THE

WESTMINSTER

REVIEW.

JANUARY,

1887.

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

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

NEW SERIES.

VOL. LXXI.

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

Ballantyne Press
BALLANTYNE, HANSON AND CO., EDINBURGH
CHANDOS STREET, LONDON

Uttarpara Jaikrishna Public Library
Acc. No. 7246 Date 2.8.75

CONTENTS.

ART. PAGE

I. *State Eduction in America* 1

II. *The Ancient Wild Animals of Britain* . . . 36

III. *Diderot and the Art of Acting* 44

IV. *What Woman is Fitted for* 64

V. *The Art of Government* 75

VI. *The Bishop of Chester's Oxford Lectures.*

Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Mediæval and Modern History and Kindred Subjects. Delivered at Oxford under statutory obligation in the years 1867-1884, by WILLIAM STUBBS, D.D., Bishop of Chester and Honorary Student of Christ Church, late Regius Professor of Modern History, LL.D. of Cambridge and Edinburgh, a Member of the Court of the Victoria University, and an Honorary Member of the Imperial University of S. Vladimr of Kieff and of the Royal Bavarian, Prussian, Irish, and Danish Academies. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1886 93

VII. *Plato's Moral Mission.*

1. Œuvres de Platon. Traduites par VICTOR COUSIN. Paris. 1828.
2. Plato and some of the Companions of Socrates. By GEORGE GROTE. London. 1866.
3. The Dialogues of Plato. Translated into English, with Analysis and Introductions by B. JOWETT. Oxford. 1885 . 109

VIII. *The Rent Question in Ireland* 141

Contents.

PAGE

Independent Section.

I. LONDON GOVERNMENT.

1. The London Government Bill, 1884. Speech of Sir WILLIAM V. HARCOURT on the Introduction of the Bill, April 8, 1884. Speech of JOSEPH F. B. FIRTH, M.P., President of the London Municipal Reform League, on the Second Reading of the London Government Bill, 1884.
2. Some Reasons for a Single Government of London. By the Right Hon. Sir ARTHUR HOBHOUSE, K.C.S.I.
3. London Government, and How to Reform it. By J. F. B. FIRTH, M.P. London. 1882.
4. London Government Reform. Reprinted from the *Times* of October 3, 1882, February 9, 1883, and March 24, 1888.
5. Speech of the Right Hon. HENRY MATTHEWS, Secretary of State for the Home Department, to the Deputation of Vestries. *Times*, December 3, 1886 151

II. GOVERNMENT AND COMMERCE.

1. First Report of the Royal Commission on Loss of Life at Sea. London. 1886.
2. Third Report of the Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade and Industry. London. 1886.
3. A Review of the History of the Load Line Question. By B. MARTELL, Esq. London. 1880 171

Contemporary Literature.

Theology 191
Philosophy 202
Politics, Sociology, Voyages and Travels 207
Science 229
History and Biography 231
Belles Lettres 253

THE MONTHLY

PUBLICATION OF

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

OUR readers will, we believe, welcome the announcement that the WESTMINSTER REVIEW is about to be published every month.

The present age is distinguished beyond all its predecessors by the marvellously intense activity observable in every sphere of human life. In the world of literature this phenomenon is especially remarkable: while books, strictly so-called, are now produced with unprecedented rapidity and in ever-increasing numbers, the development of periodical publications, representing every phase of thought, every shade of belief and opinion, every conceivable "cause," and almost every industrial or commercial interest, is truly amazing. But a special and distinctive feature of this development is the *frequency* with which a large proportion of these periodicals appear.

There was a time when the WESTMINSTER REVIEW necessarily addressed itself mainly to those who were best reached by the time-honoured quarterly periodical. But the vast outspreading of liberal education in recent years, and the consequent great increase of the readers of such essays as the REVIEW has supplied, have imposed a new duty upon the adherents of the cause to which it has always been devoted: it has at length become largely possible, and being possible it has become expedient, to extend the influence of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW to another and an ever-increasing public, by issuing the future numbers of the work every month, instead of, as hitherto, every quarter.

It is believed that were this change, as well as others already designed, effected, the REVIEW would be brought into more complete harmony with the growing activity and rapidly progressive spirit of the times, its influence would be extended, and its success, as an organ of the most advanced Liberal thought in all countries in which the English language is spoken, would be increased. Moreover, there are indications that the present time is peculiarly favourable for such a transformation. A monthly series of the work will, therefore, be begun in April 1887.

This announcement is not made without some justifiable pride; for the recent and extraordinary advance in national culture just referred to has followed upon the realization of projects which were but the visions of philosophers when the WESTMINSTER REVIEW first had the boldness publicly to adopt and advocate them. Indeed, since the foundation of this REVIEW in 1824, its place has always been in the van of the ever forward and upward movement on behalf of freedom of thought upon all the questions which occupy liberal minds. For this reason the REVIEW has been, not inaptly, designated "the cradle of English Liberalism." Entering a new phase of its existence, the WESTMINSTER will continue to fulfil its function as the foremost pioneer in the direction of human freedom and of that only genuine and permanent happiness which will arise from a thoroughly scientific culture of the intellectual and moral nature of man.

The Monthly issue of the work will not only reach a greatly extended public at home: care has been taken that it shall also obtain a great increase of publicity for its principles in the British Colonies, in the United States of America, and, in short, wherever English, the leading language of the world, is spoken. Moreover, its claim on the American and Colonial public will be greatly increased by the fact that each number of the Monthly Series will consist, partly of articles written in England as heretofore, and partly of articles by Trans-oceanic writers—a special endeavour being made to secure the discussion of questions affecting the Colonies by Colonists, who will be enabled to place their opinions before the English public in the light in which they are regarded by those most immediately interested in the solution of the questions to which they refer. These "Trans-oceanic" writers will thus become authoritative interpreters to the English readers of the REVIEW of the best thoughts, tendencies, and aspirations of their brethren in the United States, India, and the British Colonies who are ready to assist in promoting the gradual and healthy translation of the principles it advocates into working realities adapted to the varying needs and racial characteristics not only of those communities who look back with pride on their English origin, but also of those of foreign descent whose national evolution is proceeding under English guidance.

Having been the recognized organ of the most advanced thinkers of England during upwards of sixty years, the WESTMINSTER has now no need to make a profession of faith; nevertheless, it may be expedient to accompany the announcement of a Monthly issue of the REVIEW by a few words concerning the general character and main objects of the work:—

The increased frequency of its publication will not involve any *essential* change in its character. Besides the change which Freedom's self effects, the most notable one will be that resulting from an endeavour to suffuse the work with fresh vigour, and to render it even more thoroughly representative than it has been hitherto of the best and freest intellectual activity of the age.

The REVIEW will continue faithful to its mission as an organ of independent thought in respect to social, political, philosophical, and religious questions; it will be the result of the earnest co-operation of men whose main ideas, desires, and aims are so nearly identical as to enable them to work together for the accomplishment of the same purposes—purposes which the founders of the WESTMINSTER had in view when they originated it more than sixty years ago, and to the furtherance of which it has remained, ever since, steadily devoted.

The great and astonishing development of the various branches of Physical Science which has taken place during the last half century has been practically recognized in the WESTMINSTER in the form of its quarterly analysis and review of scientific books; but while the REVIEW will still be suffused with the scientific spirit, and will give special attention to the literature of science, the exposition and discussion of scientific subjects (which in comparison with the whole of the other departments of intellectual activity have now attained commanding pre-eminence and supreme importance) will in future constitute a distinctive feature of the work.

Social questions, including those extremely important subjects—the legal status of woman and the relation of the sexes, will receive especial attention.

In the department of politics careful consideration will still be given to all the most vital questions, without regard to the distinctions of party; the only standard of consistency which will be adhered to being the real, and not the accidental, relations of measures—their bearing, not on a Ministry or a class, but on the public good.

The REVIEW has always recognized the principle of local self-government as at once especially sound and salutary, and has consistently advocated a large extension of its practice. Increasing attention will be given to this important subject in the Monthly Series of the work, and especially in respect to the momentous question which has cleft the great Liberal party into two sections, each of which is thus rendered virtually powerless to promote the advance of the cause it represents.

Literary criticism will still constitute a distinctive feature of the WESTMINSTER: in addition to those articles in which especially important books may be reviewed separately, a considerable proportion of each Monthly number of the REVIEW will be devoted, as heretofore in the Quarterly numbers, to a Critical Survey and Analysis of British and Foreign Contemporary Literature. The great value of this Survey being already generally recognized, it is only necessary to state here that it will be continued.

The REVIEW, which has long been distinguished as a strenuous opponent of so-called "over-legislation," will continue to insist on the necessity of restricting Governmental activity within the narrowest possible limits, the indisputably legitimate functions of Government being held to be those of defending the Empire from external attack; the maintenance of diplomatic relations with other countries; the financial management of all lands which still belong, or which may hereafter belong, to the nation; the supreme control of all railways, water-ways, and common roads; and the performance of all duties implied in the phrase—the administration of justice. Practical recognition of this doctrine is now rendered increasingly indispensable by the inevitable advance of democracy, as well as by various manifestations of socialistic tendencies, as a measure at once essentially conservative in the best sense, and the most powerfully protective of individual liberty.

But while the REVIEW will strive to counteract the prevalent superstitious belief in the omnipotence of Government, and the increasing, but futile, endeavours to remedy existing social evils by legislative interference, it will vigorously support whatever seems conducive to the growth of that excellent form of self-help—known as Co-operation—which tends, by means of the voluntarily associated endeavours of individuals, to arrest social evils at their source, as well as to prevent the waste incident to needless competitive struggles, and which is alone capable of rendering the enormously productive powers now at man's command as beneficial as they ought to be to the mass of men, by whose toil they are maintained in activity.

Ever since the WESTMINSTER REVIEW was established it has been a supporter of the principle which is as expedient in a large humanitarian sense as it is essentially just and equitable —the principle of *Free Trade.* In those far-off days when, even in England, the doctrine of Protection was generally accepted, Colonel Perronet Thompson proclaimed that principle, and advocated it with trenchant logic in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW. Faithful to the doctrine of commercial liberty, the WESTMINSTER will continue to insist upon the importance of its practical recognition by all civilized peoples, and, in particular, it will endeavour to break down those fiscal barriers which impede the commercial intercourse of the British Colonies with each other and with the Mother Country, and which, exerting, as they do, a disastrous influence on the commerce of both England and the United States, precludes their people from practising those thousand-fold forms of international intercourse which would immensely hasten and strengthen their growing union.

Five-and-thirty years ago, under the title of "Our Colonial Empire," the REVIEW began to urge the question which has at last become the leading English-world question. Many other articles animated by a spirit like to that which pervades the one just alluded to have since appeared in the REVIEW; but in future it will make itself still more emphatically the exponent of the aspirations and endeavours of all English-speaking people to increase and strengthen the ties, intellectual, social, and—as far as may be—political, which it is believed will ultimately bind them into a vast federal union, the bases of which are even now taking form.

Under the title "Independent Section," a limited portion of the REVIEW will continue available, as heretofore, for the reception of able articles which, though harmonizing with the general spirit and aims of the work, may contain opinions at variance with the particular ideas or measures it may advocate. *These articles will be either signed or anonymous, at the option of their writers.* This department was introduced in order to facilitate the expression of opinions by men of high mental power and culture, who, while being zealous friends of freedom and progress, yet differ widely, on special points of great practical concern, both from the Editors and from each other.

No. 141 of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, New Series (No. 252 of the WESTMINSTER AND FOREIGN QUARTERLY REVIEW), will form the closing volume of its *Quarterly* Series. An Index to this volume will be supplied at the end of the first number of the Monthly Series of the Work.

THE

WESTMINSTER

AND

FOREIGN QUARTERLY

REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1887.

ART. I.—STATE EDUCATION IN AMERICA.

THE insular self-sufficiency of England in all matters outside of commerce, her unwillingness to receive instruction from other nations, has always been a barrier to her progress. There seem now to be some signs of a breakdown of this national reserve, at all events in certain directions, and of a growing desire to welcome impressions from without. Especially is this change perceptible in regard to Education. We have lately woke to a recognition of two facts. The first is that, whereas our National Education is in a state of crude empiricism, other nations are making rapid strides in the application of scientific method. The second is that in other civilized countries the duty of the State with respect to education is recognised as having a much wider meaning than in our own country. The interest recently evoked by the publication of Mr. Matthew Arnold's report upon "Certain Points connected with Elementary Education in Germany, Switzerland, and France," is strong evidence of this willingness to learn. But in our study of foreign methods it is natural that our eyes should turn not only to those neighbouring European nations whose rapid intellectual growth has brought with it the development of public education on a wider and more elaborate scale than was known in any former age, but also upon that nation, more distant in space, which is so near akin to us in blood, language, manners, and institutions on the other side of the Atlantic. If it is true, the one fact on which modern historians insist so strongly, that community of race is the true bond of union between nations, that in transmitting English blood we transmit English institutions and habits, not only as they exist, but as they shall exist, that we transmit English potentialities, there can be no nation from whom we can hope to learn so much as from America. We are far from saying that in this matter of public education the United States stands ahead of the chief civilized countries of Europe, for that is certainly not true, or even that she is superior to England in that part of the work which both alike have undertaken. What we do mean is this, that the successes and the failures of America in her system of education are and must be more to us in the way of example or of warning than the successes and failures of other nations; for an example is effective just in proportion as the conditions are alike, and by far the most important condition in social development is blood relationship. This is the reason why it is likely that we can learn less that is of value from the educational systems of Germany, Switzerland, or France, excellent as these may be, than from the less highly developed and less successful system of the United States. We may admire the admirable organization and discipline of the Prussian schools, the intense earnestness which inspires teacher and scholar, the power of application and thirst for knowledge which make it easy for the German to become a student; we may admire the vivacity and perspicuity of the French mode of teaching, the ingenuity of their school arrangements, their readiness to appreciate and adopt reforms; but after all we must attribute this largely to what we call the German character, the French character, and we must own that it is not the English character. But in regarding the American system there can be no such feeling, notwithstanding the different external conditions of a new world, with various climatic influences and a history of its own. We see the solid substratum of the English character, a character so strong that it has survived, with a force little impaired, the deluge of foreign blood which has poured in during the last century from nations all over the globe. Americans are essentially English, and that is why we can learn so much from American institutions. Indeed, there seems some reason to believe that in the political institutions of the United States we see, at any rate in outline, our own future as a democracy; though it is not perhaps wise to press this point too keenly, owing to the difficulty of distinguishing what is outline and what is individual detail in a political growth.

Leaving now these more general considerations, let us take a closer and more detailed view of American education.

The main body of the information presented in this article has been culled from a Report of the Commissioner of Education published in 1884, and two "Circulars of Information," also published by the Bureau of Education within the last two years. Most of the passages marked with quotation marks are from these same sources, and some other passages are taken almost verbatim.

There is, strictly speaking, no national system of education in the United States.

The work of providing instruction for its youth is undertaken by each State for itself, and managed without the least interference from the Central Government. The Bureau of Education in Washington has no other task save that of collecting from the various States such information respecting education as may enable it to elaborate statistics and publish circulars of instruction. Thus we have not one but many systems to examine if we would form a correct estimate of the condition of American education: these systems, it is true, possess important features in common, but they also possess a sufficient number of differences to give a degree of individuality to each. It is obviously not within the scope of the present article to deal separately with each of these systems. We shall content ourselves with tracing distinctly those main features common to each system, filling in the outlines by examples selected with a view of showing the general mode of working. In dealing with City Schools we shall frequently take New York, Boston, and a few of the largest cities as our illustrations, in dealing with Rural Schools we shall pay chief attention to such States as have made most advance in educational development. Thus it will be found that the Eastern States will occupy us most. There are two reasons for this preference, first, because the tendency of the educational movement is best understood by closer observation of the more advanced part of the nation, and, secondly, because for English readers the Eastern States possess even a larger interest and importance than is proportionate to their size and population. If we would understand fully the character, and the aims of American civilization, we must without doubt give our chief attention to the older and more cultured Eastern States, not neglecting, however, to turn our eyes from time to time upon the more rugged West and the softer and more effeminate South.

