase what they know must in the long run prove the backbone of the Bank. At a special meeting, composed mainly of borrowers, they resolved, rather to go on paying a somewhat higher interest than is absolutely necessary—that is, 6 per cent.—than stint the reserve. The Bank has generally about £600 or £800 out in loans fructifying on people's farms, in the shape of cows, or pigs, or goats, or implements, or manures, or feeding-stuffs; or else earning a profit in village-shops in the shape of raw material which gives the tradesman employment for his labour. I won't say that to an untrained eye the difference is likely to be very striking. But any one acquainted with agriculture cannot fail to detect at the very first glance the contrast between an Italian village which has no bank and one in which such a bank has been at work a few years. Where there is such a bank, cultivation is sure to be better. Crops look cleaner and heavier. The live-stock are better kept. The buildings are in better order. There is, generally speaking, less poverty, a look of greater prosperity about both people and farms; and if any visitor has time to look into the social life of the village, he will find that there is a good deal more still to distinguish a "bank" village from an ordinary one, even apart from increased economy, sobriety, thrift, and saving. The population appear more independent and better conducted. People think more for themselves. They are more friendly and neighbourly with one another. And generally there is already a little village club, which is not wholly given up to amusement.

If you would see on the spot what a village bank does for its people, you could not, at Loreggia, have a better guide to explain to you its work than old "Corazza," in respect of age the "father"

of the bank. His real name is Bernardo Pietroni; you could not tell that from his signature, which he has learned to scrawl after he was a grandfather, merely to qualify himself for admission to the Bank. Every member is required to be able to sign his name. In the village his opinion counts for as much as that of any other six men. If he is deficient in knowledge of letters, you soon find out that he has plenty of common sense and sound judgment, and has not allowed experience to go by without drawing profit from it. Indeed, in conversation he discovers familiarity with the principles of modern farming rather surprising in so self-taught a man. "It is the Bank that has taught me that," he candidly admits. In providing him with the money which he required for his farming operations, under certain safeguards, it has made him think how he might best employ it. If you will go about his field and his yard, up to his corn-loft, and into his cow-house, you soon learn why he loves his bank. "I could not keep my farm like that formerly." His house is a large, simple and primitive, but substantial building, according to the custom of the country, affording room for his numerous family, comprising children and grandchildren, of twenty-eight, among whom he lives like a patriarch of old. Such large families, recalling the semi-mediæval *communautes* of France, which Queen Amélie tried to preserve, but of which now only a few stunted remnants survive on the "Black Mountain," are not unusual in Venetia. These twenty-eight are Corazza's children. So far as they are capable of work, they are also his "hands." He requires no hired labour. Corazza will show you his maize-cobs, plump and bright in colour, his full-grained barley, his well-shaped potatoes. "We used not to grow them like that. It is the Bank that has found the manure and the implements for good cultivation." "But could not you have saved what you wanted for that out of what you were making?" "There was nothing to save," said he. "It all went to the usurer. We never had a farthing over. Besides, if I had saved for buying implements, or manure, I must have starved the farm at some other point, where starving would have meant loss. The Bank came in from outside. It gave me the additional pound or two, and never taxed me except out of the produce of that additional pound itself. It was content to wait till that had borne fruit. So I could well afford to borrow. It cost me nothing." Corazza will go on to show you his beasts. He is very proud of them. Here are two bullocks worth 1000 lire—the ordinary price of a peasant's cow is somewhere about 200 lire. He never had a stableful like that in former times. He loves the beasts like children, and so do all his family. They are all inter-related, as he will point out to you. "Come la vostra famiglia," say I, thinking that I may venture upon a little joke. I could not have paid the Pietronis a better compliment. Half a score of mouths

laugh an appreciative acknowledgement. These good beasts feed Corazza's family with milk, and they feed, what he appreciates as much, his fields with fertility. "Put into the ground as much as you can," he says, having learnt, with the Bank's help, a lesson in high farming. "Our soil wants it. But it will give it you all back."

Corazza has more to tell of the benefits of the Bank in other households—real cases, which will bear enquiring into. There was such and such an one in the parish, the tenant of a farm—he has it still—of about twenty acres. It was wretchedly neglected. Everything was pawned, and the only person who got anything out of it was the usurer. It was a hard case. The man joined the Bank, but the Bank was at a loss how much it might trust him with. It advanced him £4. That sufficed to stop a hole. He repaid the money and borrowed more. [The Bank at present lends no more than £30 to one man. But that little sum may be kept continually coming and going, earning and repaying itself, giving the poor fellow £30 perpetually to work with.] The quasi-bankrupt of ten years ago now has his farm in tolerable condition, he has six beasts of his own and £60 laid by in the Savings Bank. "Then why does he not use that instead of the bank money?" "No, no," said Corazza, "that would never do. What he borrows from the Bank he knows that he must repay. So he is careful with it. He will cast over exactly what an outlay will bring him back. Aye, we have learnt to calculate. The other money is far safer where it is now. It is a good security to the bank, and the man will not fritter it away."

There was another man with a similar holding. He was miserably poor. But the Bank trusted him in 1883 with £8 wherewith to buy two calves. He has borrowed again. He has put a little in here and a little there. He has now five beasts and about 1400 lire-worth of belongings, instead of practically nothing, and is only 100 lire in debt to the Bank.

Corazza has other cases to tell you of. There was that poor old widow woman, who carries fruit to Padua to sell. What with her poverty and her debts she never felt safe from day to day. The Bank let her have a few pounds. That gave her the ground to stand upon. Her profits came to herself, instead of going to the usurer. She is quit of anxiety now. Her earnings benefit herself.

There was that small tradesman. He was a pauper, receiving parish relief. As such he was not eligible for the Bank. But a kind friend lent him a little to get himself off the rates. The Bank admitted him, gave him a few pounds to buy cheap wares with to hawk about. Now he has his little shop.

Nowhere has gold dropped down in great lumps upon the people. They have not made fortunes suddenly. But they have been helped

to earn fairly and to live respectably. It is this being able to get an extra pound or two to do a thing well which was formerly done badly, this power of drawing on a fund never failing at any time that an opportunity offers for employing it profitably, and this pressure put upon people to calculate what they are doing, which makes this bank so tellingly useful. The aspect of the farms whose tenants belong to the Bank has been materially changed within the past decade. There is order and tidiness where there used to be the neglect inseparable from penury. "We could not then eat such good polenta," says Corazza's wife, as you stop to look at that huge mess of really appetising maize-porridge brought into the common room to serve as meal for the twenty-eight mouths, large and small. "We had to live on the inferior grain."

And there is saving. Nowhere is a bank set up but it imparts a distinct stimulus to thrift. You wonder that people should be content to wait for the fortnightly meeting of the Committee, rather than deposit their pence in the Post-Office Savings Bank, which is open every day. The local people can tell you the reason. That Bank is *their own*. There are Signor Wollemborg, and the doctor, and Corazza, and one or two more, to manage it, every one of whom they know, every one of whom they trust. These are indeed the men of their own choice. And they know where the money is. It does not go into the huge stock of money held by the State, in which it would be lost like a drop of water in the sea, never to be distinguished from other coin. There it is, all their own, in their own village, and what good it does by being employed will benefit themselves and their neighbours.

To see the Bank at work in another aspect, come to the *municipio* to attend while the elected Committee hold their sitting. There is the *sindaco* ready to bow you into the room. These village mayors know the value of a village bank. It makes government easier for them. They help it by depositing municipal moneys. Charitable and Friendly Societies will do the same thing—at first, it may be, to help and strengthen the little bantling, but later, certainly, for safe keeping. As a meeting-place the *municipio* is always open to the bank. In some parishes—as in Vigonovo—the priest will allow to the banks the use of the church. The Committee meet every fortnight, or oftener, should occasion require. At Loreggia, Signor Wollemborg, as President, takes the chair. His brother, who, to save the bank expense, discharges gratuitously the functions of cashier and secretary, sits by his side. And there are the other members. It is surprising what power of following business, of mentally seizing important points, and also, in a rustic way, of expressing themselves, this bank business will give to these simple village folk. It is their first education in public affairs. If Lord Salisbury really believes that what village folk want to arouse their

interest and educate them to better things is a circus and not a parish council, let him go to one of these village bank meetings, and see for himself what a remarkably stimulating effect such council-work has upon small rural folk. They take nothing for granted. They will have everything out. And be the other man a squire or a day-labourer, they will argue the case with him thoroughly. At the general meetings, which are held twice or three times a year, to discuss the limits to be fixed for loans, the rates of interest to be charged or given, or any appeal from decisions of the Committee, to elect the committee-men, the councilmen, or whatever the business may be, there are debates which indicate a real arguing power.

But the present is a committee meeting. There are candidates waiting for election. Election is no farce. Members are by the rules made responsible for one another. The whole Society goes surety for what it borrows, and therefore, in the last resort, also, for what it lends. So members must know that they can trust one another. Accordingly they scrutinise the applicants carefully, and canvass their qualifications and disqualifications. Drunkards, idlers, evil-livers, and the like, the Bank will not have. So, if there are any such who apply, they are rejected without much to-do. In a good many more cases than one have they come back as reformed characters to find themselves elected. Here is a market which pays value for honesty and good conduct. Job is not expected to "serve God for naught." Hence that marvellous educating power which has made priests own that the Bank in their parish has done more to make good men of their parishioners than all their preaching. And that is so not at Loreggia only. Abano, Vigonovo, Crema, Faller, and whatever other places possess banks, have all similar tales to tell.

Now come the savings. Here comes in a little girl with her few *centesimi*; next an old woman brings a few lire. There is a lad with his bare legs still all purple from treading the grapes in true Old Testament style, in a water-tight cart from which the juice runs out by a spout. He has earned a little money, and he carries the *lira* or two to the Bank. These people all bring their savings themselves—not as a matter of distrust towards others, but as wishing to manifest their own keen personal interest in the common institution. This is altogether a different affair from the public-office work of the Post-office Bank. This Bank is to its members a living creature, whose pulse they may feel. Members do not come merely to bring their savings. They want to hear something of what is going on. They are entitled to see the balance-sheet, which is drawn up every fortnight at the close of the committee-meeting, and hung up for view in the public-room of the *municipio*. They want to hear if there is any new lending being done. For theirs is a



democratic institution, and, as everybody is responsible, everybody wants to be aware in a general way what he is responsible for. No secret is made of loans. Borrowers are perfectly frank with respect to them. Indeed, the more openly the lending and borrowing are done, the better is it for the Bank. At general meetings all members are expected to attend—all but the women members, two in number, both widows, who are entitled to attend by proxy only. For others there is a fine fixed for non-attendance.

After the receipt of the savings comes the consideration of applications for loans. As a rule there is the *vacca*, or the *vitella*, or the *maiale*, to be bought—though the pig is not yet as much honoured in Italy as he deserves to be. Sometimes, in the place of a cow or a calf, there is a goat. Or else the village wheelwright will want to buy wood, the shoemaker leather, and so on. Every case meets with careful consideration. Is the applicant trustworthy? Is his case good? Is the sum a legitimate one? Is the time proposed for repayment excessive? Are the sureties good? It may happen that the loan is refused, though such cases are not many. It may happen that the amount is reduced or the period curtailed. According as the committee decide, the applicant is advised, and then he may come with his sureties to receive the money from the cashier in exchange for a bill-of-exchange which runs only for three months, for whatever period the loan be granted—two years or more—in order that he may be compelled to employ the money as was stipulated. Should he fail to do so, the bill is not renewed.

It would be ridiculous to say that our "Village Bank" has brought about the millenium in Loreggia, or anywhere else. But it has brought the local people very material and welcome help. It has sent the usurer to the rightabout. He has left the place discomfited. It has taught members to bank their money, instead of locking it away in a drawer or hiding it in a stocking, where it could not possibly do any one any good. It has taught them to calculate the profitableness of their enterprises, and made them familiar with simple accounts. It has added a fresh stimulus to thrift. It has brought public opinion and class opinion to bear upon people in the most effective way—stimulating, checking, restraining. It has made the people better men and better neighbours. Where there used to be grudging and envying, ill-concealed delight in another's troubles, there is now fellow-feeling—because people have learned that they are bound together by a common interest, that their neighbour's hurt is their own, their neighbour's good their profit. Their conscience and their head have been reached by the unerring way of their pocket, which presses the lesson home. The whole is a triumph of the quickening of individual responsibility.

"Our Village Bank" has by no means completed its task. In all probability while Loreggia stands there will be work for it to do.

That work is much easier now that the Bank has a standing in the market, that it has approved its solvency, that it has gathered a little patrimony of its own, than in the early days of its childhood. It did not enter into the village like a hero, to "come, see, and conquer." Its progress has been the slow progress of "here a little and there a little"—very much more, really, even economically, than appears on the surface, because, besides the open borrowing and earning, there is so much that is sunk in the household, in the comfort, and in the education of the families benefiting by it. It is best that its triumphs should be slow, for that will make them all the more enduring.

There are about a hundred such banks now in Italy; there are 1250 of the most rigid type in Germany. They have proved themselves adaptable to the most varied circumstances. They help the poor mountaineers in the districts of Belluno and Udine, who have by their aid raised money to undertake common contracts, to set up granaries distributing grain at cheap prices, to send them on their travels for work into Austria, France, and the United States. In Germany they have, on more favouring soil, produced much more telling results. But the effects, economic as well as moral and educating, have shown themselves in character everywhere the same. And everywhere, also, in equal degree, have these banks proved the safest guardians of their own and other people's money that there could be. Neither in Italy, nor in Germany have they lost either creditor or depositor a penny. Humble, small, unpretentious, thriving only by care, enquiry and economy, they have shown themselves one of the most powerful bodies of helpers of the poor, frequently in circumstances in which, in an economic aspect, no other helper could be looked for. No doubt a great work, and a great success lie still before them.

If more Englishmen would go and study the work of these banks on the spot, as I have done at Loreggia and elsewhere, I doubt if our own villages would much longer remain without so useful an institution, which has only to be seen to be appreciated. Before the proper appreciation of its work, such as seeing would bring with it, the supposed difficulties would melt away like wax.

HENRY W. WOLFF.

## THE SEXUAL PROBLEM.

“THINKING is but an idle waste of thought,” wrote Lord Byron’s parodist; and, certainly, the majority of mankind would appear to be very much of that opinion. How few there are who ever take the trouble to inquire whether the customs and institutions of the society in which they happen to have been born are based upon sense and reason, and whether they really tend to promote the happiness of the community. It is so much easier to accept things as they are, as being the best possible in this best possible of worlds. Thus it comes about that men are actually found to pride themselves upon holding, without inquiry, the faith and opinions handed down to them by their forefathers, oblivious of the fact that they thereby place themselves upon the same intellectual plane with the cannibal and the fetich worshipper. Thus, too, it comes about that so many ordinary and respectable Englishmen of the present day have but one idea as to the sexual relation of man and woman. If it exists under the sanction of a life-long contract, evidenced according to law (and, some would add, hallowed by the blessing of the Church), it is pure and sinless, and possibly also heavenly and sublime; but, under all other conditions, it is vile, impure, degrading, and a deadly sin!

Being possessed with the belief that this idea is profoundly erroneous and profoundly immoral, and that it is one which, perhaps beyond all others, tends to multiply the miseries of mankind, I here offer a contribution towards the discussion of what is termed the *Sexual Question*; a question which, when considered in all its bearings, will be found to be by far the most vitally important of all those social problems with which the community will, sooner or later, be called upon to deal.

Let us first consider the existing state of things. On the surface, truly we English constitute an extremely moral<sup>1</sup> society. We pride ourselves upon the institution of a strict monogamy, binding the contracting parties together till death do them part, but tempered by the decrees of the Divorce Court. This institution is supposed to be the basis of our national welfare, and any suggestions for its modification in the direction of greater freedom are resented as

<sup>1</sup> Use the word “moral” in a strictly conventional sense.

nothing less than a crime against God and man. All sexual relations between man and woman outside the pale of this sacred institution are branded with the grossest names and stigmatised as "sins of impurity." Terrible indeed is the punishment dealt out by society upon the transgressor of these arbitrary rules, unless he evades detection by stealth and secrecy, or unless his position be so low in the social scale that he can disregard those unwritten laws against which his betters dare not openly offend. It is, of course, the woman who, as a general rule, has to pay the heavier penalty; but it is not true, as sometimes represented, that society inflicts its vengeance upon her alone. This social code claims its hecatombs among men also, men who have been driven to misery and despair, to lifelong suffering, and perhaps to suicide, by the pitiless, subtle and all-pervading action of that modern Inquisition which hath decreed, "Ye shall be accursed and excommunicate who dare to love without reference to priest or registrar." I speak not now of the heartless and calculating, but of good men and true to whom the unhappiness of those they love or have loved causes the deepest sorrow, and who acutely feel the harsh judgments of the world, even though they may believe them to be perverted or unjust. Indeed, in our very laudable zeal to redress the balance in favour of women there is some real danger lest we be so far carried away as to do injustice to the stronger sex. There is too much tendency nowadays to assume, in certain cases which are brought before the public, that the man must inevitably be a scoundrel and the woman but the victim of his villainy; and there are some prophets both of press and pulpit who seem to regard it as part of their mission to hound down the man and to canonise the woman as one of the Magdalenes of the nineteenth century. This may be chivalry, but it certainly is not justice, and I doubt much if it be Christianity.<sup>1</sup>

Of the woman's suffering what need to speak? I take up my newspaper and read that a poor servant girl has drowned herself, and that another has murdered her (so-called) "illegitimate" child. Why should these things be? Why is it that such horrors form the very commonplaces of our daily intelligence? The reason is obvious. When a woman's state proclaims that she has (to use the conventional phrase) "fallen from the path of virtue," it is thought necessary for the salvation of our sacred system of uncompromising lifelong monogamy that all the vials of shame and of wrath should be emptied upon her defenceless head. She is taught that she has been guilty of a crime; that she is unworthy to consort with honest people; that she has brought shame upon her family and upon herself. On all sides the finger of scorn is pointed at her, and she is

<sup>1</sup> A well-known Socialist has commented, in very vigorous language, upon this danger. See *The Ethics of Socialism*, by Ernest Belfort Bax, p. 65. There is much truth in his remarks.

branded by the name of strumpet, or any other of the elegant epithets in such case made and provided by the malevolent and fertile imagination of "the unco' guid and rigidly righteous."

And thus it is that if we take the trouble to look beneath the mere outer surface and veneering of Society, we shall see sights that may well give us pause: sights that have made some of us doubt whether, after all, modern civilisation has arrived at the best possible solution of this the most important of all social questions.

For what do we find? We find side by side with our boasted lifelong monogamy, and as the direct result of our cherished social code, a mass of prostitution more degraded and more miserable than any the world has ever seen before. And, further, as the inevitable concomitants of our merciless system, "a grisly troop are seen"—murders, suicides, infanticides, abortions, *et hoc genus omne*. These, with untold suffering throughout all the ranks of society—for the most part endured in secret, though no small portion of it is daily laid bare to the public gaze—*these* are the price which we pay for the maintenance of a social law which will admit of no exception to the one stereotyped form of monogamous lifelong union. I would implore, therefore, those who are accustomed to think that evils would ensue from any change of opinion upon these matters, to reflect that it is hardly possible to conceive evils more appalling than those which now permeate and vitiate our whole social system.

Mr. Lecky, whose authority, both as moralist and historian, stands deservedly high in this country, has drawn a striking picture of some (though only *some*) of the evils to which I have briefly alluded.

"The existence in England," he writes, "of certainly not less than fifty thousand<sup>1</sup> unhappy women, sunk in the very lowest depths of vice and misery, shows sufficiently what an appalling amount of moral evil is festering uncontrolled, undiscussed, and unalleviated, under the fair surface of a decorous society. . . . If the terrible censure which English public opinion passes upon every instance of female frailty in some degree diminishes the number, it does not prevent such instances from being extremely numerous, and it immeasurably aggravates the suffering they produce. Acts which in other European countries would excite only a slight and transient emotion, spread in England, over a wide circle, all the bitterness of unmitigated anguish. Acts which naturally neither imply nor produce a total subversion of the moral feelings, and which, in other countries, are often followed by happy, virtuous, and affectionate lives, in England almost invariably lead to absolute ruin. Infanticide is greatly multiplied, and a vast proportion of those whose reputations and lives have been blasted by one momentary sin, are hurled into the abyss of habitual prostitution—a condition which, owing to the sentence of public opinion, and the neglect of legislators, is in no other European country so hopelessly vicious or so irrevocable."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This was written many years ago. The number must be vastly larger now; probably 460,000.

<sup>2</sup> *History of European Morals*, vol. ii. p. 284.

If it be said that these evils are not necessarily attendant upon a system under which all forms of sexual union other than that of monogamy by life-long contract are held excommunicate, and that they will yield before the influences of religion and civilisation, I reply that those who thus argue ignore all the facts of human nature and all the teachings of experience. "In no highly civilised society" (to cite once more the words of Mr. Lecky) "is marriage general on the first development of the passions, and the continual tendency of increasing knowledge is to render such marriages more rare. It is also an undoubted truth that, however much moralists may enforce the obligation of extra matrimonial purity, this obligation has never been even approximately regarded." Indeed, so far from there being any probability of the abatement under present conditions of those evils to which I have alluded, we have abundant evidence that they are daily gathering in volume and intensity. My deep conviction is that by far the greater part of all this human misery is utterly unnecessary; that it is the result of a false opinion, and of an irrational and unnatural system; and that if it were possible to convince society (more especially in this country where such evils are seen in their most exaggerated form) of the truth of these propositions, an incalculable blessing would be conferred upon the cause of suffering humanity.

The happiness of mankind—*that*, and that alone, should be the basis of all our institutions, and the object of all our reforms. But my heart sinks within me when I consider the mass of human agony which is the result of our artificial laws and customs, and reflect at the same time upon the obstinacy of ingrained prejudice, and the bitter hostility engendered by false ideas concerning marriage founded upon the supposed dictates of religion. *O miseris hominum mentes, o pectora caeca.* But at any rate something is gained when people are made familiar with the fact that views such as here advanced are widely held among those who are not content to accept their opinions and their beliefs without impartial and independent investigation.

Most people seem to think that our modern society has hit upon the only possible solution of the sexual problem. Upon such persons I would urge the advantages of what is called the comparative system. Let them study the customs and institutions of other peoples throughout the world, not only in the present time, but also in time past. They will find that a multitude of different results have been arrived at, and nothing, I think, can be more instructive, or more tend to open the mind for the reception of new ideas upon this question, than a consideration of the various customs and institutions which have obtained among different races with regard to the sexual relations between man and woman.

It is indeed an excellent educational exercise, in this as in other

social and political questions, to make ourselves familiar with the usages of other peoples, whether savage or civilised. How repulsive, for example, according to our preconceived notions, is that form of sexual union known as polyandry! Yet not only has it extensively prevailed in times past, but we still meet with it "among relatively advanced peoples in Ceylon, in Malabar, and in Thibet," and Mr. Wilson, in his work, *The Abode of Snow*, tells us that it was defended by one, at least, of the Moravian missionaries in Thibet as good for the people of that sterile country. Further we know that to many Eastern peoples the one-wife system appears quite as repulsive as polyandry does to us.<sup>1</sup> Or take another example. What picture is more attractive than that presented to us by the gentle and refined Peruvians under the enlightened despotism of the Incas? of whom the last survivors of the old Spanish conquerors wrote in the preamble to his testament (made to relieve his conscience at the time of his death) that "the whole population was distinguished by sobriety and industry; that such things as robbery and theft were unknown; that far from licentiousness, there was not even a prostitute in the country!"<sup>2</sup> Yet in this well-ordered and civilised society, not only did polygamy prevail, but it was thought no disgrace for an unmarried woman to have tasted of what we foolishly term "the forbidden fruit."<sup>3</sup> As to the Inca himself, not only was it permitted to him, but it was enforced by law and religion that his queen should be his own sister, *et soror et conjux*—a practice, as Mr. Prescott points out, "countenanced by some of the most polished nations of antiquity."