The chief distinguishing feature of public education in the United States is that it is free. Tuition in all public schools, whether elementary or high, is entirely gratuitous. In other countries, such as Switzerland, Sweden, and recently in France, elementary education is substantially free; but in no other country has it been so clearly recognised that it is the duty of the State to provide free instruction for all the children of its people. The only expense which falls immediately on the parent is that of providing textbooks and stationery. This absolute gratuity of instruction is the more noticeable, inasmuch as it is due to the separate action of each State, and thus illustrates a common development of democratic sentiment. The result has not been achieved without a struggle; the advocates of free education have had many difficulties to contend with, especially as regards secondary education in the form of High Schools. But of late years the opposition has been unavailing, and we shall trace later on the development of a growing system of free secondary and technical educational establishments.

Compulsory attendance has as yet made slow progress. The earliest enactment for universal compulsory education was the Act of the first settlers on the shores of New England and dates 1642. This Act unfortunately has been allowed to lapse for centuries, instead of serving for an example to later constituted States. In recent times the question of compulsion has been often raised, but as yet it is authoritatively recognised only in sixteen of the thirty-eight States, namely California, Connecticut, Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Wisconsin. Generally speaking, the statutes for compulsion in these States require persons having the care of children from eight to fourteen years of age to send them to school for a period varying from twelve to twenty weeks in the year under penalty of a fine. To this requirement there is often attached another, forbidding the employment of children in any manufactory or mercantile establishment, who have not attended school during the preceding twelve months from twelve to twenty weeks. But in most of these States these enactments have been ineffectual, owing to the want of adequate provisions for their enforcement. In Massachusetts, indeed, truant laws have been passed and special officers appointed to carry them out, and the results have been most satisfactory. In New York also some steps have been taken for making the compulsory law operative. But, with these exceptions, hardly any attempt seems to have been made to enforce the laws. In this neglect the States stand alone. Nearly every country of Europe has adopted an effectual coercive method.

The legal school age in most of the States is from six years to eighteen or twenty. This high figure, however, includes the High School teaching, which falls under secondary education, and for which provision is only made in some of the cities.

The elementary course of instruction is so arranged as to its stages, and the amount of work to be done, that the average pupil may complete it at the age of fourteen. There is remarkable uniformity among the States in fixing upon this age of fourteen as the termination of elementary education. In both England and France pupils are expected to finish the course a year earlier.

In connection with the question of school attendance it will be interesting to quote a few figures recently published in the Journal of Education (October) on the authority of Mr. Eaton, U.S. Commissioner of Education. It appears that, taking the actual school age as six to sixteen years, the ratio of public enrolment to actual school population in five of the largest cities is as follows:—New York 87 per cent., Philadelphia 65 per cent., Chicago 68 per cent., Boston 91 per cent., Cincinnati 52 per cent. These numbers are exclusive of the attendance at private schools, which ranges from 12 per cent. in Boston to about 25 per cent. in Cincinnati. With regard to the average of actual attendance we learn, "Examination of the latest return from forty cities, having each a population above 25,000, shows that the per cent. of average attendance upon average enrolment fell below 85 in but one city, in which it was 74 per cent. For the remaining 39 cities it ranged from 85 to 99 per cent." It appears that in 1883-84 the average attendance in the United States was 6,693,928, a little more than one-eighth of the estimated population, and about the same proportion as held good in England during the same year. This comparison must be regarded as eminently satisfactory to the United States system, labouring, as Mr. Eaton points out, out under the following difficulties:—"A scattered population gathered out of all nations, compulsion next to none, public appropriations irrespective of attendance or any other condition of efficiency, and, excepting possibly in the larger cities, none of the force generated by rival agencies."

The current expenses of the State public schools are defrayed almost entirely by State and local taxes. To take California for an example, we learn that there "The public schools are sustained by a State poll-tax of Section 2 on each male inhabitant over twenty-one and under sixty years of age, except paupers, &c., to be used for paying teachers; a county tax, not to exceed fifty cents on 100 dollars; and a district tax, not to exceed seventy cents on 100 dollars for building, or thirty cents on 100 dollars for other school purposes." In other States a fixed portion (in Missouri 25 per cent.) of the entire State revenue is devoted to education, in addition to local taxes. In some few States there are endowments, but in no case does the income derived from these latter form an important element in the total revenue. The public schools of the United States are supported almost entirely from direct taxation.

The general supervision of the public schools in a State is as a rule entrusted to a superintendent, who is appointed for a period of from two to four years, either by popular vote or in other cases by appointment of the State Legislature or the Governor. With him in some States co-operates a State Board. His chief work is that of inspection and general supervision. In most States there are County Boards and with them County Superintendents. The real working centre, however is the District or the Township in rural parts, and the City, a name given to all towns containing over 7,500 population. The District Superintendent and the District Board are chiefly responsible for the condition of education in the country, while in cities the City Board and the City Superintendent have the widest powers.

We have thus far traced the scheme of public education in America from the central authority down to the district or city. In proceeding further it will be convenient to treat city schools and rural schools separately, as they differ much both as regards condition and management.

We will deal first with City Schools.

The schools in cities are under the control of Local Boards which differ greatly in different cities as to their mode of election, tenure of office, powers and duties, but which in the main represent the will of the people in reference to the maintenance of education. The size of this Local Board is various, in Boston it has reached the number of 116, but generally the number, even in large centres, is much smaller. The Boards are generally constituted by State laws; the members are elected by popular vote to represent wards of cities, and to hold office for two or three years, one-half or one-third being elected every year. At first sight it may appear that English School Boards, by the popular mode of their election, place the public education as much under the control of the democracy as is the case in America. The great difference, however, consists in the fact that, while English School Boards have to administer an elaborate system imposed by the central authority, retaining but slight powers of modification and that in matters of detail, the American City Boards are invested with a far wider authority. "They have the power to certificate, elect, and dismiss teachers, and fix their compensation; they determine the grading and courses of study of the schools, and prescribe the textbooks to be used. They make the regulations for admission of pupils to the different grades of schools, for promotion from one class to another, and for graduation." Their chief limitations are their inability to establish schools, or to provide instruction not authorized by law, and the fact that they have no control over the disbursement of the school moneys. Some cities are, however, free from these restrictions. In New York and St. Louis the Boards have almost unlimited authority in all matters referring to school property. It should be, however, observed that in other towns of importance, such as Philadephia, their powers are much more restricted. These restrictions, so far as they relate to expenditure, are in the main exercised by the municipal authority. In Massachusetts a sort of balance of power in the matter of expenditure is established between the School Boards and the municipal authorities, which has been most beneficial in its working. On the whole, the tendency is in the direction of increasing rather than restricting the authority of the Boards.

The American school system is founded on the idea of local competency in the management of education. Everything depends on the character of the School Board. As one would expect, the most competent men are by no means always elected on these Boards. There are in fact few Boards which do not contain some persons unqualified for the post. "The office is not unfrequently used by aspiring politicians as a stepping-stone to coveted places." It is difficult to conceive that the most satisfactory results can be obtained by a system which places so much power in the hands of persons elected by so wide a suffrage for so short a term of office. In some of the largest cities the evils arising from this system became so serious that the election by popular suffrage has had to be abandoned. In New York it has been replaced by appointment by the Mayor; in Philadelphia and Chicago it has also been taken away from the people. Nevertheless election by popular suffrage is the rule, and, though there may be occasionally abuses of power, the undoubted success of the city schools in America must be in large measure placed to the credit of these bodies.

We have mentioned already the important position which the City Superintendent holds in the educational system. The value of an efficient Superintendent can scarcely be over-estimated, for he is the highest official who is brought into intimate acquaintance with the actual working of the separate schools.

As a rule this official depends upon the School Board for his election, and is subject to its control. He is chosen as an educational expert, and is required to devote his energies entirely to his work of supervision. His tenure of office is subject to the same injurious condition of annual or biennial re-election which pervades the official system of the United States, and which is peculiarly detrimental to educational institutions. "The duties of a Superintendent are multifarious, he is the chief executive officer of the Board, and is required to exercise personal supervision of the instruction and discipline, and of the internal economy and management of the schools."

"He not only acts as adviser of the Board and of its individual members, and supervises, inspects and examines the schools, but he has to provide, under the direction of the Board, for all the material wants of the school." In certain large cities specialization of the executive work has been begun by the employment of assistants to do such work as does not require the qualifications of an educational expert. In New York the Superintendent's duties have chief regard to instruction, discipline, and school management. Many cities in the United States have of recent years succeeded in obtaining men of exceptional ability and devotion for this work of superintendence, and to this cause more than any other is attributed the vast superiority of city schools over country schools, where supervision is more lax.

There are nominally three grades in City Schools—the primary, grammar and high. The primary and grammar courses, however, taken together, constitute the elementary course and may be treated together; they form the real basis of public instruction in the United States, and by their success the educational condition of the country as a whole must be tested. The High School belongs to secondary education, and although of growing importance extends its influence as yet to but a small proportion of the whole community. The elementary course, as before stated, is so arranged that the pupil completes it at the age of fourteen. The lower limit of age is not the same in all cities, being almost equally divided between five and six. The eight or nine years thus allotted to elementary education are differently divided in different cities. In most New England cities the primary course comprises three years for pupils from five to eight years of age, while the grammar course comprises six years. In St. Louis the whole course of public instruction is divided into three periods of four years each, the primary, grammar and high courses, each occupying one of these periods. In other cities five years is given to the lower grade and three to the grammar or intermediate course. In most cities the High Schools constitute a separate establishment, and it will be convenient for us to consider them separately later on and to here confine our attention to the Primary and Grammar Schools. These latter are, in the Western States, commonly conducted under the same principal and in the same building, whereas in the Middle and Eastern States they are generally separate institutions.

"In New York the Primary Schools are very large establishments, some schools containing as many as fifteen hundred pupils. In Boston, on the other hand, the Primary Schools are intended to be establishments of moderate size, the maximum primary building erected in recent years containing not more than eight school rooms."

"From one to three or four of these neighbourhood Primary Schools are grouped around each Grammar School, in locations best adapted to accommodate the pupils, the master of the Grammar Schools exercising the function of principal of these schools."

Most cities are divided into districts, and the pupil is obliged to attend the school in the district where he lives. New York, however, is an exception to this rule; for there, though each ward forms a district for school purposes, the attendance of the pupils is not restricted to any particular school.

> "Hence the schools of New York, especially the Grammar Schools, have come to have a more marked individuality than those of other cities. One school, for instance, gets a reputation for fitting its pupils for the High School, while others become noted for fitting their pupils for practical business."

We should much like to quote a schedule now before us, drawn up for the use of elementary schools in Boston for 1877-78; but want of space will oblige us to content ourselves with drawing attention to a few points deserving of special notice.

(*a*) The hours given to reading are not consumed merely in enabling the pupils to acquire a mechanical habit, but give an acquaintance with pieces of good sound literature. Americans claim a great superiority in their reading books over those used in England so far as the matter is concerned.

(*b*) Several hours a week are occupied in what is termed oral instruction. Under this heading is included not only what we call object lessons—elementary teaching in physical science—but useful information of every kind which may aid in fitting the pupils for active employments. Without some such attempt, it is only too likely that the schooling which is forcibly thrust on the young will be dropped almost entirely by them when grown up and fail to achieve any permanent effect on their life and character. This oral instruction, and the miscellaneous teaching attached thereto, have a humanizing influence which is wanting from the more mechanical English code. In connexion with this same thought we may allude to the fact that drawing and music are deemed not mere ornaments, or "accomplishments" as the superficial term it, but an integral part of the training of an American citizen—one which will give him a fuller, healthier, and therefore more useful life.

(*c*) It appears that the number of school hours in Boston for the week is about twenty-two in both primary and grammar school. This is in fact about the usual length of a school week in the American cities. The English code fixes twenty hours as the school week. Mr. Matthew Arnold, in a report of education upon the Continent recently published, points out that in Germany the hours are much longer. In Hamburg, for example, the lowest classes have twenty-six hours and the highest classes thirty-two in the week. This should be borne in mind if any comparison is to be made between the results of instruction in America or England and the most advanced countries of the Continent.

It may be worth mentioning that it has been long the custom everywhere to interrupt the work of the school session, both forenoon and afternoon, by a recess varying from ten to twenty minutes. In several of the large cities, however, there has been substituted for this custom a shortening of the sessions. Under this latter system the arrangement of hours is as follows: In the primary and grammar grades the morning session begins at 9 o'clock and closes at 11.30, and the afternoon session begins at 1.30 and closes at 3.30.

A fair average number of scholars to a teacher in the Primary and Grammar Schools is somewhere between fifty and sixty. This, however, is a matter left to each School Board to settle for itself, and economy is frequently an important consideration in deciding. In New York the following regulations hold :—

(1) No class in the Grammar School shall contain more than sixty pupils.

(2) No class in the Primary School shall contain more than seventy-five pupils.

In Chicago the average of pupils to each teacher is 54, in San Francisco 41, in Kansas city 51, in Cleveland 43.

There does not, as might be expected, seem to be any precise regulations regarding punishment, common to the various State systems; but in certain cities, New York for example, corporal punishment is absolutely prohibited, the Report somewhat naïvely adding that "pupils are kept so busy that there is little time for disorder or mischief."

The City Schools of America have many excellences, and much thought and energy have been devoted to the elaboration of a system by which much has been achieved already, and which affords bright hopes for the future. The same cannot be said of the condition of Rural Schools throughout the States. The following account of the ordinary country school appears in a circular printed by the Bureau of Education at the close of 1884:—"The type is familiar to us all, a school composed of scholars of both sexes, ranging in study anywhere from the primer to Euclid, housed in a school-house of but one room and provided with one teacher, upon whom devolves all the instruction and discipline. Possibly the teacher changes every term; probably no systematic record of studies, classes, or progress is kept, and each teacher takes up the work as if nothing had gone before, and ends as if nothing were to follow. The teacher may be a person of excellent education, wise, conscientious, firm, loving and versatile—many such there are, and 'their works do praise them;' but a school may be favoured in this respect one term, and the next pass into the charge of a callow youth, a crude girl, or a man or woman of inferior mind and harsh, unsympathetic nature, who, for a consideration, makes a confusion worse confused in juvenile intellects. Of supervision there is little, of inspection less, and of standards of scholarship and tests of work none but those the teachers has not enough to supply." This is a deplorable picture, the more so when we remember that the cities of United States contain only about 22 per cent of the total population. So that full three-quarters of the youth of the country depend for their early instruction, that is, too often, for all their instruction, upon schools of this character.

The enormous difficulties that stand in the way of adequate instruction in the Rural Schools cannot fail to strike anyone who examines the schedules of work drawn up for the use of teachers in these schools. The subjects generally taught are reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, and English. The actual number of classes in a school is five. From the programme prepared for the country schools of Michigan, which we have before us, it appears that ten or fifteen minutes is the usual time for a lesson to last: the school is divided into five classes: Classes I. and II. can be taken together in certain subjects, such as writing and spelling, so also Classes III. and IV., while the highest class generally requires separate attention. All this work is conducted by one teacher, so that it is obvious that the major part of the school time of each pupil is spent in preparing work not under any real supervision. The following is the way in which Class I. employs its time: Reading 30 minutes, numbers 15 minutes, oral lessons 20 minutes, writing 15 minutes, spelling 10 minutes; total, 1 hour 30 minutes; recess 30 minutes; *assigned work, without teacher, namely, studying, copying, &c. 3 hours and 55 minutes.*" Apart from all consideration of the waste of time that such a scheme must involve, it may be readily imagined that the task of keeping discipline is no easy one; and yet without perfect discipline it is difficult to understand how any pretence of real work can be made. As a matter of fact, such a programme as that of the Michigan country school can rarely be carried out. As a rule the school is instructed collectively in every subject that will admit of it. "Writing and drawing can be managed in this way: also singing where it is taught, certain language lessons, and brief exercises upon morals and manners, and gymnastics, or drill exercises." In many of the schools, programmes and time tables are not in use at all, and the work is carried on according to the convenience of the moment. This is due not to the ignorance or indifference of the teachers, but chiefly to a feeling that if arranged such programme could not be carried out.

Perhaps the worst feature in the working of Rural Schools is the insufficient qualifications of the teachers. This difficulty is felt to some extent in the smaller cities, but is a most serious barrier to progress in the country districts. "In Georgia out of 6,128 teachers, 5,000 are represented as having limited education. If our other States be classified according to their own showing, the greater number will be found on the side of Georgia, with a majority of poorly prepared teachers," (p. 13). Limited education is in itself a somewhat vague term, but when we learn the requirements of the Board of Examiners for the State of Michigan we shall see that the condition of affairs is really unsatisfactory. The requirements of the Board are that the teachers shall pass an examination in spelling, reading, writing, grammar, geography, arithmetic, theory and art of teaching, and the history of the United States and civil government. We learn that it was not easy to obtain candidates possessed even of these qualifications, low as they are compared with those required in most European countries, or even under the English Board School system.

The immediate cause of this insufficient supply of competent teachers is the fact that though nearly all the States have recognized their obligation to make provision for the training of teachers by establishing Normal Schools, the number of these institutions falls far short of the requirements of the people. As this subject will be dealt with shortly, it is only necessary here to say that the unsatisfactory condition of so many country schools can only be attributed to this comparative indifference in the public mind. Until the people in their public capacity decide to make adequate provision for the training of teachers, but little improvement can be expected.

From the above stated facts it will appear that America has yet much to do in the direction of elementary education. The absence of all interference or assistance from the Central Government, and the too slight interference from State Government, have thrown upon the districts and townships a burden too great for them to bear at present. The large cities have indeed risen to the emergency, and have made wonderful progress in the development and support of educational institutions, but the country districts, less awakened to intellectual life and less capable of efficient union, have found the task as yet too hard for them.

Thus far we have traced a system of elementary education which more or less resembles our own English system, though in the case of larger cities it is generally more advanced in its methods, and in the case of rural schools considerably behind our own. It is however the system of secondary education in the cities of the United States that will claim more of our attention, together with such attempts as have been made in the direction of industrial or technical education. The High Schools in the cities are the chief pride of American educationalists. A system of free public High Schools is a growth of democracy, which has been as yet achieved in none of the older countries. Other countries, such as Switzerland and Prussia, have carefully organized public schools which correspond in aim to the American High Schools, but though State-assisted they are not free. In France there are a few free schools of a higher grade, but nowhere else as yet has the claim of every child to the chance of a higher education, and the claim of the community to have as many as possible of its children highly educated, received clear public recognition.

For the origin of this movement we must go back to the early history of the English colonies. By the first school law of the colony of Massachusetts Bay, enacted in 1647, every town containing upwards of one hundred families was required "to set up a Grammar School," with a master "able to instruct youth so far as they may be fitted for the University." To Boston, however, in recent times, is due the credit of establishing the first High School of a modern type. In 1821, was established an English High School providing instruction in French, and in the English branches for boys not destined to the University. A few years later, in 1826, a similar High School for girls was established. Thus the foundation of High School education was laid, but several years elapsed before the example set by Boston was followed by other cities. In 1837, a High School on a more liberal scale was instituted at Philadephia, and from that time the movement spread rapidly, until it has been recognised as a necessary part of the educational system of almost every city in the union. The earliest High Schools seem as a rule to have comprised both sexes, and to have had both classical and non-classical courses; but specialization as regards both sexes and courses has been a growing tendency of late years. In some of the smaller cities the course is mostly limited to what is called an English course, comprising only the rudiments of Latin, French and German without any Greek.

In the larger cities, however, the scope is larger, and the organization more complex. The High School at Pittsburgh, for example, has four separate departments, preparatory, non-classical or English, commercial, and normal. In New York, Philadephia, Louisville, San Francisco, New Orleans, and

Charlestown there is a High School for boys, and a High School for girls. In several of the largest towns, including New York, the High School for boys is carried up into the college grade, leading to the degree of bachelor. In St. Louis there is one High School with local branches; in Cincinnati there are two, and in Chicago three. These are of the same type—viz., mixed schools with classical and non-classical courses. The normal type of High School organization consists of four schools, a classical and a non-classical school for each sex. It is to this system that the larger cities are rapidly gravitating, though considerations of economy will for some time prevent this specialization in the small cities. The specialization of the High School system, however, is not destined to stop here. Both at Baltimore and St. Louis manual training High Schools have been incorporated into the system. With these, however, we shall deal later on. The rapidity with which educational reforms are adopted in the United States will be recognized from the fact that this vast system of higher education, offering its instruction to the whole urban population of the country, is the creation of a single generation. "Forty years ago there was not one High School west of the Alleghanies, and those of the Atlantic cities south of New England could have been counted on the fingers of one hand." This rapid growth has not been confined to any-one portion of the country, it has been universal. We learn that "The High Schools of Omaha and Denver are as completely organized and equipped as the High Schools in cities of a similar size in the Middle and Eastern States." Indeed, it appears from the Reports that the provision for High School instruction is relatively more ample in the smaller cities than in the largest and wealthiest ones. Indeed, the large cities of New York, Philadelphia and Brooklyn, when compared with the great cities of Europe, are only making a beginning in High School education. Of course, London stands outside this comparison, for we English have not as yet recognized the necessity of State education above the elementary grades; but Vienna, Berlin, Paris, are far ahead in their provision for higher education.

New York and Philadelphia have each only two public schools for higher education, whereas there are in Berlin no less than twenty-one municipal schools for secondary education, the whole number of pupils amounting to above thirteen thousand.

The programme of work in the American High Schools appears pretty well to correspond with those of the classical and modern sides of English public schools. The same complaints are raised that in the classical schools too much attention is given to composition and the niceties of scholarships, instead of making correct translation the main feature; while in the non-classical High Schools it is alleged that much time and energy is consumed in fruitless attempts to teach the speaking and writing of the French and German languages.

It is a noticeable fact that there are more girls than boys who avail themselves of secondary education. There is an excess of girls over boys in those who enter the course, and a still greater excess of girls over boys in those who graduate—that is, complete the course. This is largely to be attributed to the cause which militates more than any other against the development of mental culture in the male American, the eagerness to be making money and the necessity of ensuring success by entering business at an early age.

It may be interesting to conclude an account of High Schools by quoting the various modes of admission which are most in vogue. (1) Competitive examinations, the number to be admitted being previously fixed; (2) a pass examination, the candidates being obliged to reach a certain percentage; (3) the graduating diploma of the Grammar School is accepted as evidence of qualifications; (4) recommendation by the Principal of the High School; (5) by quotas sent up by wards or districts.

We have seen that very great liberty is accorded to each district or town in the management of its elementary school. Still more is this the case in the matter of High Schools. In many States there is absolutely no interference on the part of the State, the management of the schools being left entirely to the cities in which they are established. However, in States which possess State Universities High Schools are beginning to receive State aid and some degree of supervision by State officials. The object of this attention on the part of the State is to establish organic relations between the free schools of various grades and the University. Thus Minnesota has a High School Board composed of the Governor, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the President of the State University. The main functions of this board are to determine the qualifications of teachers, course of study, and standard of examination for graduation. There is no doubt that such a central control would be beneficial in every State, and is necessary to weld the various educational institutions into one organic whole, so as to give the best results for the least expenditure of energy.

The Evening School is intended for the use of those who have passed the limit to which elementary education is confined, the age of fourteen years, and more especially for adults of both sexes. They are thus not intended as substitutes, but as complements to the day schools. The following account of their aim may be quoted:—

Uttarpara Jaikrishna Public Library,
Acc. No. 7846 Date 2.8.75

The lowest and simplest function of the Evening School is to afford to illiterate adults and youths who have passed beyond the elementary school age the means of acquiring the rudiments of knowledge, such as reading, writing, and the simplest rules of arithmetic; but in our cities there is a happily rapidly increasing number of youths and adults who desire to devote their evenings to the acquisition of knowledge, either industrial, as a means of promoting their success in their respective callings, or general, as a means of mental culture and intellectual development. Hence the demand for Evening High Schools with both liberal and industrial courses of study, and Evening Drawing Schools of different grades.

Thus there are two classes of Evening Schools—one to serve as a continuation of elementary education, the other as a continuation of High School education. We will give a brief separate treatment of these two classes. It should, however, be premised that few cities contain anything like a completely organized system of Evening Schools: in many cities there are no Evening Schools of any kind, in the class ranking next higher in the scale of progress Evening Schools depend on voluntary efforts, in the next stage of development we find elementary public schools, in a small class we find added the Evening High School, and, last of all, the Evening Drawing School has begun to be adopted as part of the system.

It has been already explained that although in most States laws have been passed with the view of compelling parents to send their children to school, these laws have in fact been inoperative. It is because of this failure of the common day schools to reach all the children that the necessity for Evening Schools has arisen. The elementary Evening School is in fact a makeshift to supply a temporary want which will cease to exist when proper means have been taken to enforce the law. When all children of the proper age are compelled to enter at the elementary day school, and to continue through the several grades, they will have no occasion afterwards to attend an Evening School in order to learn to read, write and cipher.

It is, as might be expected, not found that the attendance at the Evening Schools is very regular; in fact, the usual number of those present in Boston is little more than half of the number on the books. Another deficiency in these schools is the inferior qualifications of many of the teachers employed in them. In Boston this is largely attributed to a rule which prohibits the employment in Evening Schools of teachers holding positions in Day Schools.

The sessions of these Evening Schools are usually held for two hours, from seven to nine, on three or four evenings in the week during the winter term, beginning early in November and ending in the latter part of March.

In some States—for instance, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts—the establishment of elementary Evening Schools has been made obligatory in certain towns and cities.

The demand for Evening High Schools does not arise, as in the case of elementary schools, from the failure of the Day School to achieve its object; but on the other hand the better the advantages of instruction in the Day Schools, the more completely they succeed in giving to all the children a thorough course of elementary education, the greater is the demand for and the use of the Evening High School. Cincinnati was probably the first city to incorporate this institution into her system of schools, and her example has been followed by many of the large cities. In St. Louis the Evening High School is a kind of preparatory department of the Polytechnic School of Washington University. The New York School was started in 1866, and is conducted on a most liberal scale.

The branches taught, as reported in 1883, are the following: Latin, history, political science, reading and declamation, English grammar and composition, German, French, Spanish, architectural, mechanical and freehand drawing, penmanship, photography, mathematics, arithmetic, bookkeeping, chemistry, anatomy, and physiology. The number of applicants for admission was about 3,000, of whom 1,655 were found qualified for admission; average attendance, 951; number of instructors, 22. The average age of students was over twenty years.

The Evening High School at Boston numbers about 1,600 pupils. Brooklyn has just taken the step of establishing a second school of this kind. The class of persons who benefit most from these schools are a peculiarly deserving one—the class of industrious men and women who are occupied by business in the daytime, and who choose to devote their spare evening-time to study. The movement is at present confined to large cities, but there are signs which predict a rapid spread among the smaller cities.

In giving here a short review of what has been done in the direction of industrial education in the States, it may be well to premise by defining the term, which is somewhat loosely used. By industrial education is meant such technical education as aims at imparting the knowledge and skill requisite for success in the departments of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce. The introduction of multifarious machinery and the attendant growth of production upon a large scale, the consequent decay of the practice of apprenticeship, presses upon society the necessity of providing some means of preparing the youth for the work they are afterwards to undertake beyond supplying them with the common elements of general education. The recognition of this necessity has led in various countries, especially in Austria, Germany and France, and to a less extent in England, to the establishment of industrial schools. As yet no great progress has been made in this direction in the States, but the subject is attracting increased interest every day, and such experiments as have been made justify great expectation for the future.

Industrial education has taken two forms. The first consists in the attachment of the workshop to the ordinary school, elementary or high, as a special department. The second consists in the establishment of separate technical schools for apprentices, consisting of the requisite shops, with means of imparting theoretical instruction applicable to the trade taught.

Trial has been made of the first form of industrial education in one or two of the smaller cities, and also on a small scale at Boston. In each of these cases instruction in carpentering has been attached to the ordinary school curriculum as an optional subject. However, although the question has been mooted for more than fifteen years, few cities have shown any inclination to adopt this method of imparting technical education. In fact, the weight of pedagogical opinion is against the annexing of the shop to the elementary school, on the ground that industrial education should be postponed till after the first stage of public education.

Far more promise attaches to the second form of industrial education, which consists in the establishment of separate manual training schools for children who have completed their general elementary course. The first establishment of this kind was the Manual Training School in connexion with the Washington University at St. Louis. The following is a sketch of the plan:—

> It is essentially a non-classical High School, with fully equipped shops annexed for work in wood and iron. Candidates for admission must be fourteen years old, and pass an examination about equivalent to the requirements of the second class (next to the highest) in a grammar school. The course of instruction covers three years. The daily session begins at 9 A.M. and closes at 3.20 P.M. Each pupil has three recitations a day—one hour of drawing and two hours of shop practice. Hand work is divided into four departments—namely, carpentry, wood-turning, forging, and machine-shop work. It is claimed that, without teaching any one trade, the essential mechanical principles of all are taught.

A duplicate of the St. Louis School has been established in Chicago, under the auspices of the Commercial Club of that city, for "instruction and practice in the use of tools, with such instruction as may be deemed necessary in mathematics, drawing, and the English branches of a High School course." Baltimore, however, has been the first to establish a Manual Training School as an integral part of the public school system. All these schools, it is to be observed, profess not "to teach trades," but "to lay the foundation of many trades."

But besides these schools there exists in New York one genuine apprentice school, established by an eminent building contractor, Mr. Auchmaty, for teaching the most important of the building trades. This school does not, indeed, profess to turn out finished workmen, but to give a boy such knowledge and skill as to make him useful in a shop and able to perfect himself by practice. "The trades taught are as follows: masonry, carpentry, plumbing, plastering (including stucco work), painting (including fresco), wood-turning, wood-carving, stone-cutting, &c." There has been no lack of pupils, we are told, and the school has been in all respects successful.

An important movement in the direction of Evening Technical Schools has been made in Philadelphia, where during the last fourteen years a school has been carried on for the benefit of artisans engaged in various industries.

The course of instruction includes geometry, mechanical drawing, arithmetic, mensuration, chemistry, and natural philosophy. This is the first representative in the States of that class of schools established in England under the auspices of South Kensington, and in France of the Association Polytechnique.

An Act of the State of Massachusetts in 1870 made it obligatory on all cities of more than 10,000 inhabitants to provide *free* instruction in industrial or mechanical drawing to persons over fifteen years of age either in day or evening schools. No less than thirty-one cities have taken advantage of this Act, and a number of flourishing schools have sprung up. In Boston there are no fewer than five evening drawing schools, with an average attendance of four hundred. We may make the following quotation from the report of the Boston Superintendent:—"It is by no means a contrivance for teaching at the public expense an unimportant accomplishment to a few idlers and drones. It is a wise provision for furnishing the young artisans and skilled labourers in various crafts the technical instruction which they need, and which they cannot get except by means of schools of this description." The system of public education in New York does not as yet include evening schools for industrial drawing, though the deficiency is to some extent made up by classes at the Cooper Institute, and in the Evening High School. In the great cities of Brooklyn, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, we find the same deficiency. As yet the example set by Massachusetts has not been followed by other States.

It will perhaps be surprising to English readers to learn that in 1882 there were no fewer than 365 institutions for collegiate work, a large proportion of which claim for themselves the name University. The number has no doubt increased by this time. With the majority of these, however, we have not here to deal, as they form no part of the system of State public education. Most of them are founded by religious bodies, and are strictly denominational in their character. Their course of study in nearly every case covers four years, during which the students answer to to the name of Freshman, Sophomore, Junior and Senior respectively; most of them have a classical course and a scientific course, the former, however, being the more popular. Many colleges report special or optional branches of study.

Harvard and Yale, the two names best known out of America, are now non-sectarian, and draw their students from all parts of the country, though they were originally, as most of the colleges are still, denominational in character, and appealing chiefly to the youth of their own State.

The institutions with which we are here concerned are the State Universities.

Twenty-six of the States, and two Territories (Dakota and Washington Territory) have State Universities, and in four of the others the place is taken by the well-known names of Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and John Hopkins; the four principal collegiate institutions in the country. The State Universities differ so much in their constitution and scheme of instruction, that it would be impossible to give an accurate description that would apply generally. A brief account of one of these Universities may serve however to give such information as would be interesting. We will take the University of Michigan, which, though not one of the largest, is in a fairly prosperous condition.