These, however, are only random instances, and I have no intention, nor would the exigencies of space allow me, to enter upon the consideration of the almost infinitely varied customs and opinions concerning sexual matters which have prevailed, and still prevail, among the various races that are distributed over the surface of the earth. I must content myself with a reference to such books as Mr. Westermarck's *History of Human Marriage*,<sup>4</sup> Mr. Spencer's *Sociology*, and the works of Tylor, Morgan, McLennan, Sir John Lubbock, and other well-known writers who demonstrate the profound truth of Mrs. Cady Stanton's observation: "The true relation of the sexes is still an unsolved problem, that has differed in all latitudes and in all periods from the savage to civilised man."<sup>5</sup>

I would, however, before passing on, specially draw attention to the familiar instance of the Hebrews of old. And here all those who regard the books of the Old Testament as a revelation from the

<sup>1</sup> Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, vol. i. pp. 635, 638, 677.

<sup>2</sup> Prescott, *Conquest of Peru*, book i., ch. v., note.

<sup>3</sup> Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, vol. i. p. 639.

<sup>4</sup> An excellent list of authorities is appended to this work.

<sup>5</sup> See an admirable article on "Patriotism and Chastity" in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW for January 1891.

Creator must make an admission of some importance to my argument. They cannot assert that our form of lifelong monogamy is a divine immutable ordinance, suitable for mankind at all times and under all conditions. On the contrary, they are bound to admit that in the days of the patriarchs (not to go back to antediluvian periods), and thenceforward for hundreds of years, both polygamy and concubinage were blessed by the sanction of the Deity. Abraham, who enjoyed such a special measure of the divine favour and confidence that he has been called "the friend of God," not only married his half-sister (Genesis xx. 12), but also took unto himself concubines (Genesis xxv. 6), besides Hagar, the Egyptian, his wife's handmaid, whom he married at his wife's desire. Jacob, again, as everybody knows, married two sisters, as well as their handmaidens, Bilhah and Zilpah. David, the "man after God's own heart," had a number of wives and concubines, and even the wise Solomon's excesses in this matter were not censured on the ground of the numbers constituting his seraglio (though a thousand is certainly a somewhat appalling figure!), but because he loved "strange women" of the prohibited races, Moabites, Ammonites, and others, who led him into idolatry. In the case of distant cities not belonging to these peoples, the Israelites are expressly enjoined by the Lord, in the event of capture after a siege, to take their women unto themselves (Deut. xx. 10 *ff.*; xxi. 10-14).<sup>1</sup>

With regard to concubinage it must be remembered that it was a perfectly well recognised and legitimate institution. The concubine was a secondary wife, whose rights were secured by law. "The position of the Hebrew concubine may be compared with that of the concubine of the early Christian Church, the sole distinction between her and the wife consisting in this, that the marriage was not in accordance with the civil law: in the eye of the Church the marriage was perfectly valid."<sup>2</sup> The status of concubinage was equally well recognised by the Romans, and under Augustus was expressly authorised by law. It is true that the Roman could not have a concubine together with a lawful wife; but it must not be forgotten that under the Roman law there were no restrictions on divorce. "In this matter the Romans proceeded on the notion, that as marriage was a free union, founded on mutual consent, it might be terminated at any time by either of the parties."<sup>3</sup> Concubinage

<sup>1</sup> Gideon is another familiar example of a man specially endowed with Divine grace and power who "had many wives" besides concubines (Judges viii. 30). From first to last there is no suggestion that there was anything wrong in these polygamous practices. It would appear, as we should expect, that the "harlot" was very rare in early times among the daughters of Israel. It is not a little remarkable that one of the patriarchs, supposing he had to do with a woman of this class, begat by a union with his own daughter-in-law a son who forms one of the links in the sacred chain by which the Apostle seeks to connect the Messiah with Abraham and the line of David (Genesis xxxviii.; St. Matthew i.).

<sup>2</sup> Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*: Art. "Marriage."

<sup>3</sup> Lord Mackenzie, *Roman Law*, ch. vi. p. 119.



subsisted as a legal institution in the time of Justinian, and the custom was "long prolonged in the West among the Franks, Lombards, and Germans, and it is notorious that the clergy for some time gave themselves up to it without restraint."<sup>1</sup>

Now, if polygamy, or, I should rather say, polygyny, were an evil in itself, those who look to the Bible for their moral code would surely expect to find its unequivocal condemnation in the books of the New Testament. Yet it is nowhere forbidden in those books, for which reason St. Augustin, as we are told, said expressly that he did not condemn it; and Luther openly declared that, as Christ is silent about polygamy, he could not forbid the taking of more than one wife. In the Merovingian era polygamy was practised by kings, and apparently was not unknown even among priests.<sup>2</sup>

"Owing to polygamy," says Canon Isaac Taylor, "Mahommedan countries are free from professional outcasts, a greater reproach to Christendom than polygamy is to Islam. The strictly regulated polygamy of Moslem lands is infinitely less degrading to women and less injurious to men than the promiscuous polyandry which is the curse of Christian cities, and which is absolutely unknown in Islam. The polyandrous English are not entitled to cast stones at polygamous Moslems."<sup>3</sup>

Similarly, Mr. Bosworth Smith writes of Mohammed, that "he has succeeded, down to this very day, and to a greater extent than has ever been the case elsewhere, in freeing Mohammedan countries from those professional outcasts who live by their own misery, and, by their existence as a recognised class, are a standing reproach to every member of the society of which they form a part."<sup>4</sup>

Polygamy has often been very absurdly attacked, as though it must inevitably be accompanied by slavery—as though, in fact, the only possible form of polygamy were that which we find in Eastern countries; the truth being, of course, that there is no necessary relationship between the two institutions. I take it, however, that no practical reformer would dream of recommending polygamy for adoption by this or other European countries at the present day, and it is certainly far from my purpose so to do. I am concerned only to point out that those who accept the Bible as a divine revelation must admit that in old days, at any rate, it had, together with concubinage, the sanction of the divine permission, and in any

<sup>1</sup> Lord Mackenzie, *Roman Law*, ch. v. p. 102. "Concubinage," says Croke (in his Introduction to the case of *Horner v. Liddiard*), "maintained its ground throughout all Europe till the middle of the sixteenth century." He describes it as "a practice which was established by law in the Empire, which had been permitted under the Old Testament, and not expressly forbidden by the New."

<sup>2</sup> Westermarck, *History of Human Marriage*, p. 434. Hallam's *Middle Ages*, ed. 1872, vol. ii. p. 208. Charlemagne had at the same time at least two wives, and he indulged largely in concubines. See Croke's Introduction to *Horner v. Liddiard*, pp. 110-120.

<sup>3</sup> Paper read at the Church Congress, October 7, 1887. I take the above quotation from the *Pall Mall Gazette* of October 8, 1887.

<sup>4</sup> *Mohammed and Mohammedanism*, p. 204.

case it would, I think, be well if some of our very *insular* monogamists would study it as an institution, both in past and present times, and impartially compare its effects with those of our own extraordinary social system.

But, it will be asked, what remedies have you to suggest for the evils necessarily involved in the present state of things? I reply that we must, in the first place, by all legitimate means in our power, and regardless of the misunderstanding and obloquy to which we shall be inevitably exposed, endeavour to call into existence a healthier and more reasonable public opinion in regard to these questions, and I can best indicate the direction and the manner in which that opinion ought, in my judgment, to be led and moulded, by once more citing from the pages of Mr. Lecky, an author to whom I am well content to appeal, since his authority stands so high, and since few will venture to charge him with propounding wild or immoral theories. Mr. Lecky has expressed his views in very cautious and guarded language, and I think we are justified in reading between the lines even more than is actually expressed in print. Having, in the first place, expressed his own opinion that the lifelong union of one man and of one woman should be the dominant type of intercourse between the sexes, he proceeds as follows :

“ Beyond this point it would, I conceive, be impossible to advance, except by the assistance of a special revelation. *It by no means follows that because this should be the dominant type it should be the only one, or that the interests of society demand that all connections should be forced into the same die.* Connections which were confessedly only for a few years, have always subsisted side by side with permanent marriages; and in periods when public opinion, acquiescing in their propriety, inflicts no excommunication on one or both of the partners, when these partners are not living the demoralising and degrading life which accompanies the consciousness of guilt, and when proper provision is made for the children who are born, it would be, I believe, impossible to prove, by the light of simple and unassisted reason, that such connections should be invariably condemned.”

And again :

“ Under the conditions I have mentioned, these connections are not injurious, but beneficial, to the weaker partner; . . . they stimulate social habits, and they do not produce upon character the degrading effect of promiscuous intercourse, or upon society the injurious effects of imprudent marriages, one or other of which will multiply in their absence. In the immense variety of circumstances and characters, cases will always appear in which on utilitarian grounds they might seem advisable. It is necessary to dwell upon such considerations as these if we would understand the legislation of the Pagan Empire, or the changes that were effected by Christianity. The legislators of the Empire distinctly recognised these connections, and made it a main object to authorise, dignify, and regulate them.”

Against these notions, as the writer goes on to point out, an implacable warfare was declared by that body of opinion which, following

general usage, he calls Christianity, but which was in truth a morbid and distorted asceticism such as formed no part or parcel of the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth.

"It taught," says Mr. Lecky, "as a religious dogma, invariable, inflexible, and independent of all utilitarian calculations, that all forms of intercourse of the sexes, other than lifelong unions, were criminal. By teaching men to regard this doctrine as axiomatic, and therefore inflicting severe social penalties and deep degradation on transient connections, it has profoundly modified even their utilitarian aspect and has rendered them in most countries furtive and disguised. There is probably no other branch of ethics which has been so largely determined by special dogmatic theology and there is none which would be so deeply affected by its decay."<sup>1</sup>

Terrible as has been the amount of human suffering occasioned by the perversion of the teaching of Christ, I believe that by originating and fostering these pernicious doctrines with regard to the sexual relations this pseudo-Christianity committed the greatest of all its innumerable sins against the happiness of mankind. A profound truth underlies the admirable and suggestive passage which I have above cited from Mr. Lecky. If the public opinion of the society in which we live could but be brought to recognise other marriages besides those of the one stereotyped form, a step of inestimable value would have been taken in the path of human progress. I say other "*marriages*" because I would adopt the definition of Mr. Westermarck, "according to which marriage is nothing else than a *more or less durable* connection between male and female, lasting beyond the mere act of propagation till after the birth of the offspring" (if offspring there be). "It implies not only sexual relations, but also living together, as is set forth in the proverb of the Middle Ages: 'Boire, manger, coucher ensemble est mariage, ce me semble.'<sup>2</sup> I would myself go further than this, for I protest against the virulent and indiscriminate blame which in this country is heaped upon the heads of those who form looser connections than are included by the above definition. But before amplifying the argument on this head I would take leave to lay before my readers some remarks of an American sociologist which may well be compared with those I have quoted from Mr. Lecky. Mr. Lester Ward, in his work *Dynamic Sociology*, writes as follows:

"When the Church assumed control of marriage, reduced it to a strict regulation, and placed it under constant surveillance, prohibiting bigamy and polygamy under heavy penalties, it succeeded in little more than driving the polyandrous system into darker regions and investing it with a baser and more criminal character. Instead of its being the beautiful and attractive who offered themselves to any whom they found congenial,<sup>3</sup> it

<sup>1</sup> *History of European Morals*, vol. ii. p. 348 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *History of Human Marriage*, p. 19. All Mr. Westermarck's observations on monogamy must, I apprehend, be taken subject to this definition.

<sup>3</sup> As in the case of the Greek *hetairæ* (e.g.) to whom the writer had made allusion shortly before. See also Lecky's *History of European Morals*, vol. ii. p. 291.

became the poor crushed victims of this social rigidity who, as outcasts of society, were compelled to gain a livelihood by prostitution, which is a modified form of polyandry. And this is the state of modern society. This system of polyandrous marriage exists everywhere to the knowledge of everybody, and yet it receives neither legal nor social sanction. As a consequence it must be a very low form, and entail evil upon every new generation. Anything will become base if it is placed under the ban, and to this monogamy itself would form no exception. Whatever must be done secretly and clandestinely will be done improperly and become an evil, though it possesses no intrinsically evil elements. Society declines to recognise the irrevocable laws of nature, one of the most persistent of which is that by which the sexes demand and seek each other. No human regulation can check this. The reproductive forces, developed and adapted to secure the perpetuity of the race, are always in operation. Society professes to provide for the greater part of the cases by sanctioning monogamous unions. But there remains, and there must always remain, a vast multitude for whom this provision is not sufficient. It would be impossible for society to guarantee the monogamous marriage<sup>1</sup> of all its members. The human race has grown so fastidious that it is not every man or woman that can find a suitable life-companion. The sentiment of love has become so delicate that it requires a certain degree of correspondence in all kinds of qualities to make such unions desirable or even tolerable. Again, there come in so many pecuniary considerations, which form barriers to marriage, that thousands who would gladly do so do not feel ready to take so important a step. . . . In these and many other ways it happens that society is constantly filled with men and women who have no legal access to one another. Modern society assumes, firstly, that all can marry if they will; secondly, that where they do not it is because they have no attachments for the opposite sex; and, thirdly, that all can abstain. Each of these assumptions is either absolutely or, in some qualified but legitimate sense, objectively untrue."<sup>2</sup>

It would be easy to take exception to some of the above remarks. For instance, instead of laying stress upon the prohibition of polygamy by the Church, Mr. Ward should, I think, rather have complained of the ecclesiastical censures which were poured upon those less formal and less durable connections to which Mr. Lecky has alluded as having been throughout Europe (as indeed they are still in some countries) perfectly honourable and respectable; and I think Mr. Ward would have done better had he pleaded more definitely for the rehabilitation and recognition of such unions, but the passage eloquently expresses the truth with regard to the condition of our modern society, and is all the more valuable as coming from an author who lays such stress upon the value of the higher form of love and the craving for its manifestation among the more cultured members of a highly civilised community.<sup>3</sup>

The following is an extract from a remarkable letter which appeared in the *Pall Mall Gazette* of June 3, 1887, signed "Philan-

<sup>1</sup> This evidently means the monogamous *lifelong* marriage.

<sup>2</sup> *Dynamic Sociology*, vol. i., p. 624 ff. (New York, 1883.)

<sup>3</sup> "In cultured communities a want of congeniality deters great numbers from marriage. The keener the sensibilities the greater the necessity for a manifestation of the higher form of love."—*Dynamic Sociology*, vol. i. p. 625.

thrope," and which was stated by the then editor to have been contributed by "one of the most eminent among those who believe in the God of the Biologists and not in the God of the Bible":

"You appear to assume," he writes to the editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, "that sexual congress, except under the conditions of matrimony, is not only undesirable as a general practice, but is *the* immoral thing, a terrible and heinous offence, to be denounced, hunted down, punished, and shuddered at wherever and whenever it may occur. I notice this assumption from time to time in paragraphs and articles in your pages having reference to widely varied occurrences. To me it appears to be an erroneous assumption. I regard the exercise of the functions in question as a natural, healthy, and praiseworthy proceeding, and I do not for a moment admit that, so long as fraud or violence have no part in the matter, there is anything in such proceedings on the part of man and woman which should excite condemnation. Persons belonging to this or that religious sect may regret that all such proceedings are not carried out with the sanctions prescribed by their particular Churches; but to regret is one thing, to condemn and punish is another. So long as the contract between a man and a woman—whether for a short or for a long period—is entered into voluntarily and without deception or malice on either side, I cannot see what ground of condemnation exists; and if the terms of the contract are faithfully carried out, who has a right to complain? I am aware that the answer which may be made to this question is that the community has a right to complain; that the community has in past ages desired a rapid increase in its numbers, and has instituted marriage (without enforcing it) as a means to that end. The community has also in civilised parts of the world, in some more than in others, persecuted and trampled upon women (but not men) who do not invoke the forms of marriage before exercising their sexual functions. In this way it comes about that those who are responsible for bringing women to the position of unmarried wives, or maintaining them in that position, or as polyandrists, are guilty of exposing those women to great suffering and degradation. Nevertheless, the community has so little conviction of its right to dictate in this matter that there is no law in any civilised country enforcing marriage or even forbidding polyandry. And further, now that we are no longer so anxious for the increase of population, the question arises whether the extreme violence of denunciation is not a survival from more primitive times<sup>1</sup> which has lost its sanction, and is doing more harm than good. The evils which are undeniably associated with the existence in society at this moment of polyandrous women are entirely due to the savage attitude of reprobation taken towards those women by society. In France, where civilisation is less primitive than in this country, the severe attitude belonging to more primitive times has been relaxed, and consequently, what are called 'loose women' of all degrees are far happier, far better, far more decent members of society than are their correlatives in England. Could the people of this country learn that now that the Middle Ages are past there is no population question which can lead, for reasons of State, to a condemnation of such free relations as may seem good to individual men and women, the misery of those women who find themselves by chance or by necessity leading polyandrous lives, would disappear. *They* would be

<sup>1</sup> The word "primitive" is, I think, wrongly applied. The "violence of denunciation" and "savage attitude of reprobation" subsequently spoken of, are of comparatively recent date. Historically Mr. Lecky is a better guide than "Philanthrope."

happier, and no one worse. It must surely be admitted, as no less a moralist than Renan has said, that a nation which, like France, is characterised by tolerance for departure from traditional sexual morality, has far less to reproach itself with than one, like England, where alcoholism is a passion with both sexes, and brutal violence and outrage to women and children a frequent charge against men of wealth and education."<sup>1</sup>

I do not pretend to say whether there be anything in these views which would be displeasing to "the God of the Bible." That expression is a varying one which has changed with every turn of the theological kaleidoscope. But so far, at any rate, as "Philanthrope" advocates the recognition and legitimisation by society of all voluntary contracts of *cohabitation* between man and woman I can see nothing in his contention in any way opposed, I will not say to the will of Jehovah but to the teachings of Jesus (I mean Jesus as seen through the pure glass of M. Renan, for example, not as distorted by monachists, scholastics, and doctors of the Church), and very sure I am that in so far as he denounces the "savage reprobation" of polyandrous women he is in perfect harmony with those teachings. So long as society refuses to recognise all other forms of sexual union than those of "life-long monogamy, tempered by divorce," so long will the existence of women of this class be a social necessity. The social reformer would fain hope, however, that a day will come when, as a result of the dissipation of prejudice, and the broadening and enlightenment of public opinion, that miserable necessity will gradually disappear. It is not the elevation of the prostitute that he seeks, but rather her absorption in a happier and more liberal social system. At the same time he welcomes the spirit which would mitigate the miseries of her lot.

Meanwhile we who hold unconventional views on these matters must of course be prepared for the denunciation of those who see "impurity" in all forms of sexual relationship outside the pale of our orthodox lifelong monogamy. All reformers must be prepared to endure the storms of obloquy and misrepresentation, more especially those who attack prejudice in its very citadel. But if we have to bear the scorn of the Pharisee, and ultimately, perchance, to suffer the pains of social crucifixion, we shall be sustained by the thought that we are labouring, as we earnestly believe, to alleviate some of the very worst miseries that afflict mankind, and

"They are slaves who dare not be  
In the right with two or three."

Purity! Let us have it by all means. But I protest against the

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Lecky writes: "A recent writer on Spain has noticed the almost complete absence of infanticide in that country, and has ascribed it to the great leniency of public opinion towards female frailty."—*History of European Morals*, vol. ii. p. 25, note (1).

monstrous doctrine that there is impurity in all sexual coming together of man and woman unless done under cover of marriage according to law. The idea that marriage according to law can make pure what was before impure seems to me almost too ridiculous to merit serious consideration. There may indeed be impurity in sexual relations, whether among the married or the unmarried, as there may be excess and degradation in the natural functions of eating and drinking; but that there is any impurity in the mere union of male and female moved thereto by mutual inclination, I for one most strenuously deny. To take an example: Pitiably indeed, as it seems to me, must be the mind of that man who can read the exquisite passages in which Byron has narrated the happiness of Juan and Haidée on their ocean isle as

“ arm in arm  
They yielded to the twilight’s purple charm,”

to find therein not the innocent raptures of divine and passionate love, but only the offence which springs from the miserable suggestions of his own morbid and impure imaginings! For myself I prefer the judgment of the poet Campbell, who writes, in scorn of the fastidious critic

“ Who minces virtue, and doth shake the head  
To hear of pleasure’s name,”

that “ if the loves of Juan and Haidée are not pure and innocent, the tender passion may as well be struck at once out of the list of the poet’s themes. We must shut our eyes and harden our hearts against the master-passion of our existence; and becoming mere creatures of hypocrisy and form, charge even Milton himself with folly.”

Let us, then, by all means have purity; but, in the name of reason and morality, let us not affect to see a lack of it in the natural satisfaction of natural desires. And let us beware of confounding purity with chastity. If by the latter term is to be understood, as it so commonly is, abstention from the exercise of the sexual functions, then chastity is no virtue. The Socialists have long ago arrived at a sound and reasonable opinion upon this matter which is well expressed in the following passage which I have taken from the writings of Herr Bebel:

“ When we consider the intensity of the sexual impulse we cannot be surprised at the effect which abstinence, at a mature age, exercises upon the nervous system and upon the whole constitution; we cannot wonder at the errors and perturbations, or even at the mental derangement and suicides to which it occasionally gives rise. The degree of perfection which any human being, either man or woman, can obtain, depends on the measure in which impulses and vital manifestations accentuate themselves in sex, or the extent to which sexual life finds its expression in

organic and spiritual development in form and character. Only when this expression is complete can the individual reach his own completion. 'In civilised society,' says Klöncke, in his book, *Woman in the Position of Wife*, 'the impetus towards sexual gratification is, it is true, placed under the guidance of those moral principles which reason dictates; but not even the most powerful will is able entirely to silence the urgent admonition to propagate the race which nature has expressed in the normal and organic differentiation of the sexes; and when healthy individuals of either sex do not fulfil this duty at some period of their lives, the reason is not to be sought in their unbiassed resolve to resist nature, even when this is affirmed to be the case, or when free-will is self-deceptively stated as the cause, but in social checks and their consequences, which have encroached on natural rights, stunted the growth of organs, and at the same time stamped the whole organism with the type of retrogression, of sexual imperfection, in appearance and character, while giving birth to morbid nervous tendencies and conditions of body and mind. Man becomes womanish, woman masculine, in form and nature, because sexual differentiation never reached the realisation intended in Nature's plan; the individual remained one-sided, never attaining the completion of himself, the perfection of his own existence.' And Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell says in her book, *The Moral Education of the Young in Relation to Sex*, 'The sexual impulse exists, as an indispensable condition of life, and as the basis of society. It is the greatest force in human nature. Whatever else disappears this remains. Often undeveloped, not even an object of thought, but none the less the *central fire of life*, this inevitable instinct is the natural protector against any possibility of extinction.' Thus does modern philosophy agree with the dicta of exact science and with the plain common sense of Luther. The outcome is that every human being has both the right and the duty to satisfy instincts which are not only intimately connected with his innermost being, but form an integral part of it. If social institutions or prejudices prevent the gratification of these instincts, the development of his being is checked, it becomes crippled and stunted. We may learn the consequence of such a system from our physicians, our hospitals, lunatic asylums, and prisons, to say nothing of the thousand cases in which families are broken up and their happiness destroyed."<sup>1</sup>

And this is the description given by the same writer of woman in the ideal state—woman in the future :

"In the choice of love she is free just as man is free. She woos and is wooed, and has no other inducement to bind herself than her own free-will. The contract between two lovers is of a private nature as in primitive times, without the intervention of any functionary, but it is distinguished from the primitive contract by the fact that the woman no longer becomes the slave of a man who obtained her as a gift or by purchase, and can cast her off at his pleasure. Human beings must be in a position to act as freely, where their strongest impulse is concerned, as in the case of any other natural instinct. The gratification of the sexual impulse is as strictly the personal affair of the individual as the gratification of every other natural instinct. No one has to give an account of him or herself, and no third person has the slightest right of intervention. Intelligence, culture and independence will direct and facilitate a right choice. Should incompatibility, disappointment, and dislike ensue, morality demands the dissolution of a tie that has become unnatural, and therefore immoral."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Woman in the Past, Present, and Future*. By August Bebel. Translated by H. B. Adams Walther. p. 45.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 229.