The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, a part of the public educational system and governed by a Board of Regents elected by popular vote, is enabled, through funds provided by the United States and by the State, to offer its privileges without charge for tuition to all persons of either sex who are qualified for admission. Students from abroad are received on the same terms as residents of the State, except that their matriculation fee is somewhat higher. The University is closely connected with the public schools, receiving pupils on diploma from such High Schools as are approved by the faculty. It aims to complete public school work by furnishing ample facilities for liberal education in literature, science, and the arts, and for thorough professional study of medicine, pharmacy, law, and dentistry. In the department of literature, science, and the arts, numerous elective courses are provided, leading to the degrees of bachelor of arts, science, and letters, with the corresponding degrees; also to the degree of doctor of philosophy, and to those of civil, mechanical, and mining engineer.

The University of Michigan appears to be a fair example of the aims and methods of an ordinary State University. Most of them offer free instruction to members of the State, admitting strangers upon payment of fees, several offer scholarships to members of other States.

Many of them have considerable property and endowments, and also draw an annual appropriation from the State. Most of them, while providing classical and literary instruction, lay much stress on scientific studies, especially those which form the basis of professional teaching. Professional training is an important feature in many Universities which maintain district schools of law and medicine and engineering. Several Universities provide military training. A good many have a normal course for the training of teachers. Music takes a prominent place in the programme of some of them. Among the modern languages German appears to attract the most attention. In several cases agriculture forms one of the branches of instruction. In most State Universities, though not in all, women are admitted to the full privileges of the institution.

The University of the State of New York is unique in its character. It was organized in 1784, and is composed of all the colleges, academies and academic departments of Union schools established in the State. The institutions included under the term college are such as are legally incorporated and possess the power to confer collegiate degrees; they include, therefore, colleges of arts, law schools, medical schools, and professional schools of science.

The number of colleges incorporated is twenty-two, the number of students in 1882 was 3,769. The property held by the collegiate schools under the care of the University is very large.

A system of public education which provides instruction for more than 11,000,000 children requires, of course, a very large teaching staff. It is proposed here to give some account of the provision made by the States for the training of teachers, and to examine the position which teaching holds as a profession in the country. The number of public school teachers in the United States, city and rural, reached, according to the latest report, the total of 293,294. To meet this demand, all the States, with the exception of six, have established State Normal Schools, or Training Colleges as we should call them, and a number of the larger cities have followed the example. There are in all ninety-eight State Normal Colleges and twenty-one City Normal Colleges, having an attendance of about 25,000 students. On the usual assumption that about thirty per cent. of the teachers are changed annually, it will be seen how totally inadequate is the public provision for training teachers. Some States, indeed, are better off than others in this respect: Pennsylvania has ten Normal Colleges, New York eight, Massachusetts six, Missouri five, Wisconsin and Maine each four; but this only serves to show the nakedness of the other States. It is true that there are private normal schools, which supply almost as large a number of teachers as the public schools; but we may calculate that most of these teach afterwards in private schools. Thus we see that the very large majority of teachers in the public schools must enter upon their duties without any preliminary training in the art of teaching. There is no means of ascertaining exactly what proportion of the trained teachers is employed in city schools and in rural schools respectively; but there can be no doubt that the former, being as a rule richer and better managed, take the large majority, leaving the ungraded rural schools to get along as best they may. It may be taken as a sad and noticeable fact that in the rural schools, where the majority of the youth of the country are taught, there are very few trained teachers.

The City Normal Schools, as a rule, are of a purely professional type and do not pretend to give academic instruction. They receive only pupils of mature age who have successfully passed through the High School course of instruction. For admission to the most advanced schools of this kind the applicant must be at least eighteen years of age and must have completed a High School course of four years. Such a school is the City Normal School of St. Louis, with a course of training comprising two years, the schools of Cincinnati, Boston, and Washington, whose course is, however, limited to one year. The following account of the Washington school is interesting:—

> The Normal School takes a limited number of graduates from the High School, and gives them a one year's course of professional training, the study of the theory and the practice of the art of teaching. The candidates admitted are selected by competitive examination, which secures to the school a high standard of academic scholarship as a starting-point for each class. The Normal School has practice schools of the first and second grade, under the exclusive control of the principal of the school. The teachers of the practice schools rank as assistants in the Normal School. Schools of the higher grades are also made use of for observation and practice. The fundamental principles of education can be studied best in connexion with their application in teaching young children. Hence the greater part of the practice is in the lower grade schools especially assigned for this purpose.

The City Normal Schools are attended almost exclusively by female pupils. This will at first sight appear extraordinary, but we shall have occasion a little later to dwell upon the preponderance of female teachers over male throughout the schools of the country.

In a number of important cities there are State Normal Schools which render the establishment of City Normal Schools unnecessary: such cities are Baltimore, Providence, Trenton, Albany, Buffalo, &c. In some other cities there are normal departments in universities and colleges which to some extent supply the want of regular Normal Schools. The New York Board of Education is required by law to establish a school or schools which shall be attended not only by those desirous of being teachers, but by such of those teachers actually engaged in the common schools as the Board of Education shall direct to attend. In Boston for a number of years past Saturday courses of lectures have been provided for teachers, at which attendance, however, is optional.

In the State Normal Schools, as a general thing, much the greater part of the course of instruction is devoted to academic studies. There being no distinct division between the academic and professional instruction, both are carried on simultaneously. There are some who defend this method on theoretical grounds, but the chief reason for its adoption is the fact that a sufficient supply of normal pupils with a good general education cannot be had, and that it is therefore necessary that the general education should be continued in the Normal School. This same fact does not apply to City Normal Schools: hence the difference in method.

At first sight it may seem strange that in a country which has taken such great strides in educational reform as the United States there should be any difficulty in getting men and women with a good general education for the post of teacher in the public schools. But upon closer examination this surprise will disappear. The reason is that the profession of teacher has one decided disadvantage attached to it which renders it far from a desirable one to embrace as a life work, and that is precariousness of tenure. The teachers in City Schools are almost universally subject to the ordeal of an annual election. Thus they are regarded as possessing no property or interest in their position.

They are not only liable to removal at the end of each year by a failure to be re-elected, but they are liable to summary dismissal at any time by the action of the Local Boards, without notice, without the right of a hearing, and without the right of appeal to a superior authority, and such dismissal is final and absolute.

There are few exceptions to this rule, among those few being

New York and Brooklyn. This instability of position is of course a common feature of all official life in America. Every five years a vast disturbance takes place; men who have just succeeded in gathering the experience which fits them for the place they hold are jostled out of it, and new men without experience are put to do their work; and society is the loser. This is bad enough in other offices; in the profession of teaching it is fatal. If there is one position in life where stability is essential, and where no ability can compensate for experience, it is the profession of teacher in a school. This liability to loss of position at any time, therefore, strikes at the root of success, and precludes the possibility of the establishment of a strong profession. No strong, able man or woman will undertake as a life occupation work subject to such a condition. This plan of appointing teachers dates back to the first establishment of the common school system. The result is what might be expected. The condition of affairs has been well expressed in a Report on American Education by a French Commission:—

> The profession of teacher would appear to be a sort of stage, where the girl waits for an establishment suited to her taste and the young man a more lucrative position. For many young persons this temporary profession is the means of procuring the funds for continuing their studies. Few masters count more than four or five years of service, and if instructresses remain longer in the profession it must be remembered that marriage is ordinarily the end of their desires; and once married they always withdraw from the profession.

Thus the fact is plain, there is no permanent profession of teaching in the United States. Whatever may be the other excellences of the system of public education, it is clear that this fact precludes such progress as can enable the American schools to compare in real efficiency with those of the more enlightened European countries. For in schools everything depends on the earnestness and efficiency of the teacher; this earnestness cannot exist when the work of teaching is but a stopgap, nor can this efficiency be acquired except by many years of experience. It may be supposed by some that an annual election like the one above mentioned is a mere form, and that a teacher never loses his place except for inefficiency or some other good reason. On this important point we will quote the words of the Official Circular of Information for 1885:—

> The actual summary dismissals without just cause are not numerous, but even in the best managed city systems they occur with sufficient frequency to inspire too many of the teachers who are spared with a sense of humiliation and insecurity.

We further learn—

> It is no uncommon thing for the best of masters to be elected by a

small vote, for which no possible reason could be assigned except that they had some individual opinions with regard to educational matters.

This condition of insecurity is to some extent compensated by the rate of salary. In fact the United States system has relied mainly upon money compensation as the means of securing desirable teachers. It will be easy to see that merely from economical considerations the method pursued is a foolish one. The rate of salary offered is much larger than that for which the life work of able teachers in Germany is obtained. For instance, we find that the average remuneration of male teachers in the public school is, in the State of California, at the rate of £192 per annum, in Massachusetts £240 per annum; the rate for female teachers is in most States considerably lower, but in California it averages £156 per annum, in Massachusetts it sinks to £84. The average rate throughout the States seems to be for males about £144, for females £110. When we compare these figures with the salaries in the French primary schools, where the masters' salaries vary from £36 in the lowest class to £48 in the highest, or with the Prussian schools, where the average salary is ascertained to be £51 12*s.* per annum, we shall perceive what an expensive system that of the United States is.* Of course, in considering these figures it is necessary to bear in mind that money wages of all labour in the United States are considerably higher than elsewhere (a dollar a day is the ordinary labourer's wage), and that there are greater inducements to young men to enter trade or agriculture than in the older civilized countries of Europe. There is, however, little doubt that, if permanency of tenure were once attached to the teacher's office, the salaries given would soon render the profession an attractive one to a large number of persons, whose character and tastes were averse from the excitements of business life and the roughness of agriculture. Educationalists in America are perfectly alive to the defects in their system, and unhesitatingly point to two reforms as necessary to give efficiency to public education. Those are, first, permanency of office, second, ample means of professional training.

As a rule, the School Board in each city conducts the examination which tests the qualifications of the teachers it appoints. Hence, in these examinations there is no uniformity; so that the certificates given by one Board may be almost worthless as evidence of fitness and capacity, while the certificate granted by another Board in the neighbourhood may be safely taken as evidence of the holder's competence. In a few States, a State

---

* See for further interesting information respecting salaries the recent "Special Report" by Mr. Matthew Arnold.

Board of Examiners awards certificates of different grades, valid in the cities of those States. Some of the newer States are ahead in this as in other matters, notably California. In every city in California it is provided that there should be a Board for examination of teachers, consisting of the City Superintendent, the President of the Board of Education, the Country Superintendent, and three public school teachers elected by the Board of Education. This Board is empowered to grant certificates of several grades available for periods of six, four, two, or one year respectively. At the present time the State of Ohio is amongst the foremost States in respect of provisions for the examination of teachers. In this State the law provides for State, County, and City Boards of Examiners and prescribes their duties in detail. According to the provisions of this law the Board of Examiners in the city of Cincinnati consists of nine members, of whom the Superintendent of Schools is one, and presides, and holds examinations five times during the year, conducted upon a most elaborate scale. In most States, however, there is no State regulation, and the examination is conducted by a standing committee of the School Board in each city, with the assistance of the Superintendent. In some cities, as in New York for instance, the examining and certificating of teachers is almost entirely in the hands of the Superintendent.

One of the most curious features of the public school system is the large preponderance of female teachers. So large is this preponderance that it would not be far from the truth to say that the cities where male teachers are employed in elementary schools, in any other capacity than that of principals or as teachers of special subjects, may be reckoned as the exceptions. In the mixed High Schools the numbers of male and female teachers are about the same. Where the High Schools are unmixed, those for boys are taught by male teachers, those for girls by women under a male principal. Selecting a few of the largest cities, we find that in New York the number of male teachers is 452, the number of female teachers 2,899, the ratio being 1 to 6·4; in Boston 122 males as against 996 females, the ratio being 1 to 8·2. In Philadelphia and Chicago the preponderance of females is much greater, the ratios being 1 to 25·4 and 1 to 23·6 respectively.

If we take twenty-four of the largest towns we find that the average proportion of male teachers to female is about 1 to 10. In Chicago there are in fact in the elementary schools no male teachers, properly so called; for the men reckoned as teachers are in fact superintendents, each with a large number of classes and teachers under his direction. Nor is this custom confined to city schools, the rural schools also are largely taught by females:

thus in 1882 there were in Massachusetts 1,079 male teachers as against 7,858 females, in New York State 7,123 male as against 24,110 female. This condition, however, does not hold in all the States; in most of the Central States, such as Kentucky and Tennessee there is a considerable preponderance of male teachers, as also is the case in certain of the Southern States. On the whole, taking the numbers in all the States, the number of female teachers is nearly double that of male teachers. It may be supposed that considerations of cheapness have chiefly prompted the employment of females in preference to males, but there seems also to have existed a strong impression in favour of their greater efficiency, and even now the question seems an open one.

> Some years back, it was quite common for State Superintendents of schools, in their reports, to mention as a matter of congratulation and as evidence of progress, the increasing proportion of the female teachers; but there seems to have been a turn in the tide. The question is coming to be discussed in more than one place, whether the displacement of male teachers has not been carried too far for the best interests of our schools.

This question is in no small measure identified with the question of the greater permanency of school offices. With women, as a rule, teaching can only be a temporary occupation and not a life work; and thus, if for no other reason, the best teachers will generally be men.

No account of education in the United States would be complete without some account of the provisions for the instruction and mental culture of the large coloured population. In the Northern States no separate arrangements are made: the coloured children are admitted to the same schools, sit in the same classes, and partake of the same instruction as the white population, with whom they are reckoned in all the statistics quoted from the Northern States. In the Southern States, however, the children of the freedmen are not taught with the white population, but separate provision is made for them. At first, after the war, there was a strong sentiment in the South against the education of the coloured people; but this feeling has been dying out gradually during the later years, so that now there is a strong general disposition to establish schools and to make like provision for both races. From statistics collected in 1882, it appears that in sixteen States and the District of Columbia the coloured school population was 1,944,572, the number actually enrolled being 802,982. If we compare these figures with those relating to the white population, we find that a much smaller proportion of the coloured children receive instruction than of the white. There appear to be several reasons for this; there are few school buildings for the coloured folk; the supply of teachers is limited; while the poverty of the people, their irregular habits and capricious moods, interfere with their school attendance. But all these are subsidiary to, and are to a great extent the effects of, a want of funds. There is no doubt that the South have felt the necessity of providing education for the coloured people, a heavy burden which they are not fully able to bear; and this accounts for the deficiencies of the present provision. The national Government is, however, at length beginning to recognize its responsibility in the matter, and national aid will no doubt make up for the inability of certain States to meet the vast expense. In addition to the provision for elementary education, great strides have been taken in the direction of providing normal schools for the supply of coloured teachers, no less than fifty-six being already established. There are also schools for secondary education, colleges, universities, and schools of theology, which also contribute to the work of preparing teachers. All these classes of schools, however, above the elementary grade, depend largely for their support upon the various religious denominations, whose aid in the cause of the freedmen has been so liberal.

In a review of the system of public education in the United States, by far the most striking feature is the fact that it is free in all the States. The fact that each of the States, acting for and by itself, has arrived at the same conclusion respecting fees must not be taken to be a mere chance coincidence. It is recognized by all Americans to belong to the nature of their democratic constitution that education should be free. If it is true that this is one of the results of popular government, we in England must look forward to see this principle adopted amongst us at no distant day; and it will be well that we perceive clearly the results, so far as these may be predicted from the example of America. There are wide arguments in favour of free education that chiefly recommend themselves to thinking men and women. It is for the interest of every community that all its members should receive such education as shall enable them to become intelligent citizens and efficient workmen, and such as shall preclude them from the condition of poverty and vice which is found to coexist with ignorance. This is the main argument for compulsory education from the point of view of the State. Now, should such compulsory education be free? In the first place it should be pointed out that, if education is to be compulsory in the case of every child, it must be free in respect to certain classes. Not only can no fee be exacted for pauper children, but there is, and always must be, a certain class at the bottom of society from whom no legal ingenuity can succeed in extorting fees. We know from recent reports of London School Board officers that a very small proportion of the parents whose children fail to produce their fees are in the end compelled to pay. So, then, it is necessary either to continue to support a system which we acknowledge is in part inoperative, to maintain laws which we know cannot be enforced, or to give up in the case of a certain large class the pretence of exacting fees. In the case of a portion of society compulsory education must be free. Should it be free in the case of all society? The Americans answer "yes," and claim to establish their contention upon experience.