The clear spirit of Shelley long since soared into the future, and sang of this ideal state as though it had already come into being :

“Then, that sweet bondage which is freedom’s self,  
And rivets with sensation’s softest tie  
The kindred sympathies of human souls,  
Needed no fetters of tyrannic law.  
Those delicate and timid impulses  
In Nature’s primal modesty arose,  
And with undoubting confidence disclosed  
The growing longings of its dawning love,  
Unchecked by dull and selfish chastity,  
That virtue of the cheaply virtuous,  
Who pride themselves in senselessness and frost.  
No longer prostitution’s venomed bane,  
Poisoned the springs of happiness and life ;  
Woman and man, in confidence and love,  
Equal and free and pure, together trod  
The mountain-paths of virtue, which no more,  
Were stained with blood from many a pilgrim’s feet.”<sup>1</sup>

Another well-known Socialist, more distinguished for the *fortiter in re* than the *suaviter in modo*, after inveighing in no measured terms against “that form of humbug which pretends to regard the fulfilling of a natural physiological function, except under one condition, as something like a crime,” writes as follows :

“Society is directly concerned with (1) production of offspring, (2) with the care that things sexually offensive to the majority shall not be obtruded on public notice, or obscenity on ‘young persons.’ Beyond this all sexual actions (of course excluding criminal violence or fraud) are matters of purely individual concern. When a sexual act, from whatever cause, is not, and cannot be productive of offspring, the feeling of the majority has no *locus standi* in the matter. Not only is it properly outside the sphere of coercion, but it does not concern morality at all. It is a question simply of individual taste. The latter may be good or bad, but this is an aesthetic, and not directly a moral or social question.”<sup>2</sup>

With regard to the latter part of the above quoted passage, viz., that which has reference to sexual acts which “from whatever cause” cannot be productive of offspring, I should far exceed the limits of space imposed upon me were I to make the many observations which suggest themselves upon this branch of the subject. I will therefore content myself with referring to a very remarkable judgment delivered at Sydney by Mr. Justice Windeyer, senior puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of New South Wales, on December 12, 1888. The question for decision was whether Mrs. Besant’s pamphlet on the *Law of Population* was an obscene book, and the judgment of Mr. Justice Windeyer in favour of the work

<sup>1</sup> Shelley, *Queen Mab*. As Mrs. Cady Stanton well puts it, “a family of twelve children and an invalid wife casts no shadow on those who fill the most holy offices in the Church. But a healthy, happy mother and child outside the bonds of legal wedlock, though loving and beloved, are ostracised by the community as unchaste !”

<sup>2</sup> *The Ethics of Socialism*. By Delfort Dax, p. 126.

is, to my mind, one of the noblest judicial pronouncements ever delivered in a Court of Justice. It is animated by the very spirit of enlightened wisdom, and well indeed would it be for this country if we had more often upon the English Bench men not only as wise and enlightened as this colonial judge, but also of equal courage in giving fearless and outspoken exposition of the great principles of freedom and of justice.<sup>1</sup>

And now, having quoted from Socialistic writers, I cannot, I think, do better than cite the opinions of a well-known Individualist. A learned professor, some short time since, won cheap applause by a speech wherein he had severely denounced the late Mr. Parnell in connection with a notorious divorce case. On that particular incident I do not wish to make any comment whatever, but the harangue in question called forth a letter from Mr. Auberon Herbert, in which he wrote as follows to the editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette* :

“It breathes that deep, unconscious hypocrisy which pervades all of us in this matter, especially those who, with a very slight knowledge or understanding of their own human nature, proceed to denounce their fellow-men. . . . I deeply reverence the state of true marriage—by which I mean the faithful continuous attachment of two people to each other, without any legal restraint to perpetuate that attachment, when its inner life has departed—but I say that this true marriage is the concern of the two people themselves, and not the concern of the world outside them. . . . Women are to vote, to be lawyers, doctors, and so forth, but they are not to be treated as the real owners, with all the consequences, of their own selves. The modern Liberal, in this respect, is often like the Paris husband, who buys a revolver for 20 francs and dramatically shoots his wife, if she has betrayed him, amidst the half-suppressed applause of other Paris husbands. A sense of property in the wife—joined, of course, in France to the intense *amour propre* or vanity that has been injured—is at the bottom of the shooting, just as with us it is at the bottom of that foul creation, the Divorce Court and its money damages. No fouler institution was ever invented; and its existence drags on, to our deep shame, just because we have not the courage frankly to say that the sexual relations of husband and wife, or those who live together, concern their own selves, and do not concern the prying, gloating, self-righteous, and intensely untruthful world outside them.”<sup>2</sup>

It will be seen that the Individualist here agrees with the Socialist, and both, in my opinion, are right. At first sight what Mr. Herbert says concerning the Divorce Court might appear to be opposed to the views of some modern reformers who advocate greater freedom of divorce as a partial remedy for the evils of the present state of things. But the two contentions are not, I think, irreconcilable. I agree with Mr. Herbert that the Divorce Court, as it now exists, is a foul institution. That judge, jury, and learned counsel should be called together in open court in order that husband and wife

<sup>1</sup> This admirable judgment was published as a pamphlet, under the title, *Is Limitation of the Family Immoral?* by Mrs. Besant and the late Charles Bradlaugh. Everyone should read it who cares for free thought or for social reforms.

<sup>2</sup> *Pall Mall Gazette*, January 15, 1890. The italics are mine.

may bring evidence, the one against the other—the evidence of detectives, domestic servants, stained linen, *testes lupanares*, intercepted correspondence, *et hoc genus omne*—in the endeavour to establish the sexual act which the law now requires to be proved, seems to me a monstrous and peculiarly repulsive proceeding; and no less repulsive is it, to my mind, that “the injured husband” should make money in the shape of damages, because his wife has chosen to give herself to another. The institution is detrimental to the best interests of the community, and when those free unions which Mr. Herbert, in common with many other advanced thinkers, desiderates, are recognised as part of our social system, it will expire like an obscene bird for lack of its nauseating food. At present the law puts a premium upon adultery by making it a necessary condition of divorce. Meantime, however, while legal lifelong monogamy is the only recognised form of sexual union, a great step in advance would be gained if husband and wife were allowed to dissolve their marriage for other causes, the proof whereof might be harmlessly given, or by mutual consent after such legal formalities and under such conditions as may be thought expedient. Meantime, too, men must be taught that wives are not the property of their husbands, and women must learn that they are, as Mr. Herbert puts it, “the real owners, with all the consequences, of themselves.” Education is gradually teaching them this.

“As a general rule the development of the heart and fancy has hitherto been cultivated in woman to an altogether disproportionate extent; the development of her reasoning faculties, on the other hand, has been checked or grossly neglected. She consequently suffers literally from an hypertrophy of feeling, and is, therefore, generally accessible to every kind of superstition and fraud; she is a fruitful soil for all forms of religious and other charlatanism, and a willing tool in the hands of every reactionary party. This is frequently regretted by short-sighted and narrow-minded men, who suffer from the results, but do nothing to mend matters, because they are mostly over head and ears in prejudices themselves.”<sup>1</sup>

We must trust to the new education—a higher and *broader* education—to change all this. I for one have faith in “the Woman of the Future,” and I believe that in no long time to come it will be found that the majority of women, so far from condemning, will be found warmly to advocate the views which I am briefly attempting to set forth.<sup>2</sup>

Here, and in illustration of the remarks which I have made with reference to the essential difference between chastity and purity, I

<sup>1</sup> Bebel's *Woman in the Past, Present and Future*, p. 65.

<sup>2</sup> Mrs. Cady Stanton writes in the article from which I have already quoted: “Emerson, one of the purest of men, dwells on the rare and beautiful sentiment that runs through George Sand's *Consuelo*, and who can deny the evidence of keen political insight, lofty ideas, and pure morality in the writings of such women as Mary Wollstonecroft, Frances Wright, and George Elliot; and yet all these rejected the English code of morals.”

cannot refrain from quoting from Mr. Knight's delightful book, *The Cruise of the Falcon*, a description of the people of Paraguay. Of the women, he writes :

"They have well-moulded limbs, voluptuous lustrous eyes, and are of every colour, from mahogany to the white and pink complexion of the fairest Anglo-Saxon. The dress of a Paraguayan woman consists merely of a snow-white tunic, coming down to the knees, and a white shawl. . . . These women are bare-footed. . . . They stalk through the streets with a soft, supple, panther-like tread, that is most beautiful, for they do not indulge in high-heeled boots and stays, but step out as Eve herself might have done, quite unimpeded by their simple dress, which is merely a short tunic tied round at the waist, and adorned with the pretty native lace. These tunics have short sleeves and very low necks, and reveal the statuesque shoulders and breasts rather more than would be considered delicate in Europe. . . . This mild race lives principally on oranges, pumpkins, cassava, and other fruits and vegetables, being almost vegetarian. . . . Many are the virtues of these poor, brave Paraguayans ; they are hospitable, kindly, honest, and though marriage is looked upon as an unnecessary prelude to two young people starting housekeeping together, they are remarkably constant in their attachments. The Paraguayan girls are like Byron's savage heroines, faithful unto death, soft as doves, but ready to give up their lives for their mates. What I particularly remarked was the jovial gay nature of this amiable and innocent race."<sup>1</sup>

Then adds Mr. Knight, "In this land none see any shame in unlawful love." The expression is singularly infelicitous. The loves of these innocent Paraguayans are *not* "unlawful" for the very reason that "none see any shame" in them. They are open, recognised, and honourable. *O fortunatos nimium sua si bona norint.* Where is the impurity here, where the sin? A happy, innocent, vegetarian race, living in conformity with the dictates of Nature. Far, far distant be the day when they shall be cursed with the evils of our civilisation—strict lifelong monogamy, prostitution, and the Divorce Court!

I maintain, then, that there is nothing impure, nothing wrong in the voluntary sexual act *per se*, though not sanctioned by what we now term marriage. It is, of course, impossible to disregard the opinion of society, or of the great majority of society, without bringing suffering upon ourselves or others. As a general rule, therefore, it is wrong to set that opinion at defiance, however false and prejudiced we may esteem it. How far one is justified in disregarding the opinions and prejudices of others every man must judge for

<sup>1</sup> *The Cruise of the Falcon*, pp. 235 and 243. We may compare with this Mr. Froude's description of the West Indian negroes. "Morals in the technical sense they have none, but they cannot be said to sin because they have no knowledge of a law, and, therefore, they can commit no breach of the law. They are naked and not ashamed. They are married, as they call it, but not *parsoned*. The woman prefers a looser tie that she may be able to leave a man if he treats her unkindly. Yet they are not licentious. I never saw an immodest look in one of their faces, and never heard of any venal profligacy. The system is peculiar, but it answers. A missionary told me that a connection rarely turns out well which begins with a legal marriage." (*The English in the West Indies*, p. 49.) Truly I think we may learn something even from the West Indian negro.

himself in the circumstances of each particular case, and upon full consideration of the consequences. But it is the manifest duty of all those who are convinced that the opinion and practice of the society whereof they are members is false and pernicious, to endeavour to modify and to change that opinion and practice by giving free expression to the views which they honestly entertain.

But now some one will ask, What of the children of these free unions? Are their interests to be neglected in a reformed society? The answer is clear: "Humanity would rise and thunder, Nay." The happiness and well-being of the children must be the first consideration of the community, and not for a moment would I advocate the views embodied in these pages did I think that their general adoption would be prejudicial to the young. But my belief is the very opposite. The position of children would be vastly improved if public opinion would but recognise as honourable other unions besides those cast in the one orthodox legal mould of to-day. What is the state of things now? Our present system (if that which is chaotic can be called a system) involves untold miseries of child-suffering and mortality. No small portion of this misery would disappear if these less permanent connections, these secondary marriages (if so you choose to call them), could be formed in the light of day, without fear and without reproach. The odious distinction between (so-called) "legitimate" and "illegitimate" children, with all the cruel injustice which it involves, would be swept away; infanticide and those other evils to which I have before alluded would be vastly diminished, and girls would not, as now, be forced by desperation into the ranks of prostitution. These and many other considerations at once suggest themselves as showing that the position of children would be improved by a broader, more tolerant, and more reasonable public opinion on these matters. Nor is there the slightest reason to apprehend that the children of these marriages (using the word with the meaning assigned to it by Mr. Westermarck) should be one whit less cared for than the children of lifelong monogamy-cum-divorce. Marriage with a deceased wife's sister, generally the best and happiest marriage that a widower can make, is no marriage at all according to our barbarous English law; but I have never heard it suggested that the children of such unions, though "illegitimate" in this enlightened country, are less well cared for than the offspring of legal marriages. Indeed, all experience proves the very contrary. It is rather where man and woman live together in lawful wedlock which has become odious to both that the position of the children is most pitiable.

<sup>1</sup> I strongly object to this word. Why illegitimate? There is no law against the procreation of such children, and we have a much better adjective whereby to express their position, viz., *natural*. The rural population in the South of England appropriately speak of them as "love children." How odious is the spirit that can cast reproach upon these children of nature and of love!

Moreover, it is competent for the State to lay down such laws and regulations as may be expedient to secure the welfare of the children; nor would there be the slightest difficulty in the task.\*

Mr. Lester Ward writes :

“There is a tendency on the part of a great many radical reformers to hasten the completion of Nature's great cycle, and inaugurate a return to a civilised form of promiscuity. These claim, of course, that it shall possess none of the coarse and repugnant features of the savage custom, shall be founded on the absolute freedom and choice of the parties, and that offspring under their system shall receive even greater protection at the hands of the community and the parents than they receive under the monogamous system.”

There is an obvious difference between the less durable connections (or secondary marriages) spoken of by Mr. Lecky and “promiscuity,” however civilised; and for the latter Mr. Ward thinks the age is not prepared; but he adds, “It is, nevertheless, true that there is much room for improving the system of monogamy, and undoubtedly the progress of liberal and enlightened sentiment in monogamous countries will eventually remove the present strait-jacket in which society now so awkwardly labours.”<sup>1</sup>

It will, of course, be said, “Society is based upon the family, and if you attack the family you attack society.” That has become a parrot-cry among the opponents of all reform in sexual matters. I answer, in the first place, that society was indeed once based upon the family; but that was in old patriarchal times, and they were times of polygamy and concubinage. As Sir Henry Maine says: “The unit of an ancient society was the family; of a modern society, the individual,” and “the disintegration of the family” in modern times is a theme which has of late been much discussed by sociologists. But, putting this aside, I say that we are not attacking society, but endeavouring to reform it—to make it better and happier. Perfection is not attainable by man; he can only endeavour to ascertain on which side the good preponderates. Evils there must necessarily be in any system; and I say again, let the critic consider those appalling evils which afflict society under present conditions. As to the family in its present form, it exists in spite of the fact that lifelong legal monogamy is, as Bebel points out, “a social institution beyond the reach of millions,” and it is safe to say that this “the family-group proper, composed of parents and offspring,”<sup>2</sup> will flourish no less because of the *extension* of marriage—i.e., the adoption and recognition by society of other forms beside those of “the dominant type.”

I have freely and designedly quoted from the writings of others, for I think it most desirable that all advanced opinions on this great

*Dynamic Sociology*, vol. II, p. 214.

Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, vol. I, p. 740.

and difficult question should be collected and collated. Eminently desirable, also, is it that these matters should be freely and openly discussed without any of that false modesty which is one of the most contemptible of the mock-virtues, being, indeed, the sworn ally of ignorance and of prejudice. In conclusion I would take up the scattered threads. My main contentions, then, are as follow :

(1) That the true relation of the sexes is, as Mrs. Cady Stanton says, still an unsolved problem.

(2) That it is ridiculous to suppose that all sexual connections are lawful if stamped with the State die of lifelong monogamy; all others deadly sins.

(3) That modern society, more especially in England, has erred grievously, and the cause of humanity suffered infinitely, by the social ban which has been laid upon those less durable connections, which, as Mr. Lecky says, "have always subsisted side by side with permanent marriages."

(4) That the evils which now underlie the social surface are appalling; that many of such evils have their origin in this false attitude of society in regard to sexual matters; and that such evils would be in great measure mitigated or removed as the result of the spread of opinions at once more liberal and more just.

(5) That it is the duty of every one who is convinced of the truth of the above propositions to endeavour by all legitimate means to promote the growth of such opinions.

(6) That all whose opinions on these subjects are in substantial agreement should combine, without distinction of political or religious creed, with a view to the further discussion of these things among themselves, and to the dissemination of their opinions among the people.

I will only add that if this paper, which very imperfectly represents the result of many years' consideration of the problem whereof it treats, shall but induce one person, male or female, to bestow deeper thought upon these questions than he or she has hitherto given to them, it will not have been written all in vain.

BESWICKE ANCRUM.

## STATE-AIDED INSTRUCTION IN ART.

THE increasing yearly expenditure on Art by the Department of Science and Art at South Kensington, leads one to ask to what extent the results of art-instruction justify so large an outlay from the public purse. Starting, in 1836, with a grant of £1500 this sum has been steadily mounting up till, in the present financial year (1893-4), the Treasury has been called upon to provide more than a quarter of a million pounds sterling. Of this over £180,000 is for the public elementary schools and training colleges of England, Wales and Scotland, and the remainder for the schools of art and art classes throughout the United Kingdom.

The history of the Department of Science and Art gives a very fair idea of the influences under which the system of art-instruction was first promoted. In 1835 a Select Committee of the House of Commons was appointed "to inquire into the best means of extending a knowledge of the art and of the principles of design among the people (especially the manufacturing population) of the country." In its Report the establishment of a normal school of design with a museum and lectures was recommended, and in 1836 the Lords Commissioners of her Majesty's Treasury were pleased to set aside a sum of £1500 for the purpose. The school was opened on June 1, 1837, in Somerset House, and a Council, consisting of certain Royal Academicians and others interested in art-matters, was constituted the governing body. A few years later (1841) the Government of the day became alive to the necessity for schools of design in the provinces, and by promising an annual grant for the payment and training of teachers and for various other purposes, assisted in the formation and maintenance of such schools. Thus was fostered the desire for art-instruction which was at this time springing up in every quarter, but more especially in the manufacturing districts.

In 1851 there were no less than seventeen provincial schools of design in working order in busy centres of industry, the more important of them being situated at Manchester, Birmingham, Glasgow, Leeds and Paisley. These institutions absorbed more than one-half of the grant of £15,000 made at that time by the Treasury.

In the meanwhile an inquiry into the condition of these schools.



had revealed a state of affairs which was far from satisfactory, and in the Speech from the Throne at the opening of Parliament in 1852 her Majesty the Queen stated that "the advancement of the fine arts and of practical science will be readily recognised by you as worthy the attention of a great and enlightened nation. I have directed that a comprehensive scheme shall be laid before you, having in view the promotion of these objects, towards which I invite your aid and co-operation."

A scheme was accordingly prepared and steps taken to promote its furtherance. Its chief points were :

- (a) The promotion of elementary instruction in drawing and modelling ;
- (b) Special instruction in the knowledge and practice of ornamental art ; and
- (c) The practical application of such knowledge to the improvement of manufactures.

Examples in elementary drawing were prepared for public elementary schools, and in order to encourage their use were supplied at half the cost price. At the same time a class for the instruction of teachers in these schools was opened at Marlborough House, whither the National Training School of Art had been removed from Somerset House in 1853. Classes for the training of designers for woven fabrics, paper-staining, metal work (*repoussé*, chasing, casting, &c.), and architecture, and for porcelain-painting, wood-engraving, lithography, and casting and moulding, were now opened, being supplemental to the training class, in which a systematic course of instruction for masters of schools of art was given. The provincial schools of design were supplemented by the establishment of schools of art, which received aid on much the same lines as were then in force.

The various inducements held out by the Department to teachers and students in the public elementary schools and schools of art had met with a fair amount of success, so that in 1857 more than 43,000 scholars were being taught elementary drawing in the former, and 12,500 students were receiving instruction of a more advanced nature in the latter, as against about 7000 in 1853. In fact, to so large dimensions had the work connected with art schools grown, that the Department found it necessary at this time to organise a regular yearly inspection of them. By this means were the schools kept in more thorough touch with the central authority, and at the same time suggestions could be made far more easily to the local committees and alterations recommended, by which the instruction might be adapted to the needs of the locality and maintained in a higher state of efficiency.

In 1863 the system of grants made to the schools was altered to one of pure payment on results of instruction as tested by the

yearly examinations held by the Department. National scholarships were instituted to enable a small number of advanced students, who were training to become designers or manufacturers' draughtsmen, to complete their studies at the National Art Training School (which had been transferred to South Kensington from Marlborough House in 1856) and in the South Kensington Museum, each scholar receiving a weekly allowance towards his maintenance.

A third Select Committee of the House of Commons sat in 1864 to inquire into the constitution, working, and success of schools of art, and its recommendations were to a certain extent adopted. Night classes were formed for instruction in drawing, and a few years later aid was extended to all art classes, subject to complying with the Department's rules. These classes are distinct from schools of art both as regards constitution and teaching, which latter is of an intermediate character. They are usually in session from September to May, and meet on two or three evenings of the week, while a school of art is practically open throughout the whole year.

Elementary drawing is now a compulsory subject for boys in all public elementary schools, and an examination is held year by year previous to a grant being made.

In 1892 no less than 2,111,332 persons received art instruction in some form or another, and of this number the schools of art supplied more than 50,000, the art classes more than 65,000, and the public elementary schools and training colleges the remainder.

The foregoing particulars undoubtedly give evidence of a great increase in art-instruction and a consequent increase in the annual demands on the National Exchequer, and the question at issue resolves itself, roughly speaking, into two divisions :

First. Are the British workmen made more efficient as a consequence of the instruction received? And

Second. Are our manufactures made at all independent of foreign aid?

To the former question there can be but one answer, and that in the affirmative. No one can seriously question for a moment that the mechanic or artisan, who has had some instruction in the elements of drawing, is at an advantage when compared with one who is untutored in this respect. The workman who is able to transfer his ideas to paper saves time, material and money. He has a commodity which gives him the pull of the market when his competitors lack a similar ability. So much labour need not be spent in experimenting his plans, and there is a saving in every respect. To place a workman in this position should be, and is, to a large extent, the outcome of the teaching given in our public elementary schools, where the embryo mechanic is taught drawing from the outline and from models as well as the rudiments of geometry.

The full effects of the present policy of teaching drawing to all boys in the elementary schools cannot, however, yet be realised, since it is only within the last few years that it has been made a compulsory subject. But in all our large centres of manufacturing industry the art night classes have been mostly attended by artisan students, many of whom, not content with a knowledge of elementary art, have passed on to more advanced stages.

The second question, unfortunately, is not by any means so easily answered. For many years our workmen have never been called upon to do more than carry out the designs obtained from foreign sources. In the first half of the present century there can be no doubt that we, as a nation, failed to supply our manufacturers with both designers and designs. The result was that the demand was met mainly from France. To a larger extent than the circumstances of the case have warranted the demand during the last quarter of a century has been met in the same way. This has been due to many causes. Living is much cheaper abroad than here and labour consequently works for less. It is but natural that the home of the fine arts should cultivate a better knowledge of art in all its branches, and should produce a more artistic race than could be met with in countries not so advantageously situated.

But, if it be necessary for our manufacturers to still depend on sources outside their native land, what is the use of spending so much money on art-instruction, making it a luxury rather than a valuable aid to our national resources? And if there be no demand for native designers there will be a scant supply or none at all.

It is, however, satisfactory to know that within the last decade a great change has taken place in this respect, and the public interest taken in our schools of art, in which the schools of design have long been merged, has supplied a stimulus which has been most beneficial in its effect. The time when our designers were practically laughed out of court has vanished. The indomitable courage of our race would not allow itself to be beaten in the struggle, and our foreign competitors have long since realised that their British opponents could more than hold the field. Not many years have passed since Manchester and such like places were the "happy hunting grounds" of foreign designers, both clever and indifferent. But in the slow and silent battle, to which the budding tree of art-knowledge has given birth, they have gradually lost their ground and a native industry of no mean dimensions has been created.

That this has been accomplished is sure and certain evidence that the money annually expended from the public-purse is well-spent. There is a direct return which increases year by year and the investment is a profitable one. We employ our own people and a larger amount of money is laid out in our midst.

It is necessary, however, to point out that, in spite of all that has been done in the past, much more is yet needed. Our designers cannot afford to rest on their oars. And there is no reason to suppose that what is needed will not be done, provided our manufacturers will only afford the necessary employment. Prejudice towards our own talent is unpatriotic, and a constant recourse to Continental schools for designs for English manufactures must be an obstacle to progress, especially when as good or better designs may be had at home. Nor from an economical point of view can such action be commended. For it is well known that the annual pilgrimages, which are still made to Continental schools and studios by many English manufacturers, result in buying up all the designs of one particular *atelier*, in using the one or two which may be original and otherwise suitable and in discarding the rest.

The pessimist who wishes to show that we are not an artistic people and therefore cannot produce designers, is never at a loss for figures to sustain his theory. But figures may be made to prove almost anything. For instance, it is often stated that because the number of candidates sitting for the examination in design annually held by the Science and Art Department is represented only by hundreds, the results of art-instruction as affecting the manufacturing districts and industries are not commensurate with the outlay. But it must be remembered that the examinations held by this Department are suitable for the various stages through which a designer must pass in the course of his training. Some students take nearly all of these examinations in successive years, while others are content to take only a portion of them, and, having attained a certain degree of success, leave the State-aided schools to study in private studios and institutions, where they can follow that particular branch of design for which they are most adapted, and where they are unfettered by the rules and regulations which must necessarily go hand in hand with State aid. Thus the examinations held do not fully gauge the results of art-instruction. Apart from this, however, the fact that the schools of art at such places as Birmingham, Manchester, Glasgow, Hanley, Derby, and others, are very largely attended by students, who, if not actually engaged in design, are training with that end in view, is conclusive that the system of public art-instruction now in vogue supplies a public demand, and justifies the outlay from the national exchequer.

Whether the instruction given is wholly suitable to the purpose, or whether the control of the Science and Art Department is always judiciously exercised or not, are points on which it is conceivable that there may be a wide divergence of opinion. But, if it be necessary for local schools of art to have greater latitude in their courses of study, the control must be transferred to the locality, which, in turn, must pay the piper. It is extremely improbable,

however, that any advantage which might be derived from such a change would outweigh the disadvantages which would ensue, to say nothing of the conflicting standards of success which the various localities might adopt. Under the present system the same standard prevails throughout the United Kingdom, with the result that weak schools are brought up to a minimum, which may be called the level of success, and general satisfaction is afforded to those schools which surpass this level.

In addition, it must be remembered that the interest in art-matters generally, and the great increase in artistic decoration which is now a prominent feature in so many of the homes of the democracy, are in no small degree due to the spread of art-education in our midst, while the lasting popularity of the provincial art-galleries and museums is sufficient testimony that the national development of art is no passing craze.

ARTHUR J. PITMAN.

## MR. GOLDWIN SMITH IN LITERATURE AND POLITICS.

THE name of this eminent English scholar and writer, who during thirty years past has made his home alternately in England, the United States, and Canada, is received with respect in every part of the civilised world, and especially wherever English literature and culture are cherished, the Imperial problems of England considered, or the future of the Anglo-Saxon race discussed.

That this respect is modified, however, by many differing influences and impulses is inevitable from the very nature of the work in which Mr. Goldwin Smith has been engaged. To his keen ability and brilliant power of invective, to his abundant facility of literary expression, and his unusual power of condensed exposition, all English-speaking communities bear unstinted praise. But the stream of pamphlets and books, letters and lectures, magazine and review articles, which have poured from his pen during many years past have dealt with such a variety of subjects, have been so bitter in their criticism of contemporaries, and so merciless in many cases in their treatment of the men of other days; have dealt so caustically with the principles of opponents and the policies of nations, that popularity for the author is out of the question, even though the public of three or four continents read what he has written and place his name amid those of the great writers of the time.

Yet the influence of the distinguished author is hardly commensurate with his ability and reputation. This may be due to the fact that his career has been too cosmopolitan, that his efforts have been too general in their application, his views not sufficiently national in their scope to suit the peoples concerned and the interests dealt with. It may be that an utter inability to appreciate in certain cases the force of popular opinion, and a general inclination to care nothing for sentiment when opposed to theory, have been factors to this same end. It may also be that mistakes in political prophecy, unfortunate plunges into contemporary politics, self-contradiction in the literary advocacy or denunciation of various principles and proposals, combined with a popular belief that his opinions are formed from reading books rather than from reading men, militate against the influence which Mr. Goldwin Smith might have exerted in his day and generation.

The public of this age, whether it be in Australia or America, Britain or Canada, likes the confident, hopeful, invigorating leader. People do not, as a rule, understand despair or appreciate lack of faith in the nation's future or in the world's evolution upwards. Inability to see the bright side of things is a sure pass to unpopularity and decreased influence, and much of the dislike in which Mr. Goldwin Smith is held by many of those who most admire his abilities and respect his courage, is due to their belief that "progress has no genuine interest for him; that the maudling enthusiasm of humanity offends his taste; and that he knows nothing of the faith which can construct an ideal future and live ever in the hope of it." The hopefulness of Tennyson, the brightness of Lowell, the patriotism of Froude, the kindness of Holmes, have had greater influence in their respective countries than the brilliant bitterness and profound pessimism of Mr. Goldwin Smith could have were his pen to be wielded for a hundred years to come. And the fact that he assumes a position international in its scope, illustrates all the more effectually this solitary note of monotonous sorrow issuing at frequent intervals from the scholar's study at Toronto, Washington, or London. In his repeated journeys through the realm of history we cannot help feeling that

"He has but wandered there  
To waft us back the message of despair."

To him the Imperial position of England is a mistake, and the disruption of the Empire inevitable. Already "the cable is worn to its last strand," and a maritime war in which England was involved "would probably be the end." The British troops are but few now in the British Colonies, because the various sections of the Empire are able to look after their own local defence. But to him it is a cause for rejoicing, and "soon the beat of that drum will go round the world with the rising sun no more." The "inevitable receptacle" of the British agricultural labourer, "if he has the misfortune to reach old age, is the penal workhouse," and meantime he "is as ignorant of all political questions as the team he drives." The factory hands of the north of England are "citizens of the labour market" rather than of their own country, and are "impregnated with Socialist sentiment," open to economical fallacies, and animated by class hatreds. The Irish peasantry and the populace of Irish cities "are thoroughly disaffected." The demagogues are rapidly obtaining control of the State, and the proposition to pay Members of Parliament, as is done in most other countries, makes him assert that it is a strange sight to see a highly civilised, wealthy, refined, and luxurious community thus "calling in the barbarians."

More extraordinary still, he avers in a letter to the *Times*, written

in March of last year, that the British constituencies are, "on the whole, much less intelligent, and have undergone less political training" than those by which the American House of Representatives is elected. In the light of other and bitter denunciations of the latter electorate, this statement is surely amazing. But he believes that party government and the elective system are everywhere more or less of a failure, and asks, in the *North American Review* of May 1892, in a sort of climax of pessimism, "whether elective government, properly so called, has ever in the case of nations or large constituencies really existed, or can be made really to exist?" Throughout England, in recent times, "men identified with property have pandered to vain hopes of public plunder." Englishmen have not scrupled "to accept the aid and sympathy of England's bitterest enemies." Christian statesmen have laboured to "poison the heart of society," and it is difficult to see "what will be left for the next faction fight to destroy."

In the United States matters seem, to his mind, to be even worse. The Presidential elections hold out a prize every four years to "armies of office-seekers, ever growing more numerous, more hungry, and more unscrupulous," and, in the interval, the "process of irritation, corruption, and demoralisation is never suspended." He draws this picture in 1830, and in September 1892 concludes it to be "scarcely possible that this should go on for ever without a crash." And the Republic is so much distracted by these internal contests that he now considers the pursuit of any object of national aspiration, requiring a far-sighted and steady policy, as "almost hopeless." Meantime, as though its other troubles did not appear sufficiently alarming, Mr. Goldwin Smith greatly fears "Jewish ascendancy" in the States, and declares, in an article written a year ago, that the "chosen people" are getting American journals into their hands, together with a considerable share of the wealth of the North, and a still larger share of the wealth of the South. In fact, "the Jews are likely soon to add America to the number of their conquests."

But the degradation of England and the United States is as nothing compared to the sad situation of Canada. When Mr. Goldwin Smith came to the Dominion twenty years ago, he was enthusiastically welcomed as one who would help to develop local talent, extend literary culture, dissipate erroneous notions abroad concerning his adopted country, and lend his great abilities to the promotion of its national aspirations. He came to Canada when its people were in the first flush of youthful ambition and national pride, and had his sympathies been in the slightest degree directed towards the realisation of popular wishes, Canadians would have regarded him as a leader and greatly cherished his counsel. But from the first his feelings were pessimistic, and his opinions soured



by the spirit of discontent. Courtesy and kindness were of no avail against this armour of bitterness, and ere long the people as a whole, while respecting his abilities and reading his comments on public questions, came to look upon his views as those of a brilliant outsider who knew nothing and cared less for the country which had given him home and hospitality.

And to-day, after Canada has enjoyed Confederation for a quarter of a century; increased its trade by over a hundred million dollars; spent two hundred millions upon railways, canals, and public works; added a country of two million square miles to its territory; built the greatest railway in the world, and placed itself in the forefront of young and rising nations,—all Mr. Goldwin Smith can say is that “its lack of any natural basis, geographical, commercial, or even social has almost compelled it to maintain itself by corrupt means.” Or perhaps he observes in some English paper regarding a section of the country which had gone strongly Conservative in the elections of 1891, because the people there feared that the Liberal policy might involve annexation: “the outlying and decayed provinces are bribed without disguise.” Or possibly he notes in the case of a Western Province that “the sound and only hopeful policy” is one which says, “Be no longer Tories or Liberals, but Manitobans.” Before the C.P.R. was built, the proper course for Canada was to give up that “ruinous undertaking,” break its pledge to give British Columbia railway communication with the East, and “restore to that province her independence.” His book upon *Canada and the Canadian Question* devotes many pages to reaching the curious conclusion that Quebec is “a little French nation” outside the current of what should be the national life. Yet French Canadians have sacrificed much to make the Dominion, have voted patriotically upon most of the important issues, and have shared fully in the necessary taxation for great public undertakings.

Loyalty in Canada he considers a sham, the refuge of the scoundrel, the perquisite of the professional politician, the password of the office-seeker. Yet, strange to say, it is the most popular principle of the day, the basis of electoral victories, the platform of successful leaders and parties. Being, however, neither of the people nor amongst them, Mr. Goldwin Smith is unable to comprehend this fact, nor the further one of a general ambition to build up in Canada a great British state. To him this aspiration is ignominious and dangerous, so much so that he appeals to the American people in a letter, dated Washington, March 23 of last year, and asks those who favour moderate reciprocal arrangements with Canada, if they are “disposed to play into the hands of their avowed enemies and help them to erect Canada into an outpost of British Tory hostility to the institutions and hopes of the New World.”

In his opinions and writings whatever stands for Canadian unity

and British power upon this continent is anti-American and should be crushed; whatever is hopeful in sentiment should be discouraged; whatever is loyal to the Empire should be denounced.

It might be thought that pessimism could hardly go much further. But Mr. Goldwin Smith seems to have an inexhaustible fund of it. Not only is England going to the dogs through electoral ignorance and indifference; the United States on the verge of ruin through popular struggles for spoils of office; Canada in the very depths of degradation from political corruption; but Christianity itself is doubtful in origin and interpretation. Writing in the *Nineteenth Century* of October 1881 concerning the Jewish question, he observes that:

“It is surely time for the rulers of Christian Churches in general and for those of the Established Church in particular, to consider whether the sacred books of the Hebrews ought any longer to be presented as they are now to Christian people as pictures of the Divine character and of the Divine dealings with mankind. Historical philosophy reads them with a discriminating eye. But the people are not historical philosophers.”

And he goes on to speak of the long series of “equivocal passages which shocked the moral sense of Bishop Colenso,” and of which Colonel Ingersoll, “the great apostle of Agnosticism in America, makes use with such terrible effect.” It is a little difficult to understand the author’s exact position in this connection, but the shadows of doubt reflected in the quoted passages may serve to throw some faint light upon the nature of his perennial pessimism.

This pronounced quality of his has found a natural outlet from time to time in prophecy. So far the prophetic utterances, or rather forebodings, have never been realised, but they are none the less interesting and characteristic. Writing in 1880, he declares that, “if Russia could find a single ally among the Powers of Europe, the case of the Empress of India would be desperate.” The ally has been found, but we have yet to see the result depicted. We are also told, during the same year, that “the voice of England will henceforth be weak in the councils of Europe,” but it is probable that the many admirers of the strong foreign policy of Lord Salisbury and Lord Rosebery, and all those who understand the influence and prestige of Great Britain as it exists to-day, will be more amused than alarmed by such gloomy utterance. Then we are told that when “the Fisheries Question comes round, the Americans, in any demands they may make, will feel that they have Russia behind them.” In view of the recent amicable settlement of this problem, and the entire absence of even a hint of Russian-American alliance in that connection, comment is hardly necessary.

The world at large has had some reason to admire and copy the principles of British liberty, and the evolution of modern civilisation towards higher and better ideals has owed much to the example of

England. But to Mr. Goldwin Smith, writing in the *Contemporary Review* so far back as December 1878, "the probability seems to be that the leadership of political progress, which has hitherto belonged to England and has constituted the special interest of her history, will in the near future pass into other hands." To the eye of the ordinary observer, however, as opposed to the opinion of the distinguished student, England seems never to have been so full of national virility, so instinct with Imperial sentiment, so conscious of her civilising mission and Christian influence as she is to-day.

Meantime this gift of prophecy has been abundantly poured out upon Canada. When the Canadian Provinces in 1880 decided that the Dominion could never form the home of an united people, or in fact amount to anything, unless its very much separated sections were bound together by a continental railway, Mr. Goldwin Smith denounced the proposal as "an act of insanity." He repeated over and over again that from a commercial point of view it was "nothing but madness." To-day the Canadian Pacific is not only a magnificent success from a business standpoint, but it has answered the purposes of those who started the enterprise, and, besides uniting the provinces in trade and intercourse, has made for the closer unity of the Empire at large. Fifteen years ago the annexation of Canada to the United States was predicted, and since then no effort has been spared by the present President of the Continental Union Club of Toronto—a moribund institution—to achieve that end. In 1887 he declared it to be "my avowed conviction that the union of the English-speaking race upon this Continent will some day come to pass." It is not necessary to dwell upon the result of this prophecy. Suffice it to say that the mere suspicion of having annexation sentiments is enough to defeat any candidate for political place in Canada; that the fear of too American a tendency in their trade policy defeated the Liberals at the last election; that no man of position or repute, excepting Mr. Goldwin Smith, can be found in Canada to publicly support the idea; and that its advocacy has led the latter to complain bitterly of being socially ostracised in Toronto and compelled to resign his membership in a powerful charitable body of Englishmen in that city.

In an article written last July, it is said that the result of the recent American elections "is a death-blow to the system of protection on this continent." The present fight over that extremely protectionist measure, the Wilson Bill, and the recent victory of Mr. McKinley in Ohio and of the Republicans in other states, is sufficient answer to the idea that President Cleveland's free-trade theories are ever likely to be other than protectionist in practice. But Mr. Goldwin Smith has by no means confined himself to the broad field of political prophecy. In one of his "Lectures on the Study of History," delivered at Oxford in 1859-61, he declares that "the

grand cause of division in Christendom" is soon to be removed, concluding that "if historical symptoms are to be trusted, the long death-agony of three centuries is about to terminate, and within no very long period the Papacy will cease to exist."

This extraordinary announcement hardly requires to be controverted. Whether for good or ill, the power of the Pope seems to be extending rather than the reverse, and certainly there has been no diminution of Roman Catholic influence or prestige during the past thirty years. But perhaps it is hardly fair to judge the one-time Regius Professor of History at Oxford by these famous lectures. It is true they were greatly praised and are still appreciated for their literary style; but, as the WESTMINSTER REVIEW at that time declared, the author's theory of history was "built upon the assumption of a postulate which has been denied by the greatest intellects and by ages of metaphysicians, moralists and theologians." And it went on to make a complaint which finds frequent echo in the critical press of to-day, that "a philosophical question should be treated with the animus of a theological partisan." The *North British Review* in October 1862 thought the addresses "deficient alike in close analytic skill and in that comprehensive handling which one might naturally have expected from so high an authority as an Oxford Professor." These and many similar criticisms were perhaps hard to bear and are unpleasant to resurrect, but when we recollect the merciless and bitter attacks made by Mr. Goldwin Smith upon the life and memory of Lord Beaconsfield, upon the present principles of Mr. Gladstone, upon the condition of the different countries in which he has lived, upon the career of Sir John Macdonald in Canada, upon all who have ventured to disagree with or oppose him, it cannot but be remembered that his prophecies have proved utterly unreliable, that his forebodings remain unfulfilled, and that he himself, as one of the Reviews already quoted observed, is "one of the rudest critics a man can have." Not rude of course in the vulgar sense of the word, but rude in his callousness to the mental sufferings of others and in his frequent use of barbed and bitter sarcasm.

A remarkable feature in the political and literary adventures of Mr. Goldwin Smith is his inconsistency. Yet there can be no doubt of his sincerity. Like Mr. Gladstone, he possesses the quality of convincing himself that the course proposed to be pursued is right, no matter what may have been his own past views. Those who appreciate this characteristic will see how fittingly he might apply to himself the following lines of his translation from the second book of Lucretius, published in 1872:

" 'Tis sweet to view ranged on the battle plain  
The warring hosts, ourselves from danger free!

But sweeter still to stand upon the tower  
Reared in serener air by wisdom's power."

Vanity is hardly compatible with genuine ability and learning, both of which Mr. Goldwin Smith so undoubtedly possesses. But a popular impression none the less prevails that belief in his own superior wisdom has led him to make many political mistakes, and to misapprehend the course of history and the trend of national events in most important instances. There must certainly be some strong sentiment of superiority making him indifferent to the inconsistencies which lesser men would find it so difficult to explain and overcome.

As an illustration, consider his treatment of the British aristocracy and House of Lords. Speaking of the "high character and high intelligence" of the English aristocracy during the early part of the seventeenth century in his inaugural lecture on the "Study of History," at Oxford, we are told that "nothing could be more lofty than their love of principles; nothing more noble than their disregard of all personal and class interests where those principles were at stake." On May 11, 1891, the same speaker, anxious to sever Canadian sentiment from its British roots so far as possible, addressed the Young Men's Liberal Club of Toronto, and told them that after the Revolution the aristocracy came into power and inaugurated "a reign of corruption more profound and shameless than ever was seen in the United States." He also informed his interested audience that "English politics (at that time) were a mere struggle between different aristocratic cliques for a vast mass of public pelf. . . . Aristocratic morals were on a par with aristocratic politics."

Yet this was the age of Marlborough, of Dryden, Swift, and Bolingbroke. A little later and the corruption of the period centred around Walpole, certainly not an aristocrat in any sense of the word, while Argyle, Chesterfield, Carteret and Somers lent brilliance to the aristocratic element in the politics of the day. And upon this "struggle for plunder" rose the power of Chatham, the long rule of Pitt, the successes of Hastings and Clive in Hindostan, the victory of Wolfe in America.

Surely it cannot be that the famous reference of Disraeli in *Lothair* to the Oxford Professor, whom he described as a "social parasite," has had the result of hopelessly prejudicing Mr. Goldwin Smith against the upper classes of England. There is, however, no doubt that he felt this pen-picture to be a personal attack, and his remarkable letter from Cornell University to Lord Beaconsfield, published in the *Daily News*, and referring to it as "the stingless insult of a coward," is one of the curiosities of modern literature. That he still appreciates "good society" is beyond question. In a letter to the *New York Tribune* last April he speaks of Washington as "a beautiful and attractive city with a brilliant aristocracy,"

and early in the same year announced, during an address in Toronto, that "I go to Washington every year for climate and society. . . . It is fast becoming the centre of society on this Continent." This, of course, is all right in itself, and no one has any right to interfere with, or to criticise, the distinguished author's pursuit of aristocratic society in any section of the world. But such references are surely very inconsistent with his denunciations of the English social system. His fear of the danger with which aristocratic influences threaten unfortunate Canada, and his announcement of the ignominy of Americans who, "in grovelling before European royalty and rank outdo everything that is most abject in Europe itself." And for political purposes he does not hesitate to tell the young Liberals of Toronto that in England "the number of social scandals does not decrease"; while two years before, in reference to some individual scandal, he freely denounced Americans for their criticism and avers that "this passion for aristocratic scandal is nothing but flunkeyism turned upside down."

From another point of view Mr. Goldwin Smith's opinions are even more extraordinary. He has a perfect right to advocate the union of Canada and the United States and to find supporters wherever possible for that principle. But the inconsistency of his arguments is marvellous and in some cases absurd. Over and over again he reiterates his claim to be considered a loyal Englishman. In a letter to the *Toronto Mail* six years ago he says: "I am true at heart to the land of my birth, and zealous for her honour and greatness." In his Toronto address on "Jingoism" he claims to be "an Englishman to the core"; in that on "Aristocracy" he asserts that "I do love old England"; and in the one dealing with "Loyalty" he declares the "integrity of the United Kingdom to be essential to its greatness." Again, during an address delivered in the same city on the 8th of November 1886, he said: "Let us remember that we have a mother country that has always been the kindest of mother countries, and to which we owe loyal devotion; that our honour and our status on this continent are bound up with her."

Yet as far back as 1862 he was one of a little band in England which urged the separation of the Colonies from the Empire. Then the proposed policy was independence, now, in the case of Canada, it is annexation. Writing in 1889, he declared that Congress and the State Legislatures had committed "flagrant breaches of international right and courtesy"; that the histories and extradition treaties had been neglected "without a pretext of honourable reason"; that the laws of diplomatic courtesy have been broken by "the rude dismissal of a British ambassador"; that a President-elect had signed "an address justifying outrage in Ireland"; that a Senator had palliated the Phoenix Park murders; that honour had

been refused to the memory of John Bright, the foremost champion of the Republic in its darkest hour ; while day by day the American press had "fed the maw of malignity with envenomed falsehood." And he wonders whether it was "worth while to rebel against George III. if the end was to be such a bondage of the national soul as this." In furtherance of his love for England, however, he is none the less anxious to add to the power of the Republic thus sternly criticised by the incorporation of Canada.