> The old threadbare arguments in opposition about weakening parental responsibility, and impairing parental self-respect, and lessening the value of instruction in parental eyes, and overburdening the ratepayers, and making the provident pay for the improvident, have been refuted by experience; moreover, the adoption of gratuity has always been followed by an increase of attendance.

Although it seems to be contrary to the spirit of American freedom to prevent children from being sent to private schools, or to place under public surveillance all such schools, it is the great object of the public school system to attract to its schools the whole youth of the land. To achieve this end, not only has education been made free throughout the States, but it is the boast of its advocates that they intend "to make the public schools so good that no one can afford not to send his children." Setting aside for the moment the broader consideration whether the education of the young is from an abstract point of view a proper work for the State (or, as Mr. Spencer would put it, whether it is one of the objects for which society ought to cooperate), there are two practical advantages claimed by the advocates of this system which crave our attention. One of these two considerations arises from the peculiar condition of American society, the other is more or less applicable to all nations. The great difficulty which American statesmen have felt called upon to meet is the difficulty of making into loyal and genuine American citizens the mass of foreigners continually thrust upon their land—to kindle in them that sentiment of nationality which is essential to the order and progress of a nation. To assist in this work is one of the great objects of their system of public education. Its success cannot be questioned. One of the most eloquent of American preachers (Mr. Ward Beecher), dealing with this subject, expressed himself thus: "Children of all nations of the earth go into our schools—they all come out Americans." All who understand the way in which early constant impressions gradually soak into the mind and character of the young will not be surprised at this result, and those who know sufficient of the United States to appreciate the danger of the unassimilated portion of society will not wonder at the eagerness displayed to catch the foreigner young. But important as this first consideration is, the second can be deemed scarcely less valuable.

It is the desire, by bringing children of different social grades into contact and companionship in early years, to instil that human sympathy among different classes which shall survive the necessary divergence of later life and assuage the bitterness of class distinctions.

This practical instruction in childhood of the fundamental fact of democracy, that every one is equal in the eyes of the State, is of incalculable value; for it not only imparts a certain dignity to the meanest child, to feel that he or she is a source of public solicitude, but it inspires a reverence for government itself which is the surest guarantee of order. It is not of course maintained that children in the public schools are to a large extent conscious of the working of these valuable influences, but nevertheless these do instil themselves into the education of the public schools, secretly but surely informing the character. As far as social equality can be attained, it is attained in the American High School. An official circular published last year contains the following instructive remarks:—

> Nothing is more common than to see pupils representing the extremes in the social scale, sitting side by side in the High School classes. I have seen the son of a cultured and wealthy merchant, and the son of a poor immigrant going together from the same class in the Grammar School to the same class in the High School; the former expending his pocket money to buy the requisite outfit of clothes and books for the latter. I have seen young ladies coming from families of the first rank, not only in respect of culture and wealth, but also in respect to ancestral pretensions, passing the three years' course in the Girl's High School, side by side with the daughter of the labourer, and of the washerwoman. In a suburban town I have seen the daughter of a wealthy manufacturer procuring by subscription the funds to enable a schoolmate, the worthy son of a poor Irish farmer, to obtain the clothing needful to make it practicable for him to perform the post assigned him on graduating day.

A school education, where incidents like the above do actually occur, cannot fail to teach that knowledge of other classes than the one to which you belong, which is the indispensable condition of effectual sympathy. Indifference to social evils springs not so much from hardness of heart as from ignorance; given real knowledge, there is hope of reform. Such knowledge must be taught in countless little ways in the common schools of the United States. Moreover, there is another way in which this intercourse of the various classes in society must do good. Frequent contact with the children of gentlefolks must exercise insensibly a softening and civilizing influence upon the manners of the rougher children, and play no unimportant part in that education which is ever assimilating the manners of each class in society to that which is immediately above it, and which tends to an ideal uniformity of polite behaviour. It may no doubt suggest itself that the reverse process holds good equally, that association with rougher children must produce evil results, and this no doubt is true to some extent. But the good influence must predominate, if for no other reason than this, that the tendency to ape one's betters holds as largely amongst children as amongst grown-up people; the polite behaviour of the children of the more wealthy and refined must have an elevating effect on the tone of a school from this sheer force of imitation.

These considerations may appear fanciful to some, but we are convinced that they touch some of these subtler forces which play an important part in social evolution, and which are the more deserving of attention, because of the subtlety of their working.

In qualification of what has been said of the mixture of classes, it must of course be remembered that a very large number of members of the upper classes of society do not yet send their children to the public schools, but prefer the unmixed gentility of private academies. Every year, however, more parents, especially in the large cities, are finding out that the public schools are too good to be passed over; and the interests of their children combine with the interests of their pockets, to induce them to take advantage of the State education provided for them.

It may be well here to give a few words to the charge that is so frequently and so severely pressed, that the system of "no fees" pauperizes, deprives of independence, and degrades the people. It is curious how little thought is given in support of this contention. Because the State provides a police system which renders it unnecessary for each member of society to take upon himself the whole protection of his person and property, does he lose one whit in independence, does he feel pauperized and degraded? Surely not, he knows that he pays in taxation for the protection rendered him, and suffers no loss of self-esteem from the fact that he does not pay directly and immediately for each separate piece of protection. If this is so, why should free State education be calculated to degrade and pauperize? The term pauperization indeed is ridiculous as applied to a system like that of the United States, where every man contributes either a poll tax or a property tax in support of the State schools. Moreover, his individual interest in public education is enhanced by the fact that this tax is generally not a State tax, but a district or city tax; for each district or city manages for the most part its own educational establishment, especially so far as the finances are concerned. No one would think it either unreasonable or degrading for the members of a small community to prefer establishing schools, to the support of which all should contribute, and the use of which all should enjoy, rather than put themselves individually to the expense and trouble of seeking out private establishments for the instruction of the young. And this consideration is after all the weightiest one. Each parent cannot, if he would, instruct his children, he must co-operate with others in delegating to a specialist this duty; the question, then, is simply this, on what scale should this co-operation be, should the families in each street combine, or the families in each ward? Co-operation on a larger scale than this would surely be both cheaper and more efficient. That education should be one of the duties the State should take upon itself is most reasonable, for there is no duty which the individual member is less capable of efficiently performing for himself than this. This being so, it seems to follow that education should be free; for in respect of other work that the State performs it is thoroughly recognized that the work should be paid for, not by the piece, but by the wholesale method of taxation. It is quite true that, as most taxes are imposed, some individuals may reap more advantages from this State work than others do, and some may choose not to avail themselves of the services offered by the State. But A, who has no children or who prefers to send them to a private school, has no more right to complain if called on to support a system of education which most of his fellow-citizens think to be serviceable to the community, than B, who is either a thief or prefers to go about armed with six-shooters, would have to object to contribute to the support of a police force. The fact that a "no fees" system compels or induces by far the largest part of the community to send their children to State schools instead of sending them to private schools, and thus establishes the rule of the State over the education of its members, appears, we must confess, a sufficient reason in itself for the institution. If we add to this reason the difficulty and expense connected with the collection of fees, the hard cases due to the presence of extreme poverty, and above all the fact that in a large number of instances the fees cannot be exacted, we shall understand the wisdom of our Transatlantic cousins in adopting a "no fees" system of education.

The steps taken by the States in secondary and technical education are of the greatest interest to us at a time when the development of our system of national education in these directions is rapidly becoming a question of practical politics. The free City High School is perhaps the part of the American system which is most opposed to average English sentiments. Most people (though by no means all) are now reconciled to the elementary education of the State schools, whereby our children are furnished with the meagre equipment of the three R's to assist them in the battle of life; but public feeling is by no means ripe for an institution where real intellectual pabulum should be provided at the public expense. Yet this is done in all the centres of population in the United States, and there are few who grudge the expense. Of course, among the lower orders, it is only the selected few whose hopes can encourage them to spend in further instruction those years in which most begin to earn their livelihood. Still the fact remains that every one has the opportunity of receiving higher education, and of receiving it gratis from the State. When we remember that in Germany, Austria, France, and Switzerland, secondary education depends largely upon State assistance, we shall recognize a growing prevalence of that tendency which to most English people seems dangerous and almost revolutionary. Technical schools are, as we have seen, not as yet numerous in the United States, but their numbers are growing, and several of the more advanced States have distinctly recognized the State duty of providing such technical training as shall increase the efficiency of its workers in different occupations. In several European countries, notably in Austria, and the large towns of Germany, a system of State-supported, or State-assisted technical education is already firmly established, and Paris has been taking decided steps in the same direction. Now, upon what theory is all this done? For in a subject of this kind we cannot avoid reverting to first principles. Is all this a gift of charity from the State to its poorer members to alleviate inequality, or does the State undertake this work with the expectation and design of getting some equivalent public good? If the former, then we have the most dangerous form of practical Socialism—a premium upon poverty; if the latter, what is the equivalent good? Now it is obvious that a well-ordered State will not deliberately plan a system of degrading pauperization, from such a sentiment of short-sighted pity as that which dictates so much of our private charity. It will act from a real public policy, and where it gives it will exact an equivalent. The State gives education, not that the individual may be thereby enabled to better his position, and make profit for himself, but that he may be enabled to do most efficiently such work as will contribute most to the public advantage. The object of public secondary and technical education, then, is to discover and educate those special faculties, some one or more of which most individuals possess in a degree above the average, in order that each member of society may do that work which will contribute most to the general working efficiency of society. If our doctors, our engineers, our lawyers, our preachers, our authors could be drawn by selection from the whole of society, instead of from the upper classes only, it is obvious that the average efficiency of each member of these professions would be largely increased. The same will hold of all other forms of work. The object of specialized public education is to enable talent of every kind to assert itself, and to become fitted to its proper work, in order that each person may work along the line of his best faculties. It is in this that the real identity of interests between the individual and the State consists, the greatest good of the individual becomes the greatest good of the State. We are aware that practical business men, politicians to boot, are wont to term such abstract statements platitudes, and to pass them by with a contemptuous recognition; but such platitudes after all form the basis of practical politics, and there is probably no instance of real large reform which has not issued in the first place from the reflections of theorists. The question of the development of our public education is pressing forward, and we shall have to ask ourselves how far the State shall move, and in what direction, if we are to deal effectually with the subject in actual legislation.

It will have been observed from the few statistics that have occurred in the foregoing pages that much more attention is given to female education in the United States than is the case amongst us. Not only are the Girls' High Schools more largely used than the Boys' High Schools throughout the cities in the States, but there are not less than 230 institutions for the superior instruction of women, in addition to the State and other Universities, of the advantages of which in most cases women have at least an equal share. There can be no doubt that the demand for higher education among the women of the United States is much greater than in England. The principle is recognized that so far as public education is concerned there shall be perfectly free competition between the sexes. As a consequence of this course, there is no country where the relative aptitude of the sexes for various kinds of employment has such a chance of being fairly tested as in the United States. In connexion with this higher education of women, however, a serious evil is recognized in the United States system, which may serve (not too early) as a warning to us in England, where Girls' High Schools and Female Colleges are growing with a rapidity which is alarming to many. This evil is the injury of health inflicted chiefly by excessive study both in High Schools and Universities. It may be well, however, to enumerate the different causes that are ascribed:—

Injudicious application of the marking system; injudicious system of examinations; too many studies; too many home lessons; an injudicious method of teaching, which confounds thoroughness with exhaustiveness; too much pressure to secure punctuality and regularity of attendance; rolls of honour printed in annual reports; competition for honours and medals; too long abstinence from substantial foods and nourishing drinks; bad air; cold draughts; too many flights of stairs.

Seeing that the health of its members is the first object of a Government, too much attention cannot be taken to guard against physical injuries inflicted by unwise arrangements. It is not, however, sufficient to take steps to prevent physical injuries; positive steps must be taken to promote physical health. Especially does this apply to girls whose physical education has been so wofully neglected in the past. If the new strain of hard intellectual labour is to be put upon their system, it must be relieved by well-arranged and healthy exercises. In the United States it is astonishing to find that no efficient gymnastic system forms part of the public education. It is true that there is in the primary and grammar schools what is termed "free gymnastics," consisting of what amongst us is termed "calisthenics:" but in none of the elementary schools, and in but very few of the High Schools, is there any proper gymnasium, and in none of the cities is any special qualified teacher of gymnastics employed. This loss in the case of boys is of course compensated by a variety of healthy sports from baseball and football downwards; but for girls there is no such compensation, and the deficiency is therefore the more to be regretted.

Respecting one of the bugbears of our School Board education, the religious question, we hear nothing in America. State education is entirely secular; the teaching of religious dogmas is considered no part of the duty of the State, and is therefore delegated to the parent and the clergyman. Thus one cause of constant irritation and wrangling, which has done so much in England to damage and discredit our public education since its beginning, is entirely avoided. Indeed, the idea of religion as a part of the programme of the public school can never have suggested itself in a country where there is no State church, and no sect whose adherents command an absolute majority either in the nation or in any particular State. A religious teaching which should avoid the points of difference would be felt to be a practical impossibility, and the selection of a particular sect or sects for preference would militate against that spirit of equal competition between the different churches which exists throughout the country.

ART. II.—THE ANCIENT WILD ANIMALS OF BRITAIN.

UNTIL the beginning of the present century the extinct animals of the British Islands beyond the historic period received little attention. With the formulation of the truths of geology the knowledge thereby acquired was extended to prehistoric men and animals, whose remains have been found in the river gravels and bogs of the valleys, or in the caves in the less accessible mountainous districts. Gradually the thick veil of ignorance enveloping all the phenomena which occupy an intermediate position between the geological and historical periods is being removed, and a large mass of varied and interesting information accumulated, which goes far towards bridging over the gulf existing between the two periods. The historical data are being extended step by step towards remote antiquity, and the geological evidences as constantly advanced in the opposite direction; so that, happily, at no distant period, a more or less perfect union between the two may be expected. From the historic record, the extinction of a number of wild animals which formerly inhabited Britain, can be traced. The wolf and the wild boar were not exterminated until the seventeenth century; the reindeer and the beaver existed until the twelfth or thirteenth, and the brown bear was not extinct when the Romans quitted the country in the fifth century. In the circumscribed area of these islands the disappearance of wild animals has been much more rapid than on the Continent. The reindeer, which formerly extended its range to Germany, is now confined to the north of Russia and Norway; the beaver at the present day builds its wonderful habitations in the rivers of Scandinavia and in the upper reaches of the Rhone; the wolf still survives in France, and played its part in the recent war between Germany and France; and the brown bear may be met with in the wildest and least frequented mountains of Europe. The rapid progress of cultivation has destroyed the immense tracts of woodland which formerly existed throughout the length and breadth of England. In Saxon and Norman times more than one-half the country was covered with vast continuous forests. Fitz-Stephen, a monk of Canterbury, in 1174 wrote that to the north of London were open meadows and pasture lands, and beyond these was a great forest, in whose woody coverts lurked the stag, the hind, the wild boar, and the bull. The counties of Leicestershire and Staffordshire were covered with woodlands, which extended northwards to Derbyshire and Yorkshire. With the Peak as a centre, the whole of the Midlands was a series of mighty forests. From Sherwood the timber extended unbroken to Manchester, and the West Riding of Yorkshire and opposite side of the Penine Hills was an area of moors and forests. Dr. Whitaker, in his famous "History of Whalley, in Lancashire," thus describes the district:

> If, excluding the forest of Bolland, we take the parish of Whalley at a square of 161 miles, from this sum at least seventy miles, or 27,657 acres, must be deducted for the four forests, or chases of Blackburnshire, which belonged to no township or manor, but were at that time mere derelicts, and therefore claimed, as heretofore unappropriated, by the first Norman lords. There will, therefore, remain for the different manors and townships 36,000 acres, or thereabouts, of which 3,520, or not quite a tenth part, was in a state of cultivation, while the vast residuum stretched far and wide, like an ocean of waste interspersed with a few inhabited islands.