In an article upon American "Hatred of England," contained in the *North American Review* of May 1890, Mr. Goldwin Smith replies apparently to his own frequently made assertion that war can never take place between England and the States, by saying that "we may hope it is very unlikely, but there has not only been a good deal of hatred, there has been a good deal of fighting between kinsmen since Cain and Abel." British Canadians, he continues—and correctly—"love a mother country which has never wilfully given them cause for complaint and they take hostility to her as hostility to them." Yet in an article (*New York Independent*) published on March 19, one year afterwards, he endeavours to arouse both hostility and aggression in the United States by referring to the Conservative electoral victory which had just occurred in Canada in most extraordinary language :

"That it interests the enemies of America is plain from the congratulations telegraphed by Lord Salisbury to Sir John Macdonald on his supposed triumph. . . . Unless the spirit of the American people is poorer and lower than well-wishers would willingly believe it to be, the day has dawned in which this continent will be finally set free from European interference."

Comment upon such an utterance is unnecessary from either the English, American, or Canadian standpoint. But how the writer can thereafter claim to "love England" and desire peace, or speak to Canadians of owing their "chief allegiance and affection to Canada" is beyond conception. In the same review for May 1892 he continues to urge annexation in a similarly peculiar fashion : "There is reason to apprehend," he says, "that the question may remain unsolved, and that a power antagonistic to the American Republic may thus be allowed to form itself under the auspices of European Toryism in the North of this Continent, though by that result a stain would be brought on American statesmanship deeper even than that which was brought on it by its failure to solve the question of slavery." It is hard to understand the cause or object of such utterances. Certainly peace on earth and good-will towards men can never be subserved by attempts to promote American hostility towards Canada and towards the party in England which may at any time be again in power. And the policy of Continental union can only be injured in Canada by comparing the efforts of

Canadians to build up a great country and a flourishing people with the exertions of Southern statesmen to preserve slavery. And whether the reader of his article be an Imperialist or Annexationist, an American, Canadian, or Englishman, he can hardly help feeling that any people worthy of union with the United States, to say nothing of connection with England, would only be insulted and antagonised by the statement that their future was not in their own hands at all, but was entirely under the control of American politicians.

An interview given in the *New York Tribune* of February 1, 1892, by Mr. Goldwin Smith, contains the additional kindly counsel that "the United States ought not to feel timid about taking Canada." The Professor may not have meant this in a military sense; but what is the position of the England which he claims to love so well in such a case? The Dominion, he goes on to say, ought to be a "desirable acquisition," as it would give the United States more waterways, greater fisheries, and an immense measure of mineral wealth. No doubt this is true, but Canadians might desire to have something to say in the decision of their destiny, and the end would hardly be continental harmony, while England's very natural objection to the loss of one-third of her Empire would probably prevail over her recognition of Mr. Goldwin Smith's "love" for his mother country. But this is prophecy, and therefore objectionable, although possibly pertinent to the subject.

In a myriad minor ways has Mr. Goldwin Smith been incorrect in advocacy or inaccurate in argument. Writing in March 1893 to the *Toronto Mail*, he declares that "there can be no doubt that the Americans would welcome Canada into the Union." In the *Nineteenth Century* of last July he asserts, however, that "the general feeling (in the States) about the Canadian question has been one of singular indifference." A paragraph in the same article asserts, what he has repeated over and over again during ten years past, that "Canada suffers from commercial atrophy," owing to its fiscal severance from the rest of the continent. Yet the writer of those words cannot help but know that the total trade of Canada has risen from \$131,000,000 in 1868 to \$201,000,000 in 1888, and that it increased in 1889 to \$204,000,000, in 1891 to \$218,000,000, in 1892 to \$241,000,000, and in 1893 to \$247,000,000. He has during twenty years striven for the union of Canada and the States, on the ground that "God and Nature demand it." Yet, in his *Lecture on History*, already quoted from several times, he declares that "the division of nations has entered deeply into the counsels of creation." And he adds that "Nations redeem each other. They preserve for each other principles, truths, hopes, aspirations which, committed to the keeping of one nation only, might become extinct for ever."

This was practically the theory which Sir John Macdonald applied



during his long life-work to the relations between Canada and the American Republic. But in latter years that statesman had no more bitter antagonist than Mr. Goldwin Smith. Such was not always the case, however. In 1878, the apostle of continentalism actually supported the Imperialist leader, voted for him, and spoke for him. A letter written by the former, and dated September 16, explains that "our best chance of obtaining a Government on a broad basis, and a respite from the dangerous excesses of party strife, is the restoration to power of Sir John Macdonald." On the following day he addressed a public meeting, urging the electors to support the Tory chief, and, in an article contributed to the *Contemporary Review* in September 1881, declares emphatically that the Canadian protective tariff, which followed as a result of these elections, was not directed against the mother country with any unkind intentions, and was absolutely necessary in the interests of Canada. Yet, on September 28, 1891, Mr. Goldwin Smith writes an English paper that, "after twenty-four years of Sir John Macdonald, the country is too saturated with corruption to care very much whether a man is or is not convicted of corruption," while in other voluminous contributions to the discussion of international relations, he insists that the protective tariff of Canada is disloyal and hostile to England. It is impossible to explain this change of front, especially with regard to Sir John Macdonald, who was the last man to personally make an enemy of any one. Opponents of Mr. Goldwin Smith have been heard to whisper that it was owing to his asking for the nomination in a Conservative constituency and being refused. However that may be, implacable enmity towards Sir John has been the feature of his writing upon Canadian subjects for many years past.

A volume might be filled with similar remarkable instances of illogical or inconsistent advocacy. But a few further illustrations must suffice. In that delightfully written work recently published, and treating of early American history in a style which constitutes a perfect marvel of condensation and culture, he denounces the many leaders of the Revolutionary period as being mere political agitators, or, in the case of Patrick Henry, thriftless bankrupts. Yet his own supporters in Canada, in a similar attempt to bring about a "peaceful severance" of the connection with England, have partaken largely of this character. In an article written in January 1888 he declares that British statesmen would in those days have been willing to grant Colonial representation in the Imperial Parliament. But he thinks that Imperial Federation in this much more advanced period would be madness, and is clearly impossible. In an address on "The Schism in the Anglo-Saxon Race," he asks pathetically whether American loyalists "would have been very base or guilty in shrinking from revolution" had they ever foreseen the great republic of later days. Yet almost in the same breath

Canadian loyalists are denounced, and in the most severe terms, for opposing separation from England when no grievances are even claimed to exist.

In a newspaper letter dated March 29 of last year, Mr. Goldwin Smith speaks of Ireland, and says that "civil strife is of all things the most dreadful, and the responsibility incurred by giving the signal for it is of all responsibilities the gravest." True; and no one knows better than he that annexation in the case of Canada, or separation from Great Britain, could never occur, so far as we can now see, without civil strife and bloodshed. For years he has vigorously opposed Home Rule and Mr. Gladstone, and denied both the capacity of Irishmen for self-government and the possibility of obtaining their desires. Yet in an interview cabled the *Pall Mall Gazette* early last year, he asserts that "I never had the slightest doubt of the eventual concession of a separate Parliament to Ireland." In his extraordinary, though interesting, work on *Canada and the Canadian Question*, he declares that "the principles of the American and Canadian tariffs are the same, and the difference of rates not very great." The fact being that one was highly protective to the verge of prohibition, the other moderately protective and at least 30 per cent. lower.

Quebec he considers a fatal obstacle to closer relations between Canada and England, but its different race and religion is no bar to union with the United States. In May 1890 he told us through the pages of the *Forum* that there had recently been too great an importation of British capital into Canada. Yet one of his chiefest arguments in favour of annexation is that it would promote an influx of American capital into the Dominion. Then he observes that "Protectionism is in itself corruption," and promptly proceeds to urge Canadian union with a country having a tariff twice as heavy as its own. In earlier years in England he signed John Stuart Mill's first petition in favour of the suffrage for unmarried women. To-day, one of the ablest essays in his recently published volume is devoted to marshalling all known arguments against woman suffrage in the keenest and most incisive form. In 1881 we were told that "political economy is a matter of expediency" in England and elsewhere. If any one ventures now to hint at the slightest protective duty in Great Britain for the sake of promoting Imperial unity, he is denounced as a lunatic and an ignoramus.

But here we must leave the subject. Mr. Goldwin Smith, in a word, is a great writer, a brilliant controversialist, a master of style, sarcasm and invective; a smouldering volcano of personal animosities. He has done good service to English literature wherever the English language is spoken, and has honestly tried to benefit the English race by political preachment and international advocacy. Yet it would seem as if he had done more harm than good. The ideal and

basis of continental union should be peace and harmony between all branches of the race. But his denunciation of the Irish in America has increased their bitterness against Great Britain and promoted similar feelings in England. Vehement abuse of the British Tory party and aristocracy has delighted the American tail-twister, but has hardly aided international friendliness. Minimising the benefits of British connection in Canada may have decreased affection towards England; but pictures of corruption and misgovernment in the United States have not promoted annexation sentiment in the Dominion. Wholesale denunciation of alleged Canadian corruption in England may have diminished some desire to subsidise a Canadian-Australian cable; but it is a little difficult to see the good it would do any one concerned, even if entirely successful in that end.

It may, in fact, be said that Mr. Goldwin Smith's career, in its effect upon international relations, has been the reverse of what he desired it to be. He will be remembered, not as a national prophet crying in the wilderness before the dawn of a new and better era, but as a light shining with fitful brilliance and sometimes baleful intensity in the literature of the English-speaking world during a transition period of its international development.

J. CASTELL HOPKINS.

## AUSTRALIAN GOVERNORS AND THEIR IDEALS.

“ I NEVER spent happier days.” That is an extract from a letter written lately by an Australian ex-Governor to a friend in Sydney. The few words refer to a period spent by him as the Queen’s representative in one of the dependencies in the Southern world, and sufficiently indicate the success of his administration of affairs. Other Governors have been less successful, and some have not been successful at all, and the question naturally arises, What are the causes of success and failure in the various instances? This question and others related to it are every day up for discussion in Colonial society, and are answered in numbers of ways by colonists as well as by Governors, ex-Governors, and the home circles from which these influential officials are recruited. Perhaps the following pages may supply a key to the difficulty.

First. What do Australians require in a Governor? The London *Times*, discussing Lord Jersey’s premature retirement from office in New South Wales, advanced as a reason for the step that his lordship desired to take part in active politics. Whether this motive for Lord Jersey’s action was true or the reverse, the *Times*’ perception of what constitutes the main quality of a colonial governorship was accurate. English peers are known the world over to be of all sorts and conditions when regarded mentally. Some of the best men in the Empire are of this order, and so are some of the weakest. As Australians have practically no voice in selecting their man, and as fear is more potent than hope with them, they lay themselves deliberately out to render their Governor a political neuter, whatever his natural or acquired powers as a statesman may be. With the exception of the first few years, Australian history reveals a continuous effort to resist Governors who attempt to initiate or execute or be in any political respect other than a mindless instrument in the hands of local parties. The effort was so strenuous on various occasions, and its purpose so little disguised, that long ago men of position would have declined to leave England for an Australian Governorship were not this pill of local jealousy of imported politicians sugared over with an intense adulation of rank and a delirious homage of pomp and show.

The Governorship of Australia began as a dictatorship. Governor Phillip's five years inaugurated a dynasty of despotism. That official carried with him the disciplinary preciseness of a martinet. Notwithstanding that, he was sea-captainish and barrack-roomish in the bluntness of his bearing. His surroundings were peculiar. Among the horde of men and women his transport ships bore to Botany Bay were a few with ordinary human hearts and brains, but the overwhelming majority were a mass of brute crime. It was necessary that his wand should be a rod of iron, his will an inflexible law. His German ancestry removed him from sympathy with even the few whose crimes were of a political complexion. He liked to take his flock in the bulk and bellow his commands with equal vehemence at the thrice-convicted murderer from Seven Dials and the singer of the *Wearing of the Green* from Connemara. Still, Phillip was not a bad man. In many respects he was a man of numerous virtues. But his circumstances called for the display of his worst features. To men instinct with a sense of freedom he would be nowadays impossible. Attempts to glorify him can only be made with the eyes shut. He held his various charge in order; he kept the bit in its mouth and the bridle on its neck, and he whipped and spurred it on the road to success. But the student of history may well speculate as to whether it would have been better or worse for the first twenty years of the settlement had the convicts whom the *Sirius* pioneered to the new land retorted in kind. There would have been tears, there would have been blood; but the anarchy which destroyed a tyranny might have borne a brighter flower than the tyranny which flogged hearts out to maintain its idea of order. Captain Hunter, Phillip's successor, was no less an autocrat, but possessed less power to put his will in motion. A community of interest was beginning to stir in the little settlement. Knowledge of one another was growing, and people began to see that they were not all the wild beasts they were reputed to be. The industrious and human-hearted of the population coalesced; they set their faces against the turbulence of their fellow-convicts and against the intolerant pretensions of their rulers, and this nucleus of a young nation was so buttressed by freedom-loving members of the official party that Bligh, the third Governor, was deposed and sent back to England.

The dynasty of despotism, so far as the mere will of Governors imperiously inspired was concerned, ended here. Thereafter they were obliged to compass personal ends by other methods than dictation and the application of physical force. They consulted their council; at times they badgered their council; at times they caballed with the officials against the freemen and the ticket-of-leave convicts; at times also they caballed with these latter against the officials; but no longer was their private will law, and from then

till now the influence of Australian expansion has been primarily directed to the segregation of its Governors from active participation in its political and legislative development. From the days of elective councils, the Governor who effaced himself politically was, however moderate his endowments, the idol of the hour; whereas he who sought to participate in the management of national affairs was, however lofty his quality of mind, the scapegoat of the time. Sir George Gipps arrived in New South Wales with a reputation already achieved, and with a disposition of the buoyant and elastic character which elicits the goodwill of strangers. He had served with distinction through the Peninsular War. He was wounded at Badajoz, and fought through Biar and Castella. His manners were polished, his knowledge extensive, and his character high. But when he assumed the governorship, he determined to study the wants of the people, and to help them to improved laws. He invited his advisers to submit their proposals to him so that he could examine them. He adopted an attitude of active criticism towards all public questions. Privately he was benevolent; generally he was humane. Yet Gipps had to be recalled. His advisers quarrelled with him; the public divided into camps, and quarrelled over him, and the State ship stood still. On the other hand, Governor Fitzroy possessed merely ceremonial qualities. Difficulties of Constitutional practice gave him no trouble. He allowed his advisers to do much as they liked. He had previously, when Commander-in-Chief in the West Indies, effected entrance to a local quarrel, and had resolved not to do it again. This resolution, when reported, greatly gratified the New South Wales Council. Some of the most important events in colonial history occurred while Fitzroy was Governor, and neither his wish nor his word interfered with their course. When responsible government was in the balance, he left his advisers to see to it. When Victoria separated from the parent colony, he considered it a matter solely for his advisers to think about. Consequently, he passed ten years in the governorship, happy in himself and beloved by the colonists. At the present day, pilgrimages take place to the tree at Parramatta against which Lady Fitzroy was killed by her runaway horse, and when the accident occurred all Australia insisted on expressing its grief. When at last Sir Charles left for England, he was presented with innumerable addresses and a national purse of 2000 guineas.

If we look to Governors of recent years we find the same lines of life similarly marked. In proportion to the readiness with which he accepts a purely ceremonial relation to the colony is a Governor's popularity. Governor Loftus, or Lord Loftus as he is remembered in the colonies, was a man of many special abilities. Possibly no one of richer experience or riper capacity for the handling of constitutional questions ever ruled in Australia. He took with him to

New South Wales a diplomatic experience of over forty years. In Berlin, Vienna, Munich, and St. Petersburg the highest affairs of State passed successfully through his hands. He was, however, a failure in New South Wales. He sinned in two ways. He neglected the ceremonial aspect of his office, and ventured to form opinions on current events. He exercised his discretion in the matter of dissolving Parliament. The leader of a party in Australian politics when called on to form a government generally tries to obtain from the Governor a right to appeal to the people should Parliament become refractory. Lord Loftus invariably declined to anticipate. He also claimed the right to employ the prerogative of mercy independently of the advice of the Executive Council. Latterly this power has been taken away from Colonial Governors. In Lord Loftus's day a Governor, who is *ex-officio* President of the Executive Council, might dissent from the views of his Ministers and reprieve a prisoner sentenced to death. It was necessary in such cases that he should inform the Secretary of State of his action and acquaint him with the reasons of his dissent. The effect was that a Governor was able to reprieve without his Ministers knowing why. This power Lord Loftus exercised. His views on the development of Imperial interests were also independent. He entered heartily into the sensational attack on the Egyptian Mahdi. To promptly despatch troops from Sydney it was necessary for the letter of the Constitution Act to be broken. Lord Loftus preceded his Ministers in urging that the Act should stand aside. Some of these acts won temporary approval. But one and all they proved that his activity flowed in a wrong direction and they brought him disappointment. Before Parliament indemnified the deportation of the troops to the Soudan the Governor's part in the transaction was publicly criticised with bitterness and resentment. His neglect of ceremonials increased the adverse sentiment. He allowed it to be known that social duties tired him. He allowed it to be suspected that ornamental displays repelled him. Two things he made clear: first, that he desired to help the State with his knowledge, and second, that he declined to be a mere ornament. Hence he failed signally as an Australian Governor. In his lately published *Reminiscences* there is bitterness when he deals with this subject, but all his disappointment arose from his misconceiving the scope of a Governor's duty. Lord Carrington, who succeeded him, had only intellectual potentialities to rely upon. He had not had a career. He had taken part in no large field of affairs. But on arrival in Sydney he clothed himself in the robes of the ceremonialist, and clothed so he became a favourite at once. He could not succeed where Loftus succeeded, but he succeeded splendidly where Loftus dismally failed. He exhibited no talent for statesmanship, and when a political problem of any complexity was presented to him he turned away.

The prerogative of mercy became null and void in his keeping. If the Executive determined to hang anybody, it could do it; if it determined to commute a sentence, it could do it. It was the demonstrated uselessness of reposing the prerogative of mercy in Governor Carrington's hands which led to its being taken away from Australian Governors altogether. Now a Cabinet knows that the fate of a condemned prisoner is in its hands, and with all of the responsibility it will act with fuller deliberation. A Governor like Carrington was a trap. A Cabinet, knowing its decision was not final, might perfunctorily discharge its duty, leaving the Governor to exercise the prerogative vested in him. Such cases have occurred. But with Governors like Carrington, incapable of thinking or indisposed to think over serious disputes loaded with tangled evidence, that perfunctory decision became final. When, again, Sir Henry Parkes, before forming a government, claimed the right to dissolve Parliament when he chose, Carrington conceded the point, and wrote out a warrant to that effect which Parkes turned to party uses for a considerable time. Lord Carrington talked Imperialism with Imperialists and Republicanism with Republicans. He talked Free Trade with Free Traders and Protection with Protectionists. He was a Radical and an extender of the privileges of the peerage, a peer and an ennobler of Radicalism. But all these exploits were so manifestly untouched with thought that no political party felt either elated or aggrieved. He hindered no politician, for he helped none. His tongue moved, but without a destructive or constructive brain to inform it, and therefore the noise it made in the mart of politics passed unheeded. On the other hand he was ceremonial to a fervid degree. Shows and pageants delighted him. Under his rule Government House entertainments were unceasing. He frequented the cricket-field and the football-field. He glowed ruddily over the laying of foundation-stones and the opening of bazaars. He appeared in his element at theatrical benefits, horse-races and small house-fires. He shook hands with all and sundry, and what all and sundry said he said too. It is probable that there is no one in Australia deeply impressed by his intellect; it is certain that every one admits the exuberant sincerity of his social and ceremonial nature. Lord Loftus left Sydney in undisguised public ill-favour, Lord Carrington left with flowers raining from every balcony he passed; Lord Loftus would not be accepted back as Governor of Darlinghurst Gaol, Lord Carrington would be welcomed as Governor-General of a Federated Australia.

For purposes of compression and ready comparison Governors of New South Wales have so far been dealt with, but the history of other Australian Governors follows the lines laid down. A Governor of strong mental power alarms the colonists, and, if the power escapes into local politics, very soon estranges them. A Governor



with views or habits of living opposed to the showy, melodramatic order depresses them. The Marquis of Normanby governed Queensland, New Zealand, and Victoria successively, and won but a stunted homage in each. Lord Canterbury made himself popular during a season of ceremonial display, but his one or two efforts at actual administration alienated the bulk of his Victorian subjects. Sir George Bowen's intellect was at its ripest when he governed Queensland. He applied the spur of study and research, thinking he could mould the young nation educationally and legislatively. But Queensland sat down sullenly and refused to stir. On being transferred to Victoria he changed his purpose. There he became the butterfly of the hour, and is consequently still remembered as a successful Governor. A Governor's popularity is, it is necessary to observe, often closely connected with the social views held by his wife. An English Premier is credited with a wise saw on this feature of the question. Governor Loch was not known in the colonies when sent to govern Victoria, but his wife's repute as a social entertainer had travelled, and he was therefore welcomed with effusion. The ceremonial spirit in the woman is, however, expected to move on the same plane as the man's. There must be a glow, a dash, a pomp about the displays. They must not taste or smell of the study. Lady Carrington and Lady Loch were regarded as ideal leaders of Australian society, while Lady Jersey, with many intellectual advantages, failed to excite enthusiasm.

The fact being that the post of Governor in Australia is thus so purely ornamental, it may be asked—Is it worth while for a man of position to leave England to take it? A few words will answer this. Personal knowledge of the colonies and of the opinions prevailing among colonists should be a part of the education of statesmen who look forward to exercise influence in the Empire. This knowledge is necessary now, but must become imperatively so in the near future. If the Empire is to be kept together, its affairs must be administered by those in personal touch, not only with the central States but with the outermost provinces. Hence politicians and those who ambition to be politicians should covet the prize of a colonial governorship, as in that position, better than elsewhere, they can make their knowledge full and accurate. But both classes of politicians must bear in mind the restrictions of the position. If they cannot repress a desire to meddle in public questions, or to inspire the community to live to higher ideals, or to take a part in the moulding of young nations, they will do better to stay away. If they can repress this desire, or if they have it not, and at the same time exhibit a passionate enthusiasm for cultivating the showy, the noisy, and the theatrical sides of life they will enjoy a happy existence, and will return, if men of any ability, with minds permanently enriched.

E. LOWE.

## THE ESSAY CONSIDERED FROM AN ARTISTIC POINT OF VIEW.

IN the history of the world, as in the history of individual man, each age will have its own especial type of literature. The favourite may co-exist with several others, but it will none the less be the favourite. At the present time it is clear that the commonest mode of expression is in the novel, and I suppose that the age—in England at all events—is gradually drifting in the direction of lyric poetry, conjoined with the short sketch or story. The epic and the drama may be safely regarded as tranced, or even dead. History has a fair hold on the educated. The essay, in its various forms, still breaks out sporadically now and again, stray flowerets from a seedling long discontinued, or like the rare sparks flying from a burnt-out firebrand.

I confess to a more than sneaking kindness for the Essay, in most of her moods. A book of these detached thoughts makes no too pressing demands upon the reader; he may take it up for a spare half-hour or so, and leave it with unconcern to attend to other matters, with no harassing anxiety as to finding the place when he returns. For in a book of this kind there is no continuity of thought, no definite plan. It will go hard with us if we cannot pick out one or two essays out of two dozen that give some pleasure, or that have some message for us. So that it is better, to my mind, for the subjects to be varied as much as possible, and the treatment. I am no great friend to this modern style, introduced by Macaulay, of lengthy book reviews and historical disquisitions. They are good reading, but a trifle too solid for the times when one would fain turn to some delicate, yet not worthless, trifling. As good read a volume of history or a biography as some of these. There are seasons when the reader instinctively lays his hand upon Montaigne, or Lamb, or Stevenson's *Virginibus Puerisque*, and lazily, with pipe in mouth, listens to their quaint conceits and moralisings. Even a Lowell may be too serious for us at times, too full of information. A model essay should contain its fair proportion of useful knowledge, but it should be concealed so delicately; like the onion in the salad, it should be unseen, but permeate the whole. Defoe had a good notion of this, who said, "Thus may we wheedle men into knowledge

of the world, who rather than take more pains would be content with their ignorance." The substratum of fact should be there, like the trellis-work on which a creeper grows, but the flowering luxuriance of fancy should clothe it so completely that we hardly guess its presence.