Thus, of the 63,657 acres of land, more than 60,000 were forests or waste, and one-half of that large area unappropriated. The rich grazing grounds of Craven were similarly wooded, and even to comparatively modern times the district was either wood or bog, as evidenced by the roads invariably making a circuit to keep well up the slopes of the adjacent hills. Leland, writing in the reign of Henry VIII., says, "The forest, from a mile beneth Gnaresborough to very nigh Bolton yn Craven, is about twenty miles in length; and in bredeth it is in sum places an viii. miles." Further north, great forests, "full of woods, red-deer and fallow, wild swine, and all manner of wild beasts," extended over Cumberland and Northumberland.

> As for Scotland, we can scarcely over-estimate the wildness that everywhere prevailed, when in the south a vast forest filled the intervening space between Chillingham and Hamilton, a distance, as the crow flies, of about eighty miles, including within it Ettrick and numerous other forests; and further north the great Caledonian wood, well-known and much feared by the Romans, covered the greater part of the Lowlands and the Highlands, its recesses affording shelter at one time to bears, wolves, wild boars, and wild white cattle. (Harting.)

Over all the higher ground of the North of England extensive moorlands occur which at the present time afford sustenance only to heather and reedy-sedges, and are given up to the cultivation of grouse. The decay of the heather has produced considerable quantities of peat, not unfrequently ten or twelve feet in thickness. Where the peat has been removed, there is usually found at its base the boles and roots of large trees. They are located where they grew, and afford unmistakable evidence that, not only were the lower lands and valleys clothed with timber, but that the forests extended up the sides and enveloped the summits of the hills, 1,400 to 1,800 feet above the sea-level. Many of the tree stumps exhibit traces of fire, and the upper part is charred, leading to the inference that tracts of forest were burnt down, probably with the object of dislodging and driving away a foe, no doubt human. In the lost forest on the slopes of Whernside, in Yorkshire, the roots of birch, thorn, and mountain ash reach an elevation of 1,650 feet. At the same elevation the hazel flourished and ripened its nuts. The oak, sycamore, holly, elm, and others flourished to a height of about 1,200 feet.

It was in the wild precincts of these primæval forests on the mountains that the bear had his den and issued forth in search of prey. Packs of wolves infested the lower regions, and made midnight ravages on the scanty flocks of the herdsmen; whilst on the sedgy banks of the streams, and in the dense forests of oak, the wild boar rooted up the succulent stems of plants or fed on the acorns in the forest.

Camden, quoting Plutarch, says that the wild bears were taken from the North of England to Rome during the fourth and fifth centuries, where they were held in great admiration. It probably became extinct before the tenth century as a wild animal. Bears were, however, kept in confinement or imported from other places for the sport of bear-baiting. During the reign of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, bull- and bear-baiting were common amusements. In 1598, P. Hentzner, a German, describes a bear-baiting which he witnessed in this country. "They are fastened and then worried by great English bull-dogs; but not without great risque to the dogs from the teeth of the bear, and it sometimes happens that they are killed on the spot. Fresh ones are immediately supplied in the place of those that are wounded or tired."

The wild boar appears to always have been a favourite with sportsmen in this country to the time of its extinction. Dr. Evans gives several examples of its inscription on ancient British coins. The Romans inscribed it on their monuments; the Danes and Saxons hunted the boar, and the Normans held the sport in such high estimation that a forest law of William the Conqueror ordained that any one killing a boar should have his eyes put out. Henry I. and Edward III. were much attached to the hunting of the wild boar, and numerous records are kept of the preservation, and afterwards of moneys paid for the capture of the wild boar. Its existence extended to the latter part of the seventeenth century. Many localities perpetuate the former haunts of this once common animal by their names, such as Wild Boar Fell in Westmoreland and Wild Boar Clough in Cheshire, Swindon, Swinford, Eversham (from Eofor, a boar), Everley, Hogmer, and many others.

The beaver is a timid creature and avoids the haunts of man. When the whole of Holderness, the south-east part of Yorkshire was a dense forest, beavers frequented its shady retirement and formed a large colony near Beverley. When St. John of Beverley built his hermitage there, in the early part of the eighth century, it is said that beavers were plentiful. The stream was called in Anglo-Saxon "Beofor-leag" from which the name of the town has been derived. Other place-names in England seem to indicate a similar origin, and during the early Norman period a famous colony of beavers existed on the River Teivi in Wales. They also existed in Scotland, and from experiments made by Lord Bute within the last ten years, it would appear that there is nothing in the climate of the present time which would interfere with their successful propagation.

Wolf-hunting was much esteemed by the Ancient Britons, and their wolf-dogs were transported to the Continent and greatly prized. During the Anglo-Saxon period wolf-hunting was a favourite pastime, and we are assured that Alfred the Great was a most expert and active hunter. The Saxon kings, who considered brute power the highest distinction a man could attain, were pleased to be designated by the name of this animal; and amongst them we find Ethelwulf, the noble wolf, Berthwulf, the illustrious wolf, Ealdwulf, the old wolf, and others. To such an extent did wolves abound in some parts of the country, and so dangerous were they to travellers, that retreats were built into which the traveller might run and so avoid being devoured. The great forests of the country afforded shelter to wolves until the reign of Henry VII.; they became exterminated about the end of the fifteenth century. In Scotland and Ireland they were not so easily caught, and they lingered on to the end of the seventeenth century. Mr. J.E. Harting ("British Animals Extinct within Historic Times") gives the following account, taken from Stuart's "Lays of the Deer Forest," of the death of the last wolf in Scotland near Pall-à-chrocain in the year 1743.

> All the country round his haunt was an extent of wild and desolate moorland hills, beyond which, in the west, there was retreat to the vast wilderness of the Monaidh-laith, an immense tract of desert mountains utterly uninhabited, and unfrequented except by summer herds and herdsmen, but, when the cattle had retired, abundantly replenished with deer and other game to give ample provision to the

"wild-dogs." The last of their race was killed by MacQueen of Pall-à-chrocain, who died in the year 1797, and was the most celebrated "Carnach," of Findhorn, for an unknown period. Of gigantic stature, six feet seven inches in height, he was equally remarkable for his strength, courage, and celebrity as a deer-stalker, and had the best "long-dogs" or deerhounds in the country. One winter's day, about the year before mentioned, he received a message from the Laird of MacIntosh, that a large "black beast," supposed to be a wolf, had appeared in the glens, and the day before killed two children who, with their mother, were crossing the hills from Calder, in consequence of which a "Tainchel" or gathering to drive the country was called to meet at a tryst above Fi-Giuthas, where MacQueen was invited to attend with his dogs. He informed himself of the place where the children had been killed, the last tracks of the wolf, and the conjectures of his haunt, and promised assistance. In the morning the Tainchel had long assembled, and MacIntosh waited with impatience, but MacQueen did not arrive. His dogs and himself were, however, auxiliaries too important to be left behind, and they continued to wait until the best of a hunter's morning was gone, when at last he appeared, and MacIntosh received him with an irritable expression of disappointment. "What was the hurry?" said he of Pall-à-chrocain. MacIntosh and those with him made an indignant retort, when MacQueen lifted his plaid and drew the black, bloody head of the wolf from under his arm. "There it is for you," said he. MacIntosh expressed great joy and admiration, and gave him the land called Sean-achan for meal to his dogs.

Proceeding now in the opposite direction, it may be interesting to trace the geological evidence of the existence of animals in Britain of which there is no historical record, and whose presence is only proved by the discovery of their bones in river deposits, caves, or some other geological formation. For the present purpose it may be advisable to go no further back than the glacial period, during which the west and north of England, the whole of Scotland and Ireland, were enveloped in an immense sheet of ice, on a somewhat similar scale and after the manner of that of Greenland at the present time. The terminal and lateral moraines of this great series of glaciers have been left by the retreating ice, and afford very clear evidence of its extent: from Shropshire northward to the western slope of the Penine chain, immense quantities of boulders, sand, and till, or stiff clay, are deposited. On Boulsworth Hill, north-east of Burnley, great masses of morainic *débris* are banked up the hill side to a height of 1,300 feet. In Ribblesdale the ice has been proved to have been 800 feet thick between Ingleborough and Penyghent, and the glaciers passed over the Penine chain into Teesdale and Wensleydale, bearing with them great blocks of granite and syenite from Westmoreland and Scotland, which are now strewn over the bed of the North Sea, or deposited with the glacial clays of Holderness and the plains of York. The Irish Sea was filled with ice descending from the northwards, and Ireland was overspread by a continuation of the same mass, whilst the eastern parts of the North Sea were covered by glaciers from the adjacent land of Scandinavia. Briefly, the whole of the British Islands, north-west of an imaginary line drawn from the mouth of the Severn to that of the Tees, was enveloped in ice, whilst the district to the south-east of that line was free from it, and subject to alternating seasons, hotter in summer and colder in winter than is experienced at the present time.

In addition to the great factor of glaciation, there are others which had quite as great an influence on the fauna of the country, and probably played no small part in the presence of the glaciers themselves. The identity of the fauna of this country with that of the Continent has led to the conclusion that they were connected by land, and that the animals periodically migrated from one to the other. A line drawn from Norway, and encircling the north of Scotland and the west of Ireland, and extending southwards to the coast of Spain, encloses a shallow area which rarely exceeds a depth of 500 feet; outside the area thus indicated the depth suddenly increases to 4,000 feet in its northern part, and to 9,000 feet westwards. An elevation of 500 or 600 feet would raise the whole of this area into dry land. The English Channel, with a watershed at the Straits of Dover, would become the valley of a river conveying the united waters of the Seine and the Somme westwards to the Atlantic. The Rhine, the Elbe, the Thames, and other rivers, combined to flow northwards over the plains now occupied by the North Sea, debouching some distance from the Orkneys.

A large area beneath the waters of the North Sea is occupied by shallow sandbanks, one of the largest being the Dogger Bank. It is the constant habit of the fishermen of the East Coast to go to this bank to trawl for fish. Whilst pursuing their avocation it is no uncommon thing for them to dredge up remains of extinct animals, and the quantity of teeth and bones belonging to the mammoth, woolly rhinoceros, horse, reindeer, spotted hyæna, and other animals, is very large, and must be reckoned by thousands of specimens. An enormous number of these remains are now exhibited in the British Museum. The tusks of the mammoth are frequently of great length, and exhibit a peculiar curvature, characteristic of those of the mammoth found frozen in the mud cliffs of northern Siberia by Kotzebue. On the coast of Norfolk or Suffolk, as well as Sussex at low water, there is exposed the remains of an ancient forest, which flourished at a time when the land stood at a higher level than it does now; and all along this coast have been found abundant evidences of the elephant, the woolly rhinoceros and the big-nosed rhinoceros, the gigantic beaver, as well as other animals named above, to which must also be added the lion, the wolf, the bear, and the sabre-toothed tiger. Not only are animal remains found in the North Sea, but they have been dredged up in Holyhead harbour on the west coast, and near Torbay on the south, affording evidence of the wide area over which they had spread.

Turning to the animals discovered in the gravels and sands that are now at a depth of several feet below the surface, but at the time of which we are writing formed the bed of the river, there is abundant evidence of a large and varied fauna, of which only one or two forms continue to exist at the present day. At Wortley, near Leeds, in a brickfield, the remains of hippopotamus, elephant, and deer were found. At Windsor, in excavating foundations for cavalry barracks, a large number of reindeers' horns and bones were found in 1866, and associated with them were the bones of bear and wolf, animals which usually follow the reindeer in their migrations to Siberia. In the brick-earths of the Thames Valley, especially at Ilford, a large series of the remains of mammals have been unearthed, comprising the lion, the deer, the mammoth, the elephant, the rhinoceros, the fossil horse, the Irish elk, the bison, the reindeer, the musk ox, the marmot, and several others. At Fisherton, on the Wily, and at Freshford, near Bath, on the Avon, the mammoth, bison, reindeer, hyæna, lion, rhinoceros, and smaller animals, have been obtained from the gravels which were once the bed of the stream, but now are at considerable elevation on the slopes of the valleys.

The discoveries of the bones of extinct animals in caves have furnished much important information, from which a knowledge has been obtained of the fauna of the country before and during the last glacial epoch. The first cave investigated in Britain was Kirkdale, near Pickering, in Yorkshire, by Dr. Buckland, in 1821. The cave was formerly occupied by spotted hyænas, and the animals they had slaughtered were brought to the cave to be devoured. Dr. Buckland estimated the remains of the hyæna alone to represent two or three hundred individuals of all ages, and there were also present the remains of bear, wild boar, hippopotamus, elephant, rhinoceros, reindeer, Irish elk; but the most common bones were those of the bison and the horse. With few exceptions, the bones were broken and gnawed by the teeth of the hyæna to extract the marrow. Since the discovery of the Kirkdale cave, many others have been investigated in Yorkshire, Derbyshire, Wales and on the South Coast. Kent's Cavern, near Torquay, the Brixham Cave, the Victoria Cave in Yorkshire, have been carefully explored by committees of experienced scientists, and have not only in each instance afforded evidence of the presence of the animals already mentioned, but also that man is represented by numerous flint and bone implements. An animal with large canine teeth serrated along each margin, named, by Professor Owen, Machairodus, and supposed to have been of similar form to the tiger and the lion, but now quite extinct, was found at Kent's Cavern, and was long unique. Other examples have since been found in the Norfolk beds and in caves in Derbyshire.

Besides the information obtained from caves, into which the remains of animals slaughtered for prey have been dragged, there is a second kind, affording further but similar evidence, in the watercourses which have fallen into "potholes." These are usually in the hard limestone districts, in which it is a common occurrence for streams to fall into a deep fissure in the rock and pursue an underground channel for a considerable distance. Into such "potholes," or underground channels, it has frequently happened that the remains of animals have been washed by the streams, along with sand or mud, and have been stopped in their course, and remain embedded to the present time. An example of such an underground channel, blocked and filled up with mud and sand, together with numerous teeth and bones of extinct animals, has recently been explored at Raygill, near Skipton. The fissure descends from the surface about 120 feet almost perpendicularly, averaging about eight feet in diameter. It was filled up to the surface with debris, and was exposed in quarrying. The bones of elephant, bear, hyæna, lion, bison, hippopotamus, rhinoceros, and other animals, together with a few bones of birds, have been found.

Summarizing the facts just stated, it is found that the area south-east of the line of glaciers previously indicated is replete with the remains of an ancient fauna of which there is no record except such as is afforded by their presence and the deductions that can be made therefrom. The animals form a varied series, and may be divided into groups which are usually associated together in warmer or colder climates than is at present possessed by Britain. One group will include such animals as the reindeer, mammoth, woolly rhinoceros, bison, elk, glutton, and the bear, which were probably derived from the colder regions of the north-east; whilst on the other side there are the lion, hippopotamus, other species of rhinoceros, hyæna, sabre-toothed tiger, lynx, which were denizens of a hotter climate and have southern characteristics. Besides these there are animals like the wild horse, and some species of deer, which are not particularly associated with either a hotter or colder area. The explanation of this peculiar aggregation of animals is to be found in the far more varied climate of England, taken in its larger sense, and absorbing all the area which would accrue from an elevation of the surface sufficient to raise the North and other adjacent seas into dry land. There would then be nothing to separate this country from the Continent, and the great herds of mammoth and reindeer, driven south during the inclemency of a much severer winter than is experienced in Russia at the present day, migrated to the fertile valleys of the North Sea area, and the adjacent higher lands of England. All the arctic species would come down here for the winter and remain until more genial weather invited them north again. As the northern species retired during the spring and summer, the southern ones took their places; and the mammoth and reindeer were succeeded by great herds of wild horses, followed by the carnivorous animals which preyed upon them. In North America and North Asia similar climatal changes take place, and there is a constant interchange of places made by the animals of those continents. But, notwithstanding the proximity of the great northern glacier, the climate of this country must have been, on the average, sufficiently warm to have enabled the hippopotamus to exist through the winter. It is not probable that an animal of its size and ponderous conformation could have travelled far south between the changes of season, and its habit of frequenting the water would necessitate that the winters should not be so severe as to cover the rivers with ice.