The idea of an essay was, with Bacon, the elaboration of a single thought. But though this is strictly in accordance with the meaning of the word—essay is identical with assay, and should signify merely a careful weighing or examination—yet it is not our conception of the real thing. Montaigne is the true founder of the essay proper, and the early writers in the *Tatler*, *Spectator*, *Rambler* and so forth were his disciples. Like a good talker, he roams from subject to subject, led by some chance association, and by this means we get the delicate play of his fancy on various points: each discourse is a diamond glittering with a thousand facets, and we are not wearied by too sustained argument upon any one theme. It is this that now and again the wearied student longs for—this delightful inconsequence. When we pick up a volume of his, or of Lamb's, we have left the beaten road and wandered into some charming maze of inextricable forest paths. Dry and dusty facts are left behind, or covered over with the green turf. Here is the place to lounge in on a summer's day, and we stroll along none too hurriedly, resting, as the mood takes us, against the trunk of some giant tree of thought. It is the touch of egotism that marks the ideal writer in this form—a touch, however, that should not be overdone. I doubt whether Thackeray allowed quite sufficient of himself to appear in his *Roundabout Papers*, and it is possible that Leigh Hunt showed a trifle too much. Like the lyric poem, the essay should contain a suspicion of the writer's personality, and should also have the look of careless ease, but the look merely, like a thin glittering sheet of ice over deep waters. It should be desultory, but not too desultory; there should be some slight thread of connection running through the whole, to lead us insensibly from point to point. For it is annoying in the highest degree to meet on a sudden with some abrupt change of thought for which no reason is discoverable. It jars the mind, and puts the reader out of conceit with himself, as if in strolling along our woodland path he should strike his foot against some hidden rock. The author should gossip, but there should be purpose in his seeming divagations. He may decorate with arabesques the line on which he travels, but there must be a line, even though the shortest and slenderest. Indeed, the slenderest peg will serve for the true essayist to hang his disquisition upon. The subject should be not too narrowly defined. In good hands a book or an author will be no mere dull review; but for the less practised writer, the more ordinary craftsman, it were perhaps safer to take some more general subject as his starting-point. I like best in

Lamb those rambling discourses where he makes some imaginary acquaintance the text for his sermon, as with Captain Jackson in his cottage on the Bath Road, or the redoubtable Sarah Battle, tutelary goddess of the whist-table. Indeed, a touch of character-drawing, though not perhaps strictly proper to the style, has been ever found a useful adjunct. Addison, of course, has his worthy knight and his satellites, and Johnson, in his *Idler*, would occasionally introduce imaginary friends to the public, as his Drugget and Minim. And it is noticeable that this does, in fact, give a lighter tone, and that the commonly heavy doctor does attain to some degree of sprightly vivacity in the employment of this machinery, that distinguishes these sketches plainly enough from their more ponderous companions.

Johnson was not, as a rule, overweighted with thought. He was apt to dress up ideas delicate enough in rather incongruous robes, like young children in the armour of full-grown men. He could, with any one, make little fishes talk like whales; but if he could have attained an easy style, or if he had chosen to drop the cumbrous method he affected, he would have been no unworthy successor to Addison. It is wonderful what a pretty fancy occasionally peeps, half stifled, through the chinks of his laboured sentences. In wit and sound scholarship he was more than a match for his model, but his love of form was too strong. Antithesis was his bane; he permitted what should have been a dainty flower to spread unchecked through his garden of thought until it became a straggling weed. Some of his sentences resemble a heavily weighted pack-saddle, accurately balanced and even pleasing to the eye, with just an equal number of clauses on either side, but the total burden of which is almost too much for the sturdiest mule of a reader. But this was by no means the case because he was striving to express by inadequate means thoughts that were too subtle for him to grasp, but merely because he preferred to equip quite ordinary ideas with a considerable amount of travelling paraphernalia. He was wont to habit them with solicitous care, as though he feared that they might catch cold from the raw air of criticism, until they came forth at last from his hands with as many garments as the Esquimaux; or as the British fisherman when he sets out for the winter season in the North Sea. In fact, he was too anxious as to the manner he employed to be a great or deep thinker. It is worth remarking that these latter are not commonly stylists. They have too much and too serious an occupation in the matter of what they are saying to harass themselves about minor graces of form. It might be pleasanter if they did, but it is idle to hope for everything. The ideal essayist, I imagine, has yet to be evolved, the man who shall combine in his own person the original power of Bacon, the grace of Addison, the transcendental insight of Emerson, the gay fancy of Charles Lamb,

with any unconsidered trifles that he may chance to pick up from other essayists. But, until we see his work, we may well be content with his component parts, which, after all, may possibly afford us more pleasure separately than they would in ever so cunning a combination.

It is, to my mind, a blemish in Emerson's writings that he seems to state his matter with so slight an adornment. Indeed, his fault is the exact reverse of this of Johnson's, inasmuch as the thought here often steps boldly—and baldly—forth without so much as a rag of covering to give it a decent appearance. He has the air of shovelling down his opinions, and they are frequently weighty ones, as one shovels coal down into the cellar. They lie in a heap, in any order, for the industrious reader to quarry out as he can. It is possible that this may be done purposely, in a refinement of art, to the end that in its coarse setting the diamond here and there may show up into a finer lustre, or that the traveller may hail with a keener delight the unexpected flower in the midst of a studiously barren wilderness. I do not myself believe it to be artificial—it is tolerably obvious that Emerson was careless of style—but, if it be so, I maintain that it is bad art. The reader is wearied with stumbling over harsh phrases, and, when he comes at length to the finely expressed germ, he is probably in no mood to appreciate it. It is possible to walk too far even for the finest view. It is more likely that an unfortunate turn for epigram diverted the author into this particular channel of style. His sentences hang together but loosely, and frequently one has to look long to see the connection between them. Individually they are stimulating, full of nourishment; but they present the appearance of being insufficiently cooked. There is material in each essay enough to furnish a man with thought for a week, but it is only those with strong digestions who can assimilate it. And, however much we may like beef tea, the majority of us prefer it with a certain admixture of a weaker element.

There is almost something of an insult to one's readers in a neglect of the finer graces of writing. The world is ready, no doubt, to excuse a man who, like Emerson or Carlyle, has truths to utter; and it is ungracious to quarrel with a prophet who preaches forcibly and earnestly what he believes to be eternal verities. But no one will deny that, even so, the best language will prove a powerful adjunct to his work. It is easy to sneer at the artist in words, and some people seem to assume that because an author writes good—and musical—English, he can, therefore, have nothing of any especial moment to say. Prettiness is their pet aversion, and for this fault they will leave their Ruskin or Tennyson with contempt unread and turn for relaxation to Herbert Spencer or Robert Browning. I am not so sure that word-painting (as it is generally styled) is by

any means a bad thing. I like well enough to meet with a picturesque piece of writing, and I am far more inclined to pardon even a man whose effort at fine language is rather too apparent than one who is content to plod along in unrelieved mediocrity. It does not detract sensibly from my enjoyment of Lowell's essays, for example, to watch him preparing, as he not infrequently does, for a perhaps somewhat rhetorical outburst; and, when it arrives, I am the more ready to enjoy it for the note of warning. And it is probably the case that most people really prefer a rather florid style had they the courage to own it. They like well enough to have their ears tickled by well-turned periods. A piece of eloquent declamation will move them to admire, for a time, and even perhaps to consent. Their natural instinct is to judge soundly. But there is always in the background of a true British character a species of sullen and dogged obstinacy, apt to rebel at the thought of being swayed by mere words and phrases, and this lies ever in readiness to assert itself under the name of cool reason; so that with a conscious pride the reader will often turn round upon his first opinion, and feel a glow of thankfulness that he, at any rate, is not to be led at the author's will by tricks of honeyed speech.

I suppose we plume ourselves rather upon possessing as a nation a certain power of intellectual penetration. Some of us are always longing for something on which to exercise our minds, as wild boars are said to whet their tusks upon an indigestible tree-trunk. It is essential to this purpose that the task should not be too easy. We must have nuts to crack, and the harder the shell the more praise to our unconquerable teeth. It is to be feared that we too frequently find the kernel decayed and worthless, after all our trouble; but at all events we have had our exercise. I imagine it is this feeling that has led to the increasing popularity of the novels of George Meredith. So far it has possibly served a good turn. I yield to few men in my admiration for the writer's ingenuity, his marvellous command of illustration, and his frequently flashing epigram. But I must say that, in common with a good many other intellects of mediocre capacity, I am inclined to wish for more clearness, more light. In reading a novel I do not care to be confused by darkly hinted parallels, by adumbrations, by metaphors drawn from the whole of the author's undoubtedly wide range of knowledge. Why not, in mercy, let us have now and again a moderately straight path to our goal? To be delayed on our way by some stumbling-block of a paragraph, which requires (on the part of a conscientious reader) some six perusals at the least before one can arrive at so much of a modified uncertainty as to the ultimate meaning does not recommend itself to the common novel-reader. It is, after all, the first duty of a writer, next to having a thought worth expression, to state that thought clearly. He may

adorn it as much as he pleases, but he must not allow his ornament to interfere with his perspicuity. There is no reason why a novelist should not always be comprehensible by the ordinary intellect. Human life is a singular thing, no doubt, and there are many phases of it which suggest curious and perhaps abstruse reflections, but a novel is hardly the place for transcendental mysticism. Men who are oppressed with intellectual self-conceit can readily find fit mental food in the works of German philosophers or Scottish logicians. But it is not Meredith's fault that he goes too deeply into the problem of life. Now and again, perhaps, he may strike down suddenly some way beneath the surface; but we have no objection to him on that score. It is rather that he is a slave to metaphor. It is difficult for him, it seems, to approach a straightforward statement; he must hover round it with a succession of sly hints. There are some men who are afflicted in much the same way in ordinary conversation—men who have attained a quite marvellous aptitude for beating about the bush, but who find it almost impossible to give a direct answer to a plain question. For a time they may be very interesting companions, but they expect too much from their interlocutors. It is not fair to expose the intellect of a chance acquaintance to such a continuous strain. The work is too hard. One has ever to be on the stretch to catch some vague indication or to pursue some half-revealed line of meaning. It is only with old friends, whose methods of thought we are well acquainted with, and the workings of whose minds we have learned to know by long experience, that such conversation can be held enjoyable. It is true that the study of a lifetime might enable us to read George Meredith's works with passable fluency; but it is also unfortunate that the many other duties of life render it impossible for many of us to reach a more intimate stage with him, as a writer, than that of a slightly bored acquaintance.

I have been led into discussing novels. The same criticism does not apply to essays in the same degree. For, although we would not have our disquisitions too abstruse, and though they should certainly be free from all taint of obscurity, yet it is not objectionable to linger pleasantly over one of these volumes, and to find now and again a paragraph that claims our undivided attention for a minute or two. It gives an agreeable sensation to feel that our time is not being altogether spent on mere relaxation. It is for this reason also that a certain amount of useful information should be sprinkled over the pages of the essayist, to the end that the reader may feel that he is insensibly acquiring knowledge, sucking it in, as it were, through every pore. It is true that the general essay is not over-popular just now. Of book reviews and criticism of all sorts we have a sufficiency; but the old fanciful dissertations of Lamb have few successors. It is characteristic of the true essayist that he

can write pleasantly upon any subject. The common house-fly will furnish him with a theme expanding under his treatment to unimaginable heights. It matters not in the smallest degree from what point he starts, his province is none the less the wide unmeasured heaven of imagination. He takes the whole arena of knowledge as his lawful kingdom, and nothing of the varied complexities of human life is foreign to him. I confess that I should like to see more of this true catholicity in range of subject among our essayists of to-day. For, after all, books and the authors of books do not make up the whole sum of human life, and there are other aspects of the world to be noticed besides those which are seen from Fleet Street or the Strand. Dickens and Thackeray have been discussed enough, even the perennial fount of Johnsonian criticism is running muddy towards its close. I would respectfully suggest to all British essayists of the present day to leave these worthy gentlemen in peace, and try their hand in a somewhat wider field.

E. H. LACON WATSON.



## THE "IMPASSE" OF WOMEN.

FORMER pupils of girls' high schools or colleges who have made and sustained friendships with many of their fellow-students have opportunities, in after years, of reflecting on the various careers which they have followed. Such reflections should be of use to those who have the direction of younger lives, for they lead us to note and to inquire into the cause of that undercurrent of sadness, sometimes amounting to misery, which so frequently runs throughout the lives of the women of the present generation. In many instances, a glance into past years will reveal the fact that those women whose lives are a burden to themselves, and in some cases to others as well, have, as girls, been removed from their school or college without being given any training or preparation for any useful work in the world. Their intellectual faculties may have been fully developed, their education may have been excellent so far as it went, but, on leaving school and coming out "into the world," there has been a sudden suspension of their intellectual life, and no use was found for the newly developed powers of their minds. But "nature abhors a vacuum," and fortunately for the progress of mankind, though unfortunately for the individual, her laws are inexorable and her revenge is sure. Weak health, neuralgia, nervous and hysterical affections creep in, and gradually take possession of the vacant place. In some cases, a happy marriage, when followed by its new duties and occupations, may dispel the threatening clouds; but happy marriages seem to be the exception rather than the rule, and in the present state of English society their tendency is to become more and more rare. In the many cases of unhappy or unsatisfactory marriages from which no escape can be made, a useful and lifelong occupation will be found to mitigate its unforeseen misfortunes, and to nullify their bitterness; and whilst our laws uphold so many unsuitable and ill-assorted marriages, it will provide a safety-valve for human nature, which makes life not only bearable but full of interest and satisfaction. To young girls who have no fortune of their own to look forward to, some such occupation will give an independence which will lift them out of the necessity of entering on the marriage relationship for the sake of a livelihood. It makes them independent of the support of men, and provides them with a life as well as with a

livelihood. To many women who, under the present laws, cannot marry where they would, and will not marry where they can, it gives an opening which will at least make life satisfactory, and will lead them to positions of usefulness, in which they can spend the energy of their lives for the advantage of others.

For these considerations, as well as for others which will readily suggest themselves, it is much to be desired that those parents who have the welfare of their daughters at heart, should not deprive them of that preparation for special work which is necessary to its satisfactory accomplishment, and that when they remove them from their course of education it should be to place them in circumstances in which they can best prepare for that occupation which is most suitable for them as a life-pursuit. The mother of one of the late head girls of a popular high school was complaining a short time ago that, since her daughter had left the school, her health had failed, and that she was nervous and depressed. Some occupation was suggested, or at any rate a preparation for one. "But," said the mother, "she has had her education; now *we wish to enjoy her.*" So, for the enjoyment of the parents, the girl's health was to be sacrificed, and with it any *certainty* of happiness. Also, she was deprived of all means of obtaining a livelihood for herself in the future, when it is possible that relations will no longer be able to support her. This case was reported amongst others to one of the most experienced managers of the school. "I begin to think it inevitable," he said, "that girls should pass through a nervous, hysterical state after they leave the school." It was not until some time afterwards, on making a list of similar cases, it appeared that the names were those of recent pupils, who in the prime of their youth and strength were endeavouring to live in idleness and trivialities. Against this arrangement nature has rebelled, and her efforts have met with success. New occupations, new positions of usefulness are being discovered each year for gentlewomen. But the elementary practice which alone ensures success must be entered on in youth, when mind and body are most fit to learn. If women wait to work till the necessity for it arises they will find themselves superannuated, or their work a failure.

Twenty years ago there were scarcely more than two occupations on which gentlewomen could enter—teaching and nursing. To-day both these occupations are in their best form raised to the standards of professions, and, besides these, there are many other professions and occupations, each giving to the women who master them an independent position and a life-long interest—an interest which at least gives a *raison d'être* to the lives of women, and, as such, places them in positions to which many endowed with money and other advantages are unable to attain. In itself this takes the sting from many a life. Gentlewomen have shown their ability for

useful work and are now welcomed as doctors, commissioners, inspectors, poor law guardians, government officials, Civil Service servants, artists, architects, decorators, dispensers, secretaries, dressmakers, milliners, rent-collectors, laundry managers, managers of other institutions, and in a variety of other callings. If a girl is placed when young in a suitable profession she has the opportunity offered her, not only of usefulness to others, but of happiness for herself as the years go on. A life and a livelihood are hers. The majority of girls are powerless to help themselves in this matter. It is the forethought of the parents which should be aroused, and if only a successful appeal could be made to them to exercise it aright the girls of the present generation would not add to the ranks of those hapless beings who starve in the midst of plenty, who vegetate in the midst of life, or who may be seen flitting from boarding-house to boarding-house with neither aim nor reason, restless through idleness, idle through incompetency, and incompetent through the action or inaction of kind and well-meaning parents. Only one use can be found for them in the world. It is to serve as a warning to girls of the consequence of the neglect of those powers and capabilities with which they are by nature endowed. At the present time it is piteous to see the numbers of gentlewomen who apply for very unattractive employments, and who will even offer a yearly payment to obtain them, but who at the same time are quite incompetent to do work or to undertake its responsibilities. It is cruel to tell them that they are incapable and unfit for work, as well as too old to learn it; but such are the facts. They cannot be expected to recognise them, and, not unnaturally, consider themselves hardly used, and think that the whole world is against them. They have yet to learn that the hard treatment which they experience is the result of their own parents' conduct, and that it is their neglect to equip them for life and its sure amount of happiness which is the iron hand which has been against them all the weary years of their existence. It is one of the encouraging signs of the present day that parents are more and more beginning to make some effort for the lasting welfare of their daughters, even though it may be at a temporary sacrifice to themselves.

A girl requires an occupation for her energies and desires a lover for herself. Too often, the kindest of parents will give her money without an occupation, and will hurry her blindfold into marriage at any price. Too late she learns her incapacity for useful work, and too late and with far more bitterness she discovers that her marriage has shut her out from love for the whole of her life. In contemplating such cases as these it is a comfort to know that the independence and usefulness of gentlewomen is the first step towards remedying our social evils. Another step may follow it.

A. L. LEE.

## CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

### SCIENCE.

THERE is a certain amount of freshness in Mr. Gregory's University Extension Manual of Elementary Astronomy.<sup>1</sup> It furnishes, in language which will be "easily understood of the people," a readable, attractive, and useful epitome of some of the marvels that have been revealed to us by the telescope, the spectroscope, and the camera. The subject matter is arranged in nine chapters and an introduction, and the text is well illustrated by a number of woodcuts which have been culled from a variety of sources. The structure of the astronomical telescope and the functions of its different parts naturally form the starting point, and the chapter devoted to it is a capital introduction to the rest. After this, the author proceeds systematically through the various branches of the subject, taking up successively the sun—"the Light of the World," as he calls it—the analysis of sunlight, the moon, the planets, comets and shooting stars, the inhabitants of boundless space, the chemistry of stars and nebulae, and celestial photography. There is a familiarity about these topics which will strike most readers, and it cannot be gainsaid that much that is stated with regard to them is not new. But this must be so in a work of this nature which is not intended for advanced students, but for those who are just entering upon their astronomical studies. On the other hand, it should be said that the mode in which the facts are presented is the author's own, and it is one which we think will make a favourable impression upon the reader, and stimulate his interest in the subject. Moreover, several of the very latest discoveries and hypotheses are briefly recounted in their appropriate connections, so that in some respects the volume marks an advance upon those which have previously appeared. In illustration of this, it may be noted that there is a good account of the hypothesis recently propounded by Professor Lockyer, that comets are actually swarms of meteorites, and we are glad to observe that the merits of that hypothesis are regarded with favour. The spectroscopic evidence on which the modern views of

<sup>1</sup> University Extension Series. *The Vault of Heaven: an Elementary Text-book of Modern Physical Astronomy.* By Richard A. Gregory, F.R.A.S. London: Methuen & Co.

the composition 'of the nebulae are based is also given in outline, and with the impartiality which is desirable in the presence of the existing differences of opinion. A general summary is also added of Lockyer's classification of the spectra of celestial bodies and of the theory of celestial evolution which he bases upon it. Lastly, Schwabe's protracted observations at Dessau, and his discoveries of sun-spots, which form so remarkable a chapter in the history of astronomy, are briefly chronicled, and a well-merited tribute is paid to the persistency with which Schwabe has pursued his observations. At the end of some of the chapters, useful tables, statistical and other, are added, which contain in a brief compass much valuable information, and at the end of the volume there is a carefully selected list of astronomical works suitable for the further study of the subject.

In *The Electric Transformation of Power*<sup>1</sup> Mr. Atkinson has given electrical engineers and others a very useful treatise on a subject of great and increasing importance. That the future belongs to electricity no one in these days can feel much doubt; but, whether or not, it has obtained a hold on the present which makes the publication of such works as the one before us almost a matter of necessity. The object of the book, as its title indicates, is to present the reader with a plain statement of the essential facts in regard to the means by which electricity is employed as an agent for the transformation and transmission of power, and its application to the operation of machinery. Hence the object is a practical one, and the chief value of the book will be found, not in its theoretical teachings, but in its practical bearings. Thus it furnishes a very clear explanation of the construction and principles of electro-motors, both stationary and otherwise, and shows their relations to the dynamo, and through it to the steam-engine, the water-wheel, and other sources of power. To all who have an interest in such things we can recommend Mr. Atkinson's book. It is not loaded with the endless technicalities which so frequently deter practical men from the literature of their craft, and the few that are indispensable are carefully defined in the simplest possible way, and brought together in the first chapter, which is intended chiefly for reference. In the selection of motors which illustrate the different kinds of construction, the author has succeeded in getting the types which experience has shown to be among the best, though there are, no doubt, others that would have served his purpose equally well. They are carefully described, and the descriptions with the illustrations will readily enable the intelligent artisan to see the principles of their construction, mode of action, and other points. The adaptability of the motor to different

<sup>1</sup> *The Electric Transformation of Power and its Application by the Electric Motor, including Electric Railway Construction.* By Philip Atkinson, A.M., Ph.D. London: Crosby Lockwood & Son. 1894.

kinds of mechanical work is well illustrated by an account of various special applications, and a full consideration is given to the construction and operation of the electric railway, including its motors, cars, and the auxiliary apparatus.

Among recent publications there are few that will excite more interest in certain circles than Professor Lockyer's remarkable volume on *The Dawn of Astronomy*.<sup>1</sup> It is the outcome of an attempt to see whether any ideas could be obtained as to the early astronomical views of the Egyptians from a study of their temples and the mythology connected with the various cults; and although the conclusions reached are for the most part put forward in a tentative manner only, there can be little doubt that they embody a large amount of truth. The principal subject considered is the orientation of ancient temples, especially those of Egypt, and the celestial bodies to which their main axes were directed. But this does not cover the whole of the author's inquiries, which have embraced many related questions, some of which are of scarcely less interest than the main topic of the volume.