ART. III.—DIDEROT AND THE ART OF ACTING.

"DIDEROT," says Mr. Morley, "excels in opening a subject; he places it in a new light; he furnishes telling concrete illustrations; he thoroughly disturbs and unsettles the medium of conventional association in which it has become fixed. But he does not leave the question readjusted." The judgment is accurate and just; but it may be doubted whether the closing qualification is much more necessary in the case of Diderot than in that of any other thinker entitled to similar eulogy. It is not given to many writers to attack a subject surrounded by conventional associations, or to put an old topic in a fresh light, and then "leave the question readjusted." Berkeley, Quesnay, Linnæus and Darwin achieved the one, but hardly the other. It should not, therefore, detract specially from Diderot's credit as a thinker that he failed to say the last word on any speculative question which he can be shown to have handled with insight and originality. Such a treatment did he bestow on an important art in his "Paradoxe sur le Comédien"; and if his work now needs reconsidering, the process will perhaps do his memory a service rather than an injury.

In Carlyle's well-known essay—though, with that capricious discrimination which marks his criticism, the great theosophist tempers his more or less prejudiced depreciation with praise of the "Neveu de Rameau," and "Jacques le Fataliste"—the "Paradoxe" is characteristically ignored, presumably as being part of the "windy gospel of art" which the sage in his early days kept his hands off out of respect for Goethe. For that and other reasons the recent English translation of the "Paradoxe" probably found the majority of its readers in much the same state of mind in regard to the theory of mimetic art as that of the second speaker in Diderot's dialogue. Much as we have borrowed from French drama, we have been substantially innocent of French dramatic science. Mr. George Henry Lewes, in his able little book "On Actors and the Art of Acting," had indeed done much to promote sound thinking on the subject; on some points superseding Diderot, while, in the opinion of some, betraying indebtedness to him; but Diderot's remains the fuller treatise, and as such deserves examination.

Its thesis may be stated in a few of his own sentences. "Sensibility is only in a slight degree the quality of a great genius. He will love justice; but he will exercise that virtue with no perception of its sweetness (*douceur*). It is not his heart; it is his head which does all." "It is extreme sensibility which makes mediocre actors; it is mediocre sensibility which makes the multitude of bad actors; and it is the absolute lack of sensibility which qualifies (*prépare*) sublime actors."

That is the gist of the "Paradoxe," and it certainly justifies the title. Indeed it may be at once conceded that the paradox is loosely framed; it being impossible to accept any one of the three propositions precisely as it is put. It is only fair, however, to show how Diderot supports them; and the exposition will go far to bring out the fundamental rightness of his views. He knew many actors apart from his acquaintance with the profession through his plays (he gives a Frenchly frank account of how and why he once wished to go on the stage himself), and he studied their art with all the eager interest he felt in the industrial processes he described for the Encyclopédie. Accordingly he is able to support his doctrine with anecdotes as well as arguments. As thus:—A certain actor and his wife had to play Eraste and Lucile together in Molière's "Le Dépit Amoureux" at a time when they had a fierce quarrel on hand; and in the third scene of the fourth act they played with such brilliancy as to win loud applause; yet all the while they were keeping up, *sotto voce*, a series of bitter recriminations, the wife murmuring angry comments on the words addressed to her by Eraste in his quality of Lucile's lover; and the husband revenged himself by physical means immediately on their exit. At another time the same actress kept up an under-breath talk with another actor, her lover, each speaking low while the other declaimed. On yet another occasion she smilingly pacified, in a series of asides, another lover who, having been deceived, placed himself at the side of the stage with the intention of putting her out of countenance; and this in a scene in which her pathos moved the audience to tears. Diderot vouches for the truth of his stories; and asks triumphantly whether these players felt what they played. Again he tells how he saw Garrick, whose acquaintance he made, pass his head through a doorway, and, in the space of four or five seconds, cause his countenance successively to express extravagant joy, moderate joy, tranquillity, surprise, astonishment, sadness, despondency, fear, horror and despair, and then go back through the same phases. Could any mind, he asks, have passed through the sensations thus suggested in such a space of time? He has yet other stories, of how an actor while representing the extremest emotion could deftly put out of the way something which had fallen; and how, on the first production of "Inès de Castro," Duclos by an indignant protest silenced the parterre when it laughed on the appearance of the children, and then went on successfully with her part. "What then?" asks the paradoxer. "Is it that one can thus pass and repass from one profound sentiment to another; from grief to indignation and from indignation to grief? I cannot conceive that; but what I do conceive is that the indignation of Duclos was real, and the grief simulated."

When put thus, the principle contended for looks fairly plausible. The word "simulated" is apt to be unthinkingly accepted; and in that case Diderot's position is made good.

The discussion here tends to divide, some simply holding that the actor must have felt the situation to begin with, in order to be able to represent it; others steadily maintaining that to exhibit grief effectively the actor must needs have a sympathetic grief in his heart. The first issue had better be disposed of before the second is tried.

It is obvious that a great deal depends on what is meant by sensibility. The word, says Diderot, signifies "that disposition, accompanied with (*compagne de*) weakness of the organs, and followed by (*suite de*) mobility of the diaphragm, vivacity of the imagination, and delicacy of the nerves; which inclines to be compassionate, to tremble, to admire, to fear, to fret, to weep, to faint, to succour, to fly, to cry, to lose presence of mind, to exaggerate, to despise, to disdain, to have no precise idea of the true, the good, and the beautiful, to be unjust, to be crazy,"—a definition more copious than satisfactory. On the understanding, however, that sensibility is only asserted to incline the subject more or less to such manifestations of feeling, the term may provisionally stand. At once the question arises whether the actor must not have the capacity for a great many of these very forms of emotion. Must he or she not possess a "mobility of the diaphragm" for purposes of sobbing; a vivacious imagination; an organization of considerable sensitiveness; the power of pity; the ability to tremble and conceive fear, to feel admiration, to weep, to be extravagant, to be scornful? Diderot's great array of terms does not save him. Apart from the act of playing, the great actors, as a matter of fact, may be confidently expected to possess in some measure most of the capacities mentioned. Garrick, of whom Diderot says it was worth while to go to England merely to see him act, must, one would think, have had considerable "sensibility" of temperament. Is then the proposition as to the great actor being devoid of sensibility to be read as merely meaning that his emotional capacities shall not be exercised while he is playing? Rather Diderot seems to have held that an actor's power of feeling is to sensibility proper somewhat as the appreciation of fine poetry is to the faculty of composing it. "It is," he says, "that to be emotional is one thing, and to feel is another." (*C'est qu'être sensible est une chose, sentir est une autre.*) "The one is an affair of the soul (*âme*), the other an affair of the judgment." There is nothing to be said of this but that it is a rather crude sample of eighteenth-century literary psychology. The solution seems to be that the notion of feeling as distinct from sensibility is Diderot's account of the quality of a temperament in which the emotions are usually exhibited in moderation, being either naturally feeble or controlled by the judgment; and that his formula of the "absolute lack of sensibility" in a great actor simply covers the conception of a display of violent emotion based on no corresponding sensation—as in the case of Garrick's rapid series of facial expressions.

Now must be considered the explicit contradiction, that the actor must be in sympathy with the character he plays, just as the spectator is sympathetic, feeling the pathos of the situations. Diderot, always more anxious to get out his idea than to fortify his argument, begins his dialogue with some remarks on the difference between natural behaviour and effective acting, which are very just, but which any more adroit antagonist than the one he gives himself would have turned against him later. "The player of nature," he says—and here his remarks are hardly consistent in themselves—"is often detestable, sometimes excellent. In any direction whatsoever, distrust a steady mediocrity. . . . . And how can nature without art form a great comedian, seeing that nothing occurs on the stage exactly as in nature, and that dramatic poems are all composed after a certain set of rules?" He goes on to put the case of the man who can read to a small circle emotionally and movingly, but who becomes quite ineffective in repeating his reading to a large audience—an experience which has surprised many.

> You have, you say, felt, and very keenly. . . . . You held attention; you surprised and touched your hearers; you produced a great effect. True. But carry to the theatre your familiar tone, your simple expression, your ordinary bearing, your natural gesture, and you will see how poor and feeble you will be. . . . . Do you suppose the scenes of Corneille, of Racine, of Voltaire, even of Shakspere, can be declaimed with your conversational voice and fireside pitch? No more than your fireside talk with the emphasis and loudness of the theatre. . . . . Are you Cinna? Have you ever been Cleopatra, Merope, Agrippina? What are these personages to you? Are they historic characters? No. They are the imagined phantoms of poetry: I go too far—they are spectres in this or that poet's particular manner. . . . . They would figure strangely in history; they would provoke laughter in any society. People would ask, "Is he in delirium? Where did this Don Quixote come from? . . . . In what planet do people talk so?"

This, be it observed, bears on all acting, not merely on performances in the grand or classic style. Diderot, it is true, after rebuking his interlocutor for asking whether Corneille and Racine have failed to project life-like personages, comes round so far as to express a hope that drama will return from the inflated style of the period to something like the strong simplicity of the Greeks. "I fear," he says—and here sounds the note of critical insight and originality—"that we have for a hundred years taken the rhodomontade of Madrid for the heroism of Rome, and confused the voice of the tragic muse with the language of the epic." "How bombastic I find our dramatic authors! How their declamations disgust me when I recall the simplicity and force of the speech of Regulus urging the Roman senate and people against an exchange of captives!" He had made similar animadversions in his earlier production, "Les Bijoux Indiscrets;" and had followed them up practically in his plays, and didactically in his discourses on these; and after a century the potent championship of M. Zola is vindicating the essential rightness of his critical gospel. But between that inculcation of naturalism and the prescription of artifice to the actor there is no real inconsistency. The canon as to the necessary difference between actual conduct and stage-playing remains immutable; just as it is incumbent even on the realist in fiction to heighten and deepen the lights and shades of actual life. There is no subverting the optics of the theatre,—to use the phrase of the last century actor Molé, which delighted Mr. Lewes, and which has been adopted by both Hugo and Zola.

Diderot makes good his canon very thoroughly.

> Reflect a moment [he says] on what we call at the theatre being true. Is it to exhibit things as they are in real life? Not at all. The true, in that sense, would only be the common. What, then, is truthful acting? It is the conformity of actions, talk, figure, voice, movement, and gesture, with an ideal model imagined by the poet and often exaggerated by the player. A really unhappy woman [he continues, with much truth] weeps, and does not touch you: what is worse, she has a certain look which makes you smile; a certain accent of hers jars on your ear and wounds you; a movement which is habitual with her makes her grief indecorous and unpleasant (*maussade*); it is that extreme passions are almost always marked by grimaces, which the artist without taste copies servilely, but which the great artist avoids. . . . . The gladiator of old, like a great actor—a great actor, like the gladiator of old—does not die as we die on a bed; he feels bound to play another death in order to please us; and the sensitive spectator feels that naked truth, action entirely unimproved, would be shabby, and would contrast with the poetry of the play. A sure way [he says again] to play paltrily and pitifully, is to play one's own character. You are a Tartufe, a miser, a misanthrope, and you play it well; but you do not play what the poet has set down, for he has created *the* Tartufe, *the* miser, *the* misanthrope.

Certainly this does not harmonize with the demand for a return to simplicity of dramatization, which seems to have re-arisen freshly in Diderot's mind in the course of his thinking over his dialogue. As Zola points out, the tendency of fictional and dramatic evolution is to give us persons instead of types—a Maître Grandet instead of L'Avare; and if acting is to become less and less an affair of declamation, as Diderot expressly hopes, it must more and more individualize personages. But Diderot was considering the representation of the characters in French classic tragedy and comedy; and we in England have still enough playing in the classic style—whether in Shakspere or in modern blank verse drama—to make his observations abundantly applicable for us. And in any case, as before remarked, they are bottomed on the very nature of dramatic representation. It is only necessary to read M. Zola's dramatization of his novel

"Thérèse Raquin" to see that the very prophet of naturalism cannot but idealize his dramatic personages in some sort. There is a paradox within the paradox of Diderot. We demand that the player shall be ideally natural while we forbid him to photograph Nature. Some critics, running away with Diderot's doctrine, would disallow the use of the term "natural" in praising or blaming a performance; but this is perhaps a more serious error than the notion that the actor should simply copy what he sees. Criticism can never be on safe ground when it is not based on a spontaneous sense of verisimilitude in an impersonation; the "sensibilities"—that is, our uncalculated impressions—being, as George Eliot reminds us, the necessary basis of sound critical judgment. Though the actor's performance is not to be a mere transcript of the actual, he is most decisively condemned when he is felt to be unnatural. He is to select from Nature: he must not fall below it, or lose all resemblance to it. And it is a falling below Nature—a missing alike of a tolerable ideal and of the real—or else a gross exaggeration, that we stigmatize when we say a performance is not natural. We demand, it is true, that the statue for the open air shall be of heroic size, perhaps even of abnormal proportions in some of its parts; but we are far from tolerating that it shall be patently ill-proportioned. What we condemn as exaggeration in acting is a going too far in some direction, a jarring over-emphasis, a sacrifice of unity of effect either by the magnifying of some details in a *rôle* in comparison with others, or by its over-accentuation as a whole in comparison with the other players' work. In point of fact it almost never happens that an actor offends by being slavishly natural, even when he is vulgar. One of the flaws in Diderot's statement of his paradox is the proposition that it is extreme sensibility which makes mediocre actors. What he means is that the actor of extreme sensibility has fine moments, though no sustained excellence. But the truth is that no person of extreme sensibility becomes an actor, that is, no one whose sensitiveness is extreme at all points; at least the case is so exceptional as not to be worth considering. Extreme sensibility, according to Diderot's own definition, would mean extreme sincerity, entire incapacity for dissembling; and the person of that type cannot act at all. The average or bad actor is indeed as a rule a person of ordinary sensibility, though he is generally lacking in sympathetic imagination as well as in flexibility of voice and feature; but he is a bad actor not because of his sensibility, but by reason of a shortcoming in another capacity. To give the true explanation of bad as well as good acting, we must stretch Diderot's formula very much as it is done by Lewes without express reference to Diderot's book.

The final issue is reached by taking up one of Diderot's definitions:—"What then is [a great actress's] talent? That of imagining a great phantom and copying it by force of genius. She imitates the movement, the actions, the gestures, the entire expression of a being altogether beyond herself." The proposition is elaborated in a specially interesting passage:

> I take you to witness, English Roscius, renowned Garrick, you whom the unanimous consent of all existing nations ranks as the first comedian they have known—testify to the truth! Have you not assured me that, though feeling strongly, your action would be feeble, whatever the passion of the personality you assumed, if you did not by your thought elevate yourself to the greatness of a Homeric phantom into which you strove to transform yourself? When I objected that in that case you did not play in your own person, confess your answer: did you not avow that you well knew it, and that you seemed so astonishing just because you presented a creature of imagination who was not yourself?

So be it, but such a testimony gives scanty support to the theory that the great actor has no sensibility. The people of sensibility in private life project ideals just in that fashion, imagining themselves behaving finely or heroically in certain situations. Between them and the actor there is the difference that they never could play the ideal *rôle* for artistic purposes; but he, on the other hand, must have some of their sensibility to conceive his ideal as they do. Diderot, indeed, carries his inconsistency to the point of explicitly conceding this. He has said that the actor is to study carefully the "exterior symptoms" of a personality in a given situation—this rule being, of course, qualified by that other, that the stage performance must idealize; but he has perforce to allow that the actor reproduces in himself inward sensations too. "I will not deny," he says in one place, "that there may be a sort of susceptibility of the organs" (his words are *mobilité d'entrailles:* he constantly uses the latter term in speaking of emotion), "acquired or factitious; but if you ask my opinion I should say that it is nearly as dangerous as natural sensibility. It tends to bring the actor little by little to monotony. It is an element contrary to the diversity of functions of a great comedian." There is something here worth pondering, but further on we have this:—"Is it that there is an artificial sensibility? But be it factitious, be it innate, sensibility does not have a place in all *rôles*"—and he goes on to specify immoral or mean characters which may be and are well played by actors with excellent natures. And finally we have something like an absolute *volte-face.* "And you would have it that the interior symptoms, which indicate most strongly the sensibility of the soul, are not just as much in nature as the exterior symptoms of hypocrisy; that they cannot be studied, and that an actor of talent would find more difficulty in catching the one set than the other." This apostrophe is represented as not spoken aloud, the dialogue proper having ceased; and indeed, little as Diderot is careful to find his antagonist arguments, he could scarcely have kept up the form of dialogue here without making the other man point out that "interior symptoms" positively *must* be felt, and cannot be got up by mere observation of others. The admission, at all events, is decisive when taken in connection with the citation of Garrick. If the actor is after all to reproduce in his person the "interior symptoms" of passion, he must be experiencing certain emotional or quasi-emotional sensations. He must be more than a mere mask, as Diderot elsewhere calls him. It only remains to consider what these sensations really are—whether they are substantially or partially those of normal feeling, or, in the case of a great actor, purely factitious, as Diderot must still be held to contend, whatever he may be inferred to concede as to the player's ability to project himself into the state of mind appropriate to a given situation.