The credit of having first made the suggestion that the orientation of Egyptian temples had an astronomical basis appears to be due to the German Professor Nissen; but it was reached independently by our author a few years ago, and since then he has devoted himself, with his well-known energy and originality of method, to as thorough an investigation of the subject and its significance as his leisure and the state of knowledge would permit. The results, which are here given to the world, seem to us to be of the highest possible importance, and we shall not be surprised if the new line of inquiry which they open out should ultimately lead to epoch-making discoveries. It is shown on evidence that cannot be gainsaid that the ancient inhabitants of the Nile valley, like those of India, were worshippers of the sun, and the Sun-God had various forms and names dependent upon his position in the heavens. Assuming, then, the deification of the sun, the author's hypothesis is that there were special orientations of buildings devoted to the worship of the sun, either at one time of the year or another, the times of the solstices and equinoxes being more frequently chosen than any others. On this hypothesis it follows that the amplitude of the axes of temples oriented to the sun at the solstices should vary with the latitude; that of temples oriented to the sun at the equinox should in all cases point east and west; while the orientation of a temple directed to the sun at other epochs should have an amplitude less than the solstitial amplitude of the place. Hence the question arises whether the actual facts are in accordance with this hypothesis, and the inferences which may

<sup>1</sup> *The Dawn of Astronomy, A Study of the Temple-Worship and Mythology of the Ancient Egyptians.* By J. Norman Lockyer, F.R.S., &c. London, Paris, and Melbourne: Cassell & Co. 1894.

be legitimately drawn from it? To give a complete and final answer to it is impossible in the present state of our knowledge, but candid readers of Mr. Lockyer's volume will admit that, as far as our knowledge goes, it is all in favour of the hypothesis. In support of this view a few of the points made by the author may be referred to, though we must warn our readers that we do not pretend to give anything like an adequate view of the strength of the position he has taken up.

Among the most ancient and sacred of Egyptian temples is the one at Annu, On, or Heliopolis, which tradition says was founded by the Shesu-Hor, or Sun-worshippers, before the time of Mena, who reigned 4000 or 5000 years B.C. Almost every trace of this temple has disappeared, but the orientation was determined by Lepsius in 1844, from the position of the temenos walls. But so recently as last year Captain Lyons, at the request of the author, repeated observations they had previously made together, and confirmed the conclusion then arrived at, that the determination of Lepsius required correction. Taking the later orientation as the correct one, it compels the conclusion that the temple at Heliopolis was actually oriented to the sun, but *not* at the time of a solstice. At Karnak there are several temples oriented to the sun, the magnificent one of Amen-Rā having an axis which points to the place of sunset at the summer solstice. On the other hand, a small temple attached to it has an axis which points to the place of sunrise at the winter solstice. Now, on turning to the Pyramids and the temples of the plain at Gizeh, a most remarkable difference is met with, for the structures found here are not oriented to the north-west and the south-east, but to east and west. We have, indeed, either temples of Osiris pointing to the sunset at the equinox, or temples of Isis pointing to the sunrise at the equinox, but in either case built in relation to the Pyramids. Thus, in passing from Thebes to the Pyramids at Memphis, to Saïs and Tanis, we find a solstitial orientation changed to an equinoctial one. This, as Mr. Lockyer points out, indicates a fundamental change of astronomical thought, and one which to a large extent justifies the suggestion that its explanation almost requires the supposition of a difference of race. Those who worshipped the sun at the solstice almost certainly began the year at that time, while those who ranged themselves as equinoctials would begin it at the equinox, and both these practices could hardly go on in the case of the same race in the same country, and least of all in the valley where an annual inundation marked the solstice.

• A comparison of the shrines found in other countries shows that in some cases these, like those of Egypt, were oriented in relation to the position of the sun at special times. The observations made in Babylonia are somewhat discordant, and it is not certain whether

or not the Babylonians were familiar with the solstices. If, however, the orientation given by M. Flandin of a temple at Khorsabad be the correct one, we have in it the amplitude of the sun at the summer solstice in the latitude of Nineveh. The great temple of the sun at Peking, which is the most important temple in China, is oriented to the winter solstice, and, as has long been known, Stonehenge, in this country, is oriented to the rising of the sun at the summer solstice. On the other hand, we have equinoctial temples at Jerusalem, Baalbek, and Palmyra which were apparently as perfectly squared to the equinox as the Pyramids at Gizeh.

Having dealt generally with the early temple-worship of the sun in Egypt and the adjacent countries, Mr. Lockyer describes in detail the finest of the Egyptian temples which remain open to examination—viz., that of Amen-Rā, at Karnak. The orientation of this temple, which is justly said to be the most magnificent ruin in the world, proves that many thousand years ago the Egyptians were familiar with the solstices, and therefore, more or less fully, with the yearly path of the sun. Mr. Lockyer tells us that the axis was occupied by a stone avenue some 500 yards in length, and that the object of the builder was to preserve that axis absolutely open, straight, and true. The axis was open at the entrance, where the pylons were situated, and closed at the other end, where was located the sanctuary, or Holy of Holies. From one end of the temple to the other, the axis was marked out by narrow apertures in the various pylons and many walls with doors crossing the axis, the whole giving the very definite impression that every part of the temple was built to subserve a special object—viz., to limit the light which fell on its front into a narrow beam, and to carry it to the other extremity of the temple where stood the sanctuary. Thus the axis of the temple resembled a sort of gigantic horizontal telescope, and the author puts forward the hypothesis that, whatever view may be entertained with regard to the worship and ceremonial which went on in this and similar temples, they were constructed, among other reasons, for the purpose of obtaining an exact observation of the precise time of the solstice.

Another suggestion put forward in this connection is that our year, as we know it, was first determined in these temples, and by the Egyptians. The described structure of the axis of the solstitial temple of Amen-Rā would cause a magnificent burst of light to shine into the sanctuary at sunset, and this would show that a new true solar year was beginning. It so happens that the summer solstice was the time when the Nile began, and still begins, to rise; so that in Egypt the priests were enabled to determine year after year, not only the length of the year, but the exact time of its commencement.

Proceeding with his investigation Mr. Lockyer comes later to



another branch of his subject. Among the numerous temples of Egypt there are several that are certainly not solar temples, since the direct sunlight never enters them at any period of the year. From the evidence brought forward, we cannot hesitate to accept Mr. Lockyer's conclusion that some of them at least were oriented to the stars. The proof of this is a somewhat difficult matter, since a temple oriented to a star thousands of years ago will not be so oriented to-day, owing to the change in the star's apparent position brought about by precession. But the difficulty is not an insuperable one, and the manner in which it is grappled with by the author may be commended to the reader as one of the best illustrations of his ingenuity which the volume affords. In connection with it he suggests to Egyptologists that in the case of those temples in which the axis is bent, the change in direction was made to meet a change of the star's declination, while in other cases the change of amplitude was met by putting up a new temple altogether. Unfortunately, our space being well-nigh exhausted, we cannot dwell upon these and other suggestions made by the author with regard to stellar temples, but were it otherwise it would be a pity to beggar the volume by doing so. We feel convinced, however, that in these suggestions, and in the method of inquiry which has resulted in them, there is the promise of future developments of our knowledge of ancient Egypt which will prove of the greatest possible significance.

With the second aspect of Mr. Lockyer's volume—viz., the temple-worship and mythology of the Egyptians, we do not propose to deal, although it is not the least attractive, not to say startling. In Egypt, as in India, the pantheon was astronomical and to a very large extent solar in origin. But it is here shown that nearly the whole of the remainder had its origin in stellar relations, that the stars were personified, that there were different star-cults, that the cult followed the star, and that the cult of the northern stars was more or less opposed to that of the southern. Thus, as the author himself expresses it in the preface, "the mythology was intensely astronomical, and crystallised early ideas suggested by actual observations of the sun, moon, and stars."

In Dr. Dutton's *Food and Drink rationally Discussed*<sup>1</sup> we have practically a second edition of the little work previously published under the title of *Digestion and Diet rationally Discussed*. The change of title appears to be restricted to the title page, as the old title is still retained in the body of the work, and in other respects the volume appears to have been left pretty much as it stood originally and neither carefully revised nor amended. It contains much useful information on the subject of dietetics and may be read with profit

<sup>1</sup> *Food and Drink rationally Discussed*. By Thomas Dutton, M.D. London: Henry Knapton and Hirschfeld Brothers. 1891.

by those who have not already familiarised themselves with these matters. At the same time we have found nothing special either in the matter or the treatment, and fancy most people would find some of his suggestions altogether impracticable.

### PHILOSOPHY.

It would be doing scant justice to the industry and ability of Professor William Wallace if we did not avow our appreciation of the evidence he gives of them in three volumes<sup>1</sup> for which we are indebted to the courtesy of the Delegates of the Clarendon Press, in which a large portion of Hegel's philosophy is offered to English readers. Much credit is due to Professor Wallace for the translations which render Hegel accessible and perhaps as intelligible as so difficult a philosopher can be made. We have no bias against Hegel; but we confess to feeling little interest in his writings. We have no doubt he had grasped what seemed to him some great ideas, but they were so peculiarly his own that no one else appears to be able to elucidate them. It is not our fault, we think, that if, after the English manner, we prefer something more concrete, and fail to grasp the meaning of Hegelian subtleties. The great changes that have come over our ways of thinking during the last generation render it difficult for us to put ourselves in the place of those who constructed their philosophies before the evolutionary epoch. It is not so long ago when Hegelianism was looked upon as "dead as a door-nail," as Professor Wallace himself confesses, and though there is a tendency to revive it, we look upon it as only a spasmodic movement which will have no permanent results. Even the most ardent admirers of Hegel confess that his philosophy is difficult, to put it mildly, and that the only way to do it justice is to spend some years in reading and re-reading it. Life has other demands upon us, and we must put up with the loss. The great use of a philosopher, however, lies not so much in his philosophy itself as that it is a cause of philosophy in others: they get some sort of inspiration from their master, and either adapt his ideas to their own time, or are provoked to the construction of a system,

<sup>1</sup> *Prolegomena to the Study of Hegel's Philosophy and especially of his Logic.* By William Wallace, M.A., LL.D. Second edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1894.  
*The Logic of Hegel.* Translated by William Wallace, M.A., LL.D. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1892.

*Hegel's Philosophy of Mind.* Translated, with Five Introductory Essays, by William Wallace, M.A., LL.D. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1894.

of their own. To us the most interesting portion of the present volume is that which is due to Professor Wallace himself.

The translation consists of two parts, the first and third of the *Encyclopædia of the Philosophical Sciences*—The Logic and the Philosophy of Mind. The second part, the Philosophy of Nature, Professor Wallace does not offer us, excusing himself on the ground that he lacks the special knowledge necessary for a satisfactory performance of the task.

The *Prolegomena*, of which this is a new edition, was originally published twenty years ago, and a great deal of it, fourteen chapters, at least, out of the thirty-two, are almost entirely new, and some others have been largely re-written, and a few have been dropped. The new portion deals especially with Jacobi, Herder, Kant, Fichte, and Schelling. The *Prolegomena* is divided into three books respectively: "Outlooks and Approaches to Hegel;" "In the Porches of Philosophy;" and "Logical Outlines." The first two chapters of the first book contain Professor Wallace's apology for troubling English readers with the philosophy of the Teutonic metaphysician, and he answers the questions, "Why Hegel is hard to understand?" and "Why translate Hegel?" Other chapters deal with a good many philosophers and philosophical topics besides Hegel and his system, and are well worth reading for their own sake. The five essays, introductory to the Philosophy of Mind, we prefer to the *Prolegomena*; they exhibit more freshness, and give evidence of more contact with the modern spirit. The first essay is on the scope of a Philosophy of Mind, the three next deal with Psychology and various systems, and the fifth is on Ethics and Politics. That Professor Wallace is quite in sympathy with current modes of thought may be inferred from such passages as the following:

"There are religions of all sorts; but some of them which are most heard of in the modern world only exist or survive in the shape of a traditional name and venerated creed which has lost its power."

"The religion of a time is not its nominal creed, but its dominant conviction of the meaning of reality, the principle which animates all its being and striving, the faith it has in the laws of Nature and the purpose of life."

The difficulty we find in assimilating the philosophy of Hegel, and many other things, is really explained by one pregnant sentence of Mr. Wallace's, in which he tells us that "art, religion and philosophy rest on the national culture and the individual mind." So that when we describe any particular manifestation of either of them as German, French, or English, we are making a true distinction. For instance, the Royal Academy, Church of Englandism, and Mr. Spencer's philosophy, could not have been produced in any other country than our own.

The chapter on Ethics and Politics contains much that deserves serious consideration, and in spite of Hegel's idealisation of the State, which, properly understood, is not so alarming as it sounds, we find that in practical politics he held views which we admire. Professor Wallace quotes the following which contains the principle upon which Mr. Spencer lays so much stress: "Everything which is not directly required to organise and maintain the force for giving security without and within must be left by the central government to the freedom of the citizens. Nothing ought to be so sacred in the eyes of a government as to leave alone and to protect, without regard to utilities, the free action of the citizens in such matters as do not affect its fundamental aim; for this freedom is itself sacred." Having found something of Hegel which we can understand and with which we fully agree we part on good terms with these three important volumes.

Another volume of Hegel<sup>1</sup> has reached us this month which is of a more generally interesting character than those noticed above. Rather more than a year ago<sup>2</sup> we noticed in these pages the first volume of Mr. Haldane's translation of Hegel's *History of Philosophy*; the second volume is now before us, and another volume is yet to appear to complete the work. Miss Simpson's name as joint translator now appears on the title page. The first volume brought the lectures down to the end of, according to Hegel's division of the subject, the second division of the first period of Greek philosophy, and the present volume opens with the third division of the same period, the greatest of all, as it includes Plato and Aristotle. This period justly occupies a large place in the lectures, filling about half of the volume; but we cannot say we are favourably impressed with Hegel's method, for the bulk of the lectures deals with the ontological side of the great philosophers' writings, only a few pages towards the end being given to the ethics, politics, and logic of Aristotle. This is all the more inexcusable as Hegel, speaking of the Logic, says that "*For hundreds and thousands of years it was just as much honoured as it is despised now.*" "*Hundreds and thousands of years*" is a vague expression, generally used to imply a much vaster period than that which has elapsed since the days of the great Stagyrite. The second section of this volume treats of the Stoics and Epicureans, and the third of the Neo-Platonists.

We can hardly speak too highly of the translation of Spinoza's *Ethic*,<sup>3</sup> by W. Hale White, the second edition of which, revised by A. H. Stirling, has just reached us. The book is produced in a

<sup>1</sup> *Lectures on the History of Philosophy.* By Georg Wilhelm Friederich Hegel. Translated by E. S. Haldane and Frances H. Simson, M.A. Vol. II. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. 1894.

<sup>2</sup> WESTMINSTER REVIEW, February 1893.

<sup>3</sup> *Ethic.* Translated from the Latin of Benedict De Spinoza by W. Hale White. Translation revised by Amelia Hutchinson Stirling, M.A. Second Edition. Revised and corrected. With New Preface. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1894.

manner worthy of its importance in the excellent style for which Mr. Fisher Unwin is famous. The translation is forcible and clear, and some few apparently unavoidable obscurities in the text are cleared up in the admirable Introduction. To many readers it is probable that the Preface of 100 pages will prove the most interesting portion of the volume. It opens with a sketch of the biography and personal characteristics of the great thinker, and forcibly reminds us of the great influence which his study of mathematics and his interest in scientific discoveries had in the formation of his philosophy. "What he did," says Mr. White, "in theology and ethics is parallel to the work which Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, and Huyghens did in the science of worlds, for his main achievements are the enlargement of the idea of God, the removal of God from the petty position He had formerly occupied, and the introduction of unity into the conception of man and Nature."

The preface contains a careful and penetrating analysis of other works of Spinoza's beside the *Ethic*, a very important part being an account of the contents of the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, in which Spinoza appeared as one of the first of the long line of Biblical critics, and though he seems to have exhibited some reserve, in the way of general principles he anticipated most of what has since been accomplished, if with more detail not with more success.

As to the *Ethic* itself, the great strength and power of it lies, not only in the truths which it presents, but in the clearness and precision with which they are laid before the reader. Nearly all our troubles in theology and in politics arise from the confusion of thought which springs from an absence of precision and severity of definition. So much that is utterly absurd is taken for truth merely because it is never subjected to a severe logical examination, and a study of Spinoza would be found to be one of the best remedies for the looseness of thinking which still prevails in theology, politics, and, to a less extent happily, in ethics. We congratulate all concerned, translators, editor, publisher, and the public, on the appearance of this volume, the value of which cannot be over-estimated.

Our excuse for noticing the *Tyranny of Socialism*,<sup>1</sup> translated from the French of Yves Guyot, in this section is that M. Guyot's opposition to Socialism is based upon broad philosophical principles. In the WESTMINSTER REVIEW of March last appeared an extended notice of the same author's *Les Principes de '89 et Socialisme*, which contains a fuller exposition of the views given in the work now translated, so that we need not dwell upon them at length, and we not only can give our hearty commendation of the author for these two books, but we feel grateful to him for his persistence in

<sup>1</sup> *The Tyranny of Socialism*. By Yves Guyot. Edited, with an Introduction, by J. H. Levy. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1894.

emphasising principles which are falling into neglect amongst those who ought to give them a foremost place. M. Guyot shows convincingly that the question between Socialism and Individualism is not one of mere expediency, but that upon our choice depends the intellectual as well as the industrial progress of nations. Much of the present volume is taken up with matters of local and temporary interest which are of importance so far as they illustrate the general doctrines of the writer, and though this work was written first it forms no bad appendix to *Les Principes de '89*. In his summary M. Guyot lays down four rules which may be practically applied to any proposal, or measure, or institution, and these four rules will be no bad standard for politicians in doubt as to how they ought to vote; and we think them of so much importance as to take the liberty of giving them *in extenso*:

“1. Progress is in inverse ratio to the coercive interference of man with man, and in direct ratio to the control by man of external nature.”

“2. Every institution (or measure) is injurious which has for its object the restraint of the intellectual or productive activity of man.”

“3. Every institution is pernicious which has for its object the protection of an individual, or a group of individuals, against competition; because it has as a result the apathy and atrophy of those whom it is sought to protect.”

“4. Every institution is useful which has for its object the development of the aptitudes of the individual for the struggle for existence and his ability to act in the environment in which he must live.”

We need hardly point out that these principles are in accordance with evolutionary philosophy and appear to us to apply to sociology as much as to biology. All attempts to traverse them arise from impatience and an endeavour to reach by a short cut results which can only be arrived at by long endurance and slow experience.

Mr. Levy contributes a very interesting Introduction, partly biographical and partly critical. He points out what he believes to be one or two economic mistakes in matters of detail made by M. Guyot, but these in no wise detract from the soundness of his general doctrines.

---

#### SOCIOLOGY.

It is with the highest satisfaction that we welcome the second edition of *Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies*,<sup>1</sup> by the

<sup>1</sup> *Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies*. By Alpheus Todd, LL.D., C.M.G. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1894.

late Mr. Alpheus Todd. The new edition is edited by his son Mr. A. H. Todd. It is now fourteen years since this work first appeared and Mr. Todd informs the reader that "he has, to the utmost of his endeavour, embodied important legislation illustrative of the author's constitutional doctrines, in Canada and other colonies covering the first ten years—the period since the author's demise. In so doing, however, he has not intruded on an author's privilege, as will be evident to the reader, but has strictly confined himself to a simple narration of facts, without obtruding his opinions or conclusions thereupon. Thus the public has the assurance that the book is the author's in every sense of the word."

It is hardly necessary to say that Mr. Todd has scrupulously fulfilled his promise. In addition to some 262 pages of text, Mr. Todd has very judiciously given an appendix containing the British North America Acts, 1867–1886, together with lists of the successive Secretaries of State for the Colonies, and of the various Colonial Governors, with their respective Ministries. The appearance of the new edition at the present time is singularly opportune. A twelvemonth ago, when the Home Rule controversy was raging with all its party bitterness and its religious bigotry, it was absolutely impossible for such a constitutional question to be debated in an impartial or academic spirit. Now that the fierceness of the strife has momentarily passed away, this is no longer the case.

The large part which the Canadian analogy played in the discussion will be within the memory of all. The late Sir J. Pope Hennessey, himself a Colonial Governor, was the first, in 1890, so far as we know, to draw the analogy between Home Rule in Ireland and Home Rule in Canada. In the debate on the second reading of the Home Rule Bill, Mr. Gladstone himself made allusion to this analogy, and in his speech to the deputation from the Belfast Chamber of Commerce dealt more specifically with it; and in the same debate Mr. E. J. C. Morton made it the subject of a brilliant display. Then followed the reply of the Belfast Chamber of Commerce and a speech of Lord Randolph Churchill at Macclesfield, and in the May and July numbers of this REVIEW the more purely constitutional and financial aspects of the analogy were presented. The Unionist politicians chiefly took up the position that even if the analogy from a constitutional point of view was theoretically true, yet when put to the proof of actual facts it crumbled away. And as evidence of this they produced illustrations which, curiously enough, were as a rule taken from that recent period of Canadian history not covered by Mr. Alpheus Todd's work. Some of this evidence was, it is true, contradicted at once, but since the bulk of people in this country are necessarily ignorant

of current Canadian politics, we cannot be too thankful to Mr. Todd for bringing this work up to date.

We have no hesitation in saying that the fresh matter added by Mr. Todd completely shatters every one of the arguments adduced by the Unionist politicians to prove the breakdown of Canadian institutions. And when we remember that this work is written, not by partisans of the movement in this country, but by writers of constitutional history in other countries, their simple narrative of facts has an additional weight.

Various attempts have been made to prove that the Roman Catholic majority tyrannise the Protestant minority in Quebec, and that the Roman Catholic minority is persecuted by the Protestant majority in Manitoba. As an illustration of the first class the writer of the Belfast Reply declared "that one-sixth of the provincial revenue of Quebec is applied to the maintenance of ecclesiastical institutions." From the Returns for 1890 it appears that \$400,000—about one-sixth of the provincial revenue—were applied in settlement of the Jesuit Estate's claim. And this is the only payment of the kind. The story is fully set out by Mr. Todd at pp. 484-511, and completely refutes this ridiculous accusation. As an illustration of the second class, Lord Randolph Churchill quoted the Manitoba school controversy. Mr. Todd gives a most complete account of this case, quoting the judgments delivered both in the Canadian Courts and in our own Privy Council, and showing conclusively that this was a struggle, not between Protestant and Roman Catholic, but between the denominational school party and the non-sectarian school party. Whilst this work was going through the press, the matter was still under the consideration of the judges of the Supreme Court, and it is satisfactory to find that Mr. Todd has anticipated the judgment of their lordships which has recently been delivered.

A great point attempted to be made by the Unionist politicians was that conflicts of law constantly arose between the Provincial Legislatures and the Dominion Parliament. Lord Randolph's illustration of this friction was the controversy between the Dominion Parliament and British Columbia over the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is scarcely necessary to add that his lordship's account is a gross and unpardonable travesty of the truth. The facts are clearly and impartially stated by Mr. Todd at pp. 206-208. We have only space to refer the reader to the account of the New Brunswick School Acts at p. 458; to the Ontario and Quebec Statutes for the union of Presbyterian Churches at p. 481; to the Goodhue Estate Act, p. 526; and to the Ontario Executive Powers case at p. 367. While frankly admitting the mistakes of both the Dominion and the Provincial Legislatures, Mr. Todd shows that not only in Canada, but in our other colonies "responsible government" has, on the



whole, been a complete success. For the extension of such "responsible government" to Ireland there could be no more forcible argument than the history of Canadian Home Rule, and it is with the utmost confidence that we commend this work to all who really desire to ascertain the results of the practical application of this principle amidst their kinsfolk in other lands. We can give no higher praise to Mr. Todd's labours than to remind him that the proper citation of the new series of English Law Reports is not, *e.g.*, L. R. Appeals 1892, but L. R. (1892) A. C.

There is no falling-off in the *Statesman's Year Book*, 1894.<sup>1</sup> The present volume is the thirty-first issue of this invaluable publication, which, as in former years, has been prepared under the able editorship of Mr. J. Scott Keltie. A special feature has been made of the sections dealing with the navies of the world, which "have been entirely recast and practically rewritten," and, in addition, a comparative table of the warships of the principal maritime Powers, together with an explanatory summary, is given. Another novelty is a chapter entitled "Customs Valuations in Different Countries." The statistics, so far as we have tested them, are accurate, and the information on recent events well up to date.

To all interested in public education in this country, *The Report of the Minister of Education*<sup>2</sup> of Ontario for 1893 will be found especially valuable. In this province, education may be said to be more truly nationalised than in any country of the Old World, with, perhaps, the exception of Switzerland or France. The report is printed by order of the Legislative Assembly, and the statistics may, therefore, be taken as official.

*The Handbook of Jamaica*<sup>3</sup> for 1894, compiled chiefly from official records and published by authority, is a handsome volume comprising the historical, statistical, and general information concerning the island. The chapter on the "Political Constitution" would form instructive reading to anti-Home Rulers. There is an excellent map of the island.

We sincerely congratulate the authors of *Parish Councils*<sup>4</sup> upon the production of a treatise at once intelligible and concise, and yet with sufficient detail to be of practical service to those engaged in the task of reconstructing parochial self-government. The book consists of some one hundred pages of introduction and the text of the Local Government Act 1894, with explanatory notes and cross references to the Introduction, which latter is a general statement of the effect of the Act in popular language. The authors are inclined to think that

<sup>1</sup> *The Statesman's Year Book*, 1894. Edited by J. Scott Keltie. London: Macmillan & Co.

<sup>2</sup> *The Report of the Minister of Education (Ontario) for 1893*. Toronto, 1894.

<sup>3</sup> *The Handbook of Jamaica for 1894*. London: Edward Stanton, Jamaica: Government Printing Office, 1894.

<sup>4</sup> *Parish Councils*. A Handbook to the Local Government Act 1894. By P. B. Akerman and P. H. Ford. London: Routledge & Son.

where there is no parish council, and the parish is co-extensive with the ecclesiastical parish, that the parish meeting will be entitled to meet in the church. It is, we believe, very doubtful if this view of the law would be upheld by any competent Court. As a precedent for the use of schoolrooms by the parish council might have been added that use of school rooms and public rooms which is provided under the Local Government Act 1888 for the purpose of taking a poll for the election of county councillors. That we have no more serious criticisms to make is a proof of the accuracy and merit of the book, for we have carefully compared the Introduction with the Act itself.

## BELLES LETTRES.

*The Hon. Stanbury and Others*<sup>1</sup> is one of the best books brought out in Mr. Fisher Unwin's Pseudonym Library. There is in it a deep knowledge of human nature, combined with touches of true pathos. The realism of the stories is wholesome and, instead of disgusting the reader, will probably bring tears even to masculine eyes. The Hon. Stanbury is not a very romantic type of hero, but he is a good fellow withal. The story of his curious marriage is very well told, though the ending is unsatisfactory.

"Poor Miss Skeet" is a very sad little sketch; indeed it is more lachrymose than anything Dickens has written. "An Indigent Gentlewoman" is evidently a picture drawn from life. Altogether there is rare literary power exhibited in this latest addition to the Pseudonym Library, and we have no doubt the book will be read with deep interest by thousands. At the present time there is an over-production in the department of fiction, and for that reason we should welcome anything in the shape of a really good collection of short stories.

The second volume of *English Prose Selections*,<sup>2</sup> edited by Mr. Henry Craik, covers the period from the sixteenth century to the Restoration, which, as the editor points out, was "a critical one for English prose." The introduction is admirably written, and shows a very extensive knowledge of the development of English literature. It is possible that Mr. Craik over-estimates the merits of Jeremy Taylor's style when he says: "In Jeremy Taylor, and, we might

<sup>1</sup> *The Hon. Stanbury and Others*. By Two. Pseudonym Library. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

<sup>2</sup> *English Prose Selections*. With Critical Introductions. Edited by Henry Craik. Vol. II. Sixteenth century to the Restoration. London & New York: Macmillan & Co. • 1894.

add, in a lesser degree, in Leighton, we see the evolution of order from disorder. Taylor inherited something from the Euphuists; he caught his note of earnestness from such a man as Donne; but in his prose we have a sense of greater security and restfulness than in any other that had gone before. The fretfulness of controversy, the zestfulness of individualism, the perpetual pursuit of intricacy, and the ceaseless desire to startle the reader, all these are calming down. The note of his books is earnestness; but it is earnestness which flows calmly. Contrast his prose with that of Milton, powerful as that is with the very heat of the fight, and sounding, as it were, with the very echo of the war-trumpet. We cannot deny its power, we cannot resist its excitement. But yet we are compelled to hear in it rather the echoes of what had gone before than to recognise it as the harbinger of a new and more self-contained prose." Turning to the extracts from Taylor's works given in the book, we find little to sustain this eulogy. For instance, take the opening sentences of the passage headed, "Of the Practice of Patience":

"Now we suppose the man entering upon his scene of sorrows and passive graces. It may be he went yesterday to a wedding, merry and brisk, and there he felt his sentence, that he must return home and die (for men very commonly enter into the snare singing, and consider not whither their fate leads them); nor feared that then the angel was to strike his stroke, till his knees kissed the earth, and his head trembled with the weight of the rod which God put into the hand of an exterminating angel."

This is certainly not a good specimen of an easy style. The interpolation of the long and awkward parenthesis in the first sentence is very disagreeable. No doubt Taylor utters platitudes with a certain smug self-complacency which some people may think fit to call "calmness"; for instance, in the passage from *Holy Living*: "The rewards of virtue are certain, and our provisions for our natural support are certain; or if we want meat till we die, then we die of that disease, and there are many things worse than to die with an atrophy or consumption, or unapt and coarser nourishment." Compared with this kind of thing Milton's prose may not be "self-contained," but it is certainly vigorous and effective. Mr. Craik's sketch of Sir Kenelm Digby, prefixed to the extracts from his works, is an excellent piece of condensed criticism. The fault of this learned editor is the undue prominence which he gives to ecclesiastical writers, many of whom are very mediocre from a literary point of view. Mr. George Saintsbury contributes to the volume notices of Donne, Robert Burton, Hobbes, Howell, Harrington, Sir Thomas Urquhart, Sir Thomas Brown, and Thomas Fuller. Mr. Edmund Gosse gives us a capital sketch of Izaak Walton as a man of letters, and, if space permitted, we should like to quote a great part of it. The following remarks of Mr. Gosse put the subject in a new and

interesting light : " A certain happy strain in English prose may be said to start with Izaak Walton. Of the same stock have followed Sterne and Lamb and Mr. Robert Louis Stevenson. These are the delicate moralists that make a flute of our language, and pipe to us in a mode that is free and pleasant and civilly merry, so artlessly that we are in danger of forgetting that it is the very consummation of art. The humour of Walton is charming. We can imagine Charles Lamb gravely inquiring, ' How could Cleopatra have feasted Mark Antony with eight wild boars roasted whole at one supper if the earth had not been a bountiful mother ? ' No one before him had just this turn of phrase, this playful archness, and we conceive his fun to have trotted about quite unnoticed between the legs of the elephantine Jacobean facetiousness. It is to be noted, too, as a point which links him more with the later humorists of our country, that his sentences are often admirably terse, and that he was disengaged from those coils of verbiage in which his contemporaries writhed like Laocoons." The other contributors to the volume are Mr. James Miller Dodds, the late Professor Minto, Mr. A. W. Ward, Mr. W. P. Ker, Mr. Edmund K. Chambers, Mr. W. Wallace, Mr. Alfred Ainger, Mr. A. J. Fitzroy, and Mr. J. H. Overton. The book is well printed, though there are one or two bad typographical errors.

Messrs. A. and C. Black have brought out in a very handsome volume<sup>1</sup> the *Rectorial Addresses Delivered at the University of St. Andrews between 1863 and 1893*. The Introduction, by Dr. William Knight, gives an interesting account of the office of Rector in the University, showing that, till the Universities (Scotland) Act of 1858 came into force, eligibility to this office was practically confined to the two Principals, the Professor of Divinity and the Professor of Ecclesiastical History. Since then, however, a more liberal spirit has prevailed in the University of St. Andrews, as may be seen from the fact that John Stuart Mill occupied the office of Rector. The subject of the most notable of these rectorial addresses is the important and far-reaching question, " Education." The views of Mill on this question are too well known to need repetition in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW. He laid down that a university is not a place of professional education, but that its province ended where education branched off into those departments which belong to the individual's vocation in life. In his luminous style he thus explained his view : " Men are men before they are lawyers, or physicians, or merchants, or manufacturers ; and if you make them capable and sensible men, they will make themselves capable and sensible lawyers or physicians. What professional men should carry with them from a university is not professional knowledge, but that which should direct the use of their professional knowledge, and

<sup>1</sup> *Rectorial Addresses Delivered at the University of St. Andrews (1863-1893)*. Edited, with an Introduction, by Wm. Knight, LL.D. London : A. and C. Black.

bring the light of general culture to illuminate the technicalities of a special pursuit." The whole of this address is well worthy of perusal. Mill traversed almost the entire province of human knowledge, and his plea for the historical study of dogma was as significant as his defence of the study of poetry and the fine arts.

A remarkable address, too, was that of the late James Anthony Froude on the subject of "Calvinism," in the course of which he acknowledged, with a catholicity of spirit which deserves to be lauded, that Mohammedanism is not a sensual but a truly moral religion. The remaining addresses contained in the volume are more or less interesting. Dean Stanley, when first elected Rector of St. Andrews, took for his subject "The Study of Greatness." As might have been anticipated, he deprecated fanatical views of life, and advocated a noble and generous ambition for all educated young men. Perhaps the most thoroughly superficial address in the collection is that of Mr. Balfour, in which he defends indiscriminate reading, on the ground that it is enjoyable. The concluding sentence of the address is characteristic, and shows that the logical faculty is not strongly developed in Mr. Balfour: "The world may be kind or unkind; it may seem to us to be hastening on the wings of enlightenment and progress to an imminent millenium; or it may weigh us down with a sense of insoluble difficulty and irremediable wrong; but, whatever else it be, so long as we have good health and a good library, it can hardly be dull."

Surely books are not merely meant to be read by indolent persons with plenty of leisure? Unless they teach us something of which we can either make practical use, or by whose inspiration our minds are strengthened and our hearts purified, they are of less real value than gymnastic training. The true function of books is not to amuse or to "kill time," as Mr. Balfour suggests, but to increase our knowledge, to enlarge our mental horizon, and to enable us to grapple with the problems of life and destiny.

M. Edouard Rod<sup>1</sup> has elected to follow the fortunes of his former hero, Michel Teissier, beyond the point at which he threw his cap over the windmills, and sacrificed all for love. Such a revelation of the "afterwards," such a glimpse down those long years which follow after the urgent crisis of a life requires delicate handling, and it cannot be denied that M. Rod gives proof of remarkable insight. Unflinchingly he shows us how love gradually lost its hold upon Michel Teissier's tempestuous and egotistical nature, and ambition returned and possessed him seven times more strongly than before, how again he yielded before the stress of temptation, and trampled upon the lives and happiness of those dependent upon him in a second desperate attempt to satisfy the needs of his ardent and imperious nature. This task of continuation

<sup>1</sup> *La Seconde Vie de Michel Teissier.* Par Edouard Rod. Paris: Perrin et C<sup>ie</sup>.

is even specially difficult, for the interest of the book necessarily suffers as Teissier's character deteriorates, and we see him submitting to the forces of his egotism; but it is a tribute to the art of the writer that we feel from the first that his return to action is unavoidable. Blanche, his second wife, is tender and womanly, and the strange position of his two daughters is well indicated, although as portraits they inevitably suffer from the touch of unreality and affectation which that enigmatical person, the French *jeune fille*, so frequently assumes for English readers.

*L'Aveu*,<sup>1</sup> a new novel by the popular Madame "Henry Gréville," is the tragical tale of the crime of a jealous wife, and of her lengthened struggle against the necessity of a confession which would involve the laying bare of those wounds of her soul which for long had bled in secret. Stung by his scorn, and but half-conscious of her act, Madame Loysel kills her handsome unfaithful husband, and, stunned by the calamity, takes refuge in an obstinate silence. She has no overpowering moral horror of her fearful crime, but sees, perhaps even too clearly, its extenuating circumstances. She will expiate in her own way by fasting and penance, but the shame of an avowal is more than her proud spirit can endure. Her punishment comes through her superstition, through her indomitable love for her victim, and through the long-delayed pardon of her only son; but on the whole the impression given is that Madame Loysel's crime is a little too easily condoned. Bertilde, the younger heroine, is good and lovable, but is prevented by the atmosphere of tragedy around her from showing any of that wilful archness which so charms us in many of Madame Gréville's portraits of young girls; we feel that if all had gone smoothly she might have been a light-hearted and bewitching maiden, but only the tender and serious side of her nature is called forth. *L'Aveu* is an impressive book, particularly in the delicate yet powerful study of Madame Loysel, and although sterner and more gloomy than is usual with "Henry Gréville" is yet developed with the writer's usual grace and gift of interesting her readers.

<sup>1</sup> *L'Aveu*. Par Henry Gréville. Paris: Librairie Plon.

## THE DRAMA.

It is not necessary to refer at great length to Miss Farr's initial venture at the Avenue Theatre. In the interviews which were launched before the opening of the theatre, Miss Florence Farr seemed to predict a new theatrical era, but so far the promise has not been fulfilled, and the first night of the 29th of March will be remembered as one of the most tumultuous on record. Partly this was due to the fact of Miss Farr having suppressed the orchestra, an innovation which the public greeted with loud expressions of disapprobation, but partly the plays, and in some measure the acting, were responsible for the discomfiture. *The Land of Heart's Desire*, by Mr. W. B. Yeats, is no doubt a fanciful little play, that will read well, but is entirely devoid of dramatic qualities. Evidently the author has studied Maeterlinck; but Maeterlinck is a dramatist as well as a poet, and Mr. Yeats at present seems not to be familiar with the requirements of the stage. Nor was his fancy acted in the right vein. The actors were scarcely audible at times, and harmony of tone, which is an absolute *sine qua non* for the delivery of such pieces, was wanting, and several of the interpreters, whom we will do the favour not to name, did not even do justice to the rhythm of Mr. Yeats's blank verse.

The piece was unfavourably received, but this was nothing in comparison with the fate which awaited Mr. John Todhunter's *A Comedy of Sighs*. After the *Black Cat*, expectations as to Mr. Todhunter's future work ran high, and it cannot be gainsaid that when *A Comedy of Sighs*, a charming title, was announced, everybody looked forward to something witty, and delicate, and subtle. Unfortunately by straining it too much the bow has given way. The same clever talk, which was one of the main attractions of the *Black Cat*, the inclination of the personages towards epigram-mongery, the smart sayings, the unconventional twist of all the characters bored the public, because one could evidently feel that the author was not sincere, that he had sat down with the purpose to be witty. Nor was the subject to the liking of the public, or, for the matter of that, to our own taste. Women of the *Dodo* type, women who are loveless, women who, with one exception, have all the airs and manners of the demi-mondaine, women hard and flighty, women who, for a whim's sake, would imperil their domestic happiness by listening to the tempter

who tries to seduce every lady he meets with the same finely concocted confession of love, such women are repulsive, and they become hateful when represented, as Miss Farr did, without one atom of charm, and with an absolute unconsciousness of the humour which the author had put into the character. Here and there there was a diverting scene, and notably Mr. James Welch, as a parson, who believes emphatically in the music-hall as an element of popular education, gave a very clever performance. The character was overdrawn, and we defy Dr. Todhunter to show us a clergyman, who would so far forget himself as to behave like a low comedian in Lady Brandon's drawing-room, as Mr. Welch did. It is a great pity that Dr. Todhunter's play should have so badly failed, and that, in a certain measure, the management to whom he entrusted it should be responsible for this defeat. For, after the *Black Cat*, it seemed as if the gates of our theatres would be widely opened for a new dramatist, and now, we are afraid, he will knock again a long time in vain at the sesame.

At the Haymarket Mr. Tree has produced a version of Ludwig Fulda's now celebrated play *Der Talisman*, translated and adapted by Mr. Beerbohm Tree in collaboration with Mr. Louis N. Parker. *Once Upon a Time*, as the English title is, did not achieve much more than a *succès d'estime*, and before these lines appear in print it will have been replaced by a work by Mr. Sydney Grundy.

Why did *The Talisman* achieve a comparative failure in England whilst in Germany it was a gigantic success? The reason is not far to seek. Germans are passionately fond of fairy tales, they are brought up with them as it were, and even grown-up people in Germany like from time to time to be brought back to the days when they were children. Moreover, *The Talisman* in German was a fine piece of poetry written in classical form, yet in essentially modern style, and besides it particularly amused a certain fraction of German playgoers who, in the king who plays the main part in the tale, saw a satire on the Emperor. When the play came to England the satire, of course, had lost piquancy; we do not take sufficient interest in the German Emperor to applaud a caricature of his character; and, then, fairy tales are not very much to our liking. We would not mind reading again Andersen's lovely little story of the "invisible coat," on which the plot is based, but to have to listen to a fairy-tale during a whole evening is asking rather too much. To put it in one word, we are too matter-of-fact for this light, bright, fanciful, but flimsy fare. Perhaps, if the adapters had been more conscientious in the fulfilment of their task, if they had not cut away pages and pages of the dialogue, which would have lengthened the piece, but also strengthened the portrayal of the characters, if they had stuck to Mr. Ludwig Fulda's graceful form of verse, instead of giving us a prosy version, interspersed with



rhyme couplets, which are laid into the mouth of Habakuk's pretty daughter, one would have been able to derive some artistic profit and pleasure from the spectacle. As it was now, we have nothing but pretty scenes before us, charmingly acted, but on the whole it seemed like a dinner with a surfeit of *hors-d'œuvres* and dessert, but no substantial joint to appease our hunger. And so it came that, in spite of Mrs. Tree's delightful impersonation of Rita, in spite of Mr. Lionel Brough's unctuous humour as Habakuk, of Miss Julia Neilson's majestic presence as Magdalena, and last, not least, of Mr. Tree's dignified and eloquent attitude as the king, the play fell somewhat flat; and before it was over, at the end of the third act, something graver was apprehended owing to an unskilful selection of Mr. Tree's costume. In Germany, the last scene of the third act, when the king appears before the people draped in his imaginary cloak—that is, in costly undergarments richly adorned with lace, which just suggest that His Majesty is not fully dressed and that there is something wanting, and delivers the allocution to his people which terminates in a soliloquy in which the king complains of cold and asks for a mantle—is the most powerful and significant of the whole play. Here it entirely missed fire, because Mr. Tree chose to make his appearance in real underclothes, which were so *deshabillé* that the people at once coined them “pyjamas” and made merry. It seems rather inconceivable that an artistic manager like Mr. Tree should make a mistake in such a trifling detail, and that he should have forgotten that in a fairy tale, if it is not to lose its hold on the public, the principal thing is to maintain fancy at all cost. We, of course, do not wish to blame Mr. Tree for his mistake, although it might have been avoided by obtaining the necessary indications from any German municipal theatre; but it goes to show that on the stage the distance between the sublime and the ridiculous is almost infinitesimal.

It was very satisfactory to learn that Lady Greville had written a comedy in three acts for the Criterion, called *An Aristocratic Alliance*, but when one came to see the play and found out that it was not by Lady Greville at all, but merely an unskilful adaptation of Augier's masterpiece *Le Gendre de M. Poirier*, one had reasons to feel less pleased, firstly because it is outrageous to tamper with a classic by adding some purposeless comic characters to it, and secondly it is unfair, to say no more, to ascribe to Lady Greville what really belongs to the great dead Frenchman. The truth is that all that is good in *An Aristocratic Alliance*, and of course one could not adapt *Le Gendre de M. de Poirier* without leaving something good, belongs to Augier and the rest must be debited to Lady Greville. On the whole the story of *An Aristocratic Alliance* is the same as in the French play, but immediately the action begins to develop one feels that the transposition of the characters deprives

the play of its chief characteristics, for while in France there is a gulf between the bourgeoisie and the aristocracy, in England the difference, if it exists at all, is scarcely apparent, or at least people do not trouble their heads about it. In the acting of the English play moreover much of the distinction which we should expect to find in the character of the Earl of Forres had given way to a certain *parvenu* style of manners, which distinctly lessened any kind of sympathy the personage might command. The French Marquis de Presles is under all circumstances *au fond* a nobleman. In Mr. Charles Wyndham's impersonation we failed to detect anything noble; on us he made rather the impression of a jaunty man about town, utterly selfish, loud and not very *distingué*. We think that Mr. Wyndham, whose comic power we deeply admire, is not the man for this kind of part, and we feel certain that, for instance, in the hands of Mr. Tree or Mr. Alexander, the Earl of Forres would have been a quite different, far more aristocratic and also more refined personage. Miss Mary Moore, as the angelic wife, was very charming, and so exquisitely ladylike that she altogether eclipsed her highly-born husband. Mr. Charles Groves was a fine type of the British tradesman who has risen through pickles, and Miss Annie Hughes was winning in the superfluous part of Rosa Lea; but above all stood out Mr. H. de Lange, as the French cook; his Vatel will ever be remembered. Mr. de Lange had but twenty lines to speak, but if the part had been ever so long, nothing could have made a deeper impression than the delivery of those twenty lines, which Mr. de Lange endowed with a wealth of humour and a conception which certainly equals that of the creator of the part, Coquelin. It may sound strange, but it is a fact, that the hit of the evening was not made by the leading characters, but by Mr. de Lange with his brilliant, though microscopic part.

For a firstling, *Mrs. Lessingham*, by George Fleming, a pseudonym of the well-known novelist, Miss Fletcher, is not at all bad. The dialogue is a good deal better than what we are accustomed to on our stage, and in the invention of the story there is an effort to be original. If in spite of that we confess to but a slender liking for *Mrs. Lessingham*, it is because the authoress does not succeed in maintaining our interest, through her being still under the sway of the absurdly commonplace method of *dénouement*, which causes the heroine to overhear a conversation between her husband and the lady who was once his bride.

We also object to the teaching of the play—for teaching there is. According to the doctrine laid down by Miss Fletcher, illicit relations between men and women ought to be redeemed by marriage as soon as circumstances will permit it. And thus in the play we find ourselves face to face with this situation: Five years ago Mr. Forbes and Mrs. Lessingham eloped together; she was married.

After a while they fall out and part. During the interval of five years Forbes forgets Mrs. Lessingham and falls in love with a pretty girl. A month before his marriage Mrs. Lessingham reappears, free, ready to wed him. He demurs, but the girl of his heart meets Mrs. Lessingham, sounds the situation and—would you believe it?—not only gives her *fiancé* up, but forces him to marry his mistress. Of course, the match turns out misery; the old love glows in the man's bosom; it flares up when he meets his former bride; he pours his sorrow out to her and is overheard by his wife. Poison sets him free, and when the play is over we are sent home to solve the conundrum: What will happen? Will Forbes wed his erstwhile bride, or will she turn from him for ever? This question is interesting enough, but as to the Forbes-Lessingham match we certainly differ from the authoress. Space fails us here to expatiate on the subject, but surely if the play was intended to prove anything the fatal five years which lay between Forbes's relations with Mrs. Lessingham and her return entirely destroy the *raison d'être* of the fair writer's plea.

Moreover, Mrs. Lessingham, as played by Miss Robins, is not a very sympathetic creation; somehow, we venture to think, Miss Robins strikes a wrong note, makes Mrs. Lessingham too nervous, too hard, too unlovable; she plays the part as if it were a Hedda Gabler kind of woman, while, if we do not misunderstand the authoress, she should be a winning, warm-hearted, rather ill-used woman, whose fate, whose every word should appeal to us.

It is regretful that Miss Robins's conception should be so devoid of tenderness and delicacy, for we are certain that the scant amount of enthusiasm aroused by the play is rather due to the interpreter of the main part than to her fellow-actors and the authoress. And, perhaps, we might feel somewhat less irreconcilable to the moral teaching of the play if Mrs. Lessingham were less matter-of-fact and more *femme-de-cœur*!