The testimony of not a few distinguished actors goes against Diderot on the question of the genuineness of their emotion in impassioned passages on the stage. Mr. Irving has emphatically repudiated the doctrine that the actor must not be moved. In his case it might, perhaps, be worth considering whether there is not some force in Diderot's suggestion that the cultivation of an artificial "sensibility" may lead to mannerism; but he is not alone in claiming to experience the emotions of the character he assumes. Signor Salvini has avowed that in one of his lachrymose parts he weeps copiously; nay, more, that he really identifies himself with Othello, and goes through that rôle in a kind of dream. Here, again, something might perhaps be said for Diderot. It does not seem to have been generally noticed that Salvini, in common with his company, constantly relies on the prompter, whose whisper may at times be heard preceding the actor's declamation throughout a long speech. It would seem to follow that, greatest of tragedians as he is, Salvini might at any moment break down but for the prompter's help—a catastrophe which would entirely consist with Diderot's opinion that the emotional actor cannot be uniformly excellent. Diderot did not conceive a performance of practised players going on with constant help from the prompter. It is, however, clearly inadmissible to suppose that Salvini is really incapable of going through a part without the prompter, if he chose to run the risk of a lapse; and in any case there is more decisive evidence than his. Mrs. Kendal was once reproached for having, by her performance in "The Cape Mail," brought tears to the eyes of one or two playgoers long unused to the melting mood; whereupon she owned that during her performance she was crying herself. Now, there is no actress alive more perfectly mistress of her work, more entirely independent of prompting; and if Mrs. Kendal's rendering of emotion is by deduction from Diderot's theory to be pronounced mannered—as the work of Sarah Bernhardt has been by rigorous students of that lady's art—one can but say that such mannerism is good enough for us.

On the other hand, Diderot must be heard in his own support; and, doubtless, many more incidents than he mentions could be cited on his side. M. Got, for instance, has been heard, in a momentary pause in an impassioned apostrophe, in which every nerve in his body seemed to be in tension, giving a whispered direction for the stoppage of a certain noise; his vehement outburst being resumed the next instant. There is, further, the explicit evidence of Talma, that genuine emotion endangers an impersonation, making the voice disobedient and the gestures false. Take, again, Miss Ellen Terry's avowal that she does not like to play Queen Henrietta, because she does not like to cry, and in that part she cannot help it. It is scarcely necessary to remark that this supports Diderot; Miss Terry's Henrietta not being one of her successes. Patti, again, not a consummate actress, is understood to weep much in some operas. Sparring by means of such incidents and counter-incidents might be kept up for any length of time; and the only way to solve the problem is to analyse them. A little reflection shows that while the stories on Diderot's side have at first sight great weight, they are apt to be allowed too much. The paradoxer asks whether the actress who rebukes the pit, and the apparently horror-stricken player who picks up a dropped bauble, can possibly be feeling the situations they fill. The answer is that a person feeling the most unquestionably genuine emotion may give attention to trifles or extraneous matters just as the last actor did. A man who believes he has a fatal disease and is near death, takes the most curious interest in small matters that usually have had no notice from him. Testimony to this effect is abundant. One deeply excited may or may not be conscious of disorder around; but the chances are that to an orderly person a really noticeable piece of disorder would be apparent and disturbing, even at a moment of deep mental distress. In fact, the profounder the emotion, the more likely is the disorder to be noticed. When there is death in the house, the housewife may be seen to be almost unusually careful to keep things in their places; and a heart-broken woman is capable, however mechanically, of remedying trivial disarray in her child's dress.

The fact, then, that an actor in a thrilling situation can remove something he sees on the boards, proves nothing. The story of Duclos rebuking the pit, again, is even less conclusive. Strictly considered, it tends to prove the contrary of Diderot's interpretation. Let it be asked why Duclos saw nothing laughable where the audience did, and it will become clear that she was really more moved by the piece, at that instant, than they. What made them laugh was in all probability the inartistic aspect of the children's entrance and bearing—a drawback repeatedly felt by every critical playgoer. A child on the stage is of necessity something less than an artist, being there somewhat on the footing of a horse or dog; and this intrusion of crude realism into the realm of art must needs be disturbing; while if the little performer be not very carefully trained it absolutely destroys the entire stage illusion. If Duclos were as entirely above the sentiment of the scene as Diderot contends, she, too, would have found the children's entrance either disturbing or comic; but precisely because her sympathies were engaged in her own part she had no sympathy with the amusement of the audience, and resented it accordingly.

Is Diderot then quite wrong? Certainly not: he only overstated, and consequently obscured, a really important æsthetic principle, which it was his merit to have caught sight of. Talma's testimony in the main justifies him. If Duclos was not unmoved, neither was she carried away by her part. Her rebuke of the audience proved her emotion; but it also proved her an artist in her emotion. The actual woman of the story would not so have reproved the laughter of bystanders at her children. She could only have shrunk from it as brutal, or found it unintelligible. Duclos was the sympathetic and irritated artist. While Diderot does not clearly see this, he, on the other hand, jeopardizes his own proposition by his account of Clairon and Garrick, as identifying themselves with the phantom they have imagined. If Garrick forgot himself in his ideal conception, how much better off would he have been than the player who forgot himself in the personage of the dramatist? Diderot must be defended against himself. The whole truth is, in brief, that the great actor *has* sensibility; that he *does* project himself into an imagined personality, which may or may not exaggerate the conception of the dramatist; that he *is* moved in sympathy with the sufferings or passions of the imaginary personage; but that all the while his special artistic faculty—the idiosyncrasy or brain function in virtue of which he is actor rather than anything else—asserts itself in the subordination of all his sympathies and sensations to his calculated and rehearsed artistic conception.

This may perhaps be made more clear by an analogy, though analogies between arts are always to be cautiously handled. Our paradox substantially squares with Wordsworth's canon of poetic composition—that it is emotion recollected in tranquillity—a dictum which carries an important truth, though a truth inaccurately stated. Tranquil recollection of the emotion is not sufficient. The poet truly does not express the emotion at the moment of its occurrence: being, so to speak, acted upon, he cannot with success act artistically; still, it is not when he is tranquil that he reproduces the emotion in poetry. It is when he recalls and re-experiences it just sufficiently to estimate it aright, to consider it contemplatively and to describe it truly. What comes of being entirely tranquil, let the bulk of Wordsworth's own verse testify. All that is true in Wordsworth's dictum is energetically expressed by Diderot in his "Paradoxe" before the poet's time. Is it, he writes in his copious way,

> Is it at the moment you have lost your friend or your mistress that you would compose a memorial poem? No. . . . . It is when the great grief is past, when the extreme emotion is deadened, when one is far past the shock, when the mind is calm, when one recalls his lost happiness, that he is capable of appreciating his loss; that the memory unites itself to the imagination, the one to recall, the other to exaggerate the sweetness of the bygone time; that he possesses his soul and speaks finely. One says that one weeps, but one does not weep while trying to render his verse harmonious; or if his tears flow, the pen falls from his hands; he gives himself up to sentiment and ceases to compose.

Well said; but again there is a risk of missing part of the truth. True, the poet does not weep when he composes his "In Memoriam"; but neither does he write it many years afterwards when his pain is wholly passed away. If the ache is not still in his heart it is not likely to get into his verse. Poignant words are got through poignant feelings. The poet has not outlived his sorrow when he turns it into song; on the contrary, he feels his sorrow the more because he is poet; only, he being poet, it expresses itself poetically. Failing to perceive, to begin with, that poetry is an art, or, secondly, that every art is a form of self-expression, some people accuse him of deficient sensibility because he thus sings his sorrow. The truth is, of course, not that he lacks sensibility, but that he has sensibility and something more. It is no less natural—it is much more natural—to him to turn his grief into verse than for them to exhibit theirs in crape. They would not think of imputing heartlessness to the mason or sculptor who carved a tombstone or a monument for the grave of his dead friend; still less would they dream of charging with deficient sensibility the mourner who lays flowers on the sod; yet each and every one, from poet to flower-bearer, is but expressing himself in his special fashion; the poet attaining both the relief of. self-expression and the solace which non-artistic natures find in mere work. Now, the actor is in even worse case than the poet as regards popular appreciation of his artistic nature; for, after all, the majority of readers credit the poet with the feeling they discover in his lines, while the simulation of the "play-actor" is notorious and avowed. He, too, however, must have had his strong sympathetic emotion—in his case it is merely sympathetic more frequently than the poet's, though, following Talma, he must study his own emotions—and he too must recall it for artistic purposes. Yet even some of his admirers, as Diderot, tell him he has no sensibility; and, passing with consistent misconception from the admiring to the coldly critical attitude, go on to say, as even Diderot does, that he lacks ordinary tenderness of heart in private life.

Behind every art, as beneath every philosophy, there is a paradox; and the *artistic* peculiarity of the actor's case—the final paradox of acting—is that he must express himself by means of the very organs which were originally affected by his experience or his sympathy; that in the very act of transforming his past sensation into artistic representation he must repeat his symptoms, perhaps on a more violent scale. The poet *does not sob or tremble as he writes; but the actor must while he plays.* He must be moved in his diaphragm, as Diderot puts it, even while he is husbanding his strength for his rôle, thinking of his next pose, and remembering his next phrase. And here is apparent the force of Diderot's contention that sensibility cripples the actor; there being an obvious danger that the emotion may get uppermost. For a moment, thinking over it all, one almost accepts Diderot's characteristically headlong dictum that the great comedian is something almost rarer than the great poet; forgetting that, after all, the actor works in the grosser medium. But what it is of practical importance to recognize is that the actor is producing artistic effects with the parts and organs of his body as the poet does with his words and rhythms, and the painter with his colours. The theoretic analogy holds good thus far, despite the fact that the actor's performance is fitted for unlimited repetition. Speaking somewhat loosely, one might say that the repetitions are to the actor, in comparison with his first conception and rehearsal, what the recollection of his own lines is to the poet in comparison with the act of composing them. But, on each repetition, the good actor reproduces as fully as possible his original physical sensations; with the easily understood difference, of course, that up to a certain point—that of full mastery—each succeeding repetition makes the performance more facile, just as the gymnast at length does easily what he at first did with effort and pain. It follows that in time the emotion gets to a minimum precisely as the facility of the functional action reaches a maximum; only —to recur to the special condition of the actor's case—the physical machinery of emotion can never become quite automatic. The passions are in the long run to be described only in terms of nerve action; and the nerve action can no more take place absolutely without the emotional ideation, than can the latter absolutely without the former. For it will be found that even Garrick's rapid face-play could not go on without a certain correlated ideation. It might be very slight, but it must have taken place. Let the reader try to reproduce the mimicry in his own degree, and he will find it is so. Let him be ever so rapid, he must vaguely *think* grief before he can put grief in his features. It lies in the terms of the action that he must; else how does he know he is simulating grief? And, be it remembered, his and Garrick's rapid mimicry is done on the small and simple scale of the drawing-room; while, as Diderot told us, the methods of the drawing-room in acting, singing, and recitation appear paltry on the stage. If Garrick were to repeat his series of faces on the stage his cerebration and nerve action must have been more vigorous, and, consequently, his measure of correlated emotion larger. One is rather dubious about the familiar story of the low-spirited clown who was told by a doctor that did not know him to go and see his own performance; but if it be true it is at least consoling to reflect that the clown, being so successful, must when on the boards have experienced to some slight extent the *ricordarsi del tempo felice*, which in his case could hardly have been "sorrow's crown of sorrow." As for the quarrelling couple who played so well in "Le Dépit Amoureux," it can only be said that they must have been about as well used to quarrelling as to acting, to effect their transitions so easily. Nervous re-adjustments there must certainly have been at each speech.

If, on the other hand, Molière played the "Malade Imaginaire" while dying, we may be sadly sure it was a bad performance. Authentic sensation can only help the actor where it sometimes does the orator, by increasing, for the moment, his available nerve energy, and quickening his wits: absolute loss of energy can involve no gain whatever, even if such loss is to be represented. When all is said, there is probably a danger of drifting too far from Diderot's proposition, that the actor is perfectly cool. It remains certain that while the actor is in part experiencing the physical elements of emotion he must, if his art is to be perfect, have himself perfectly under control. The Roman actor Æsopus, who killed a slave in a moment of stage frenzy, could not have been a good actor. He would be, in Diderot's sense, a natural one, and the act of homicide might constitute, in the eye of a critical Roman, one of his "sublime moments;" but we to-day pronounce him a savage, temporarily insane. If there be any truth whatever in the stories that Salvini frequently alarms and sometimes hurts his colleagues, what is proved is that he falls short to that extent of being a finished actor. If his civilized audiences for a moment believed he really forgot himself in his part, their feeling could only be one of acute discomfort. A genuinely furious man can never be an agreeable spectacle: the whole satisfaction in seeing such a one mimetically portrayed rests on the knowledge that, strong as is the illusion, the actor's emotion is of a restricted kind, perfectly governed by artistic calculation. The spectator's enjoyment is, in its way, as paradoxical as the actor's art; the one simulating outwardly, the other inwardly; each consciously giving emotion play, and each conditioning it by a substratum of different consciousness.

Our conception of the actor as substantially self-possessed may be reinforced by one more analogy. It is from Mr. Howells' story, "Dr. Breen's Practice," which gives a well-conceived account of the contrast between the sensations and method of a strong and experienced masculine doctor and a young woman doctor over the sick bed of the latter's foolish friend. Dr. Mulbridge is cool and self-reliant: Miss Breen, whose nerves are indeed specially perturbed by recent events, is anxious, alarmed, and irresolute. The girl afterwards confesses that she sees he is incomparably the better physician; that he has everything she wants. Now, the trouble is not, strictly speaking, that the woman has too much sensibility. It can never be a disqualification to a physician to be sensitive and sympathetic. It is found that, contrary to a common notion, the physician usually grows in sympathetic capacity as he grows in years; and that at maturity he is much more concerned about the prevention of suffering than the youth who "still is Nature's priest." What Dr. Breen wants is not less sensibility, but more of the positive capacity which the enlightened physician recognises as constituting his art as distinguished from his knowledge. Of course, having much sensibility and little cool decision, she has in a sense too much sensibility; but it is all a matter of proportions. Given other functions in a stronger degree, her sensibility would in no sense be excessive. Dr. Mulbridge might have as much of the sympathetic faculty as she, if it were possible to conceive of a comparative estimate other than a simple statement as to which faculty preponderated in each; but he is gifted with faculties which she lacks.

Miss Breen then is, in another profession, the type of Diderot's natural or mediocre actor, whom he holds to be mediocre because extremely emotional. The statement is awry. The actor who merely scores an occasional success by chancing to feel his part acutely would not be a better artist if his sensibilities were deadened. He would be worse; for then he could not even have fine moments, which alone, on Diderot's own theory, give him any title to praise. He would simply become the bad actor, who is thus seen to be a person without either sensibility or fine faculty of simulation, the latter faculty being necessarily conditioned by the former. What the mediocre and sufficiently emotional actor wants is not a deduction from any faculty, but the addition of mimetic genius, that is, the endowment by virtue of which one desires and is able to apply one's sensibilities to mimetic purpose. His genius may simply be undeveloped, but at any rate there is something wanting. His sensibility is in excess only in the sense that it is not duly exploited and controlled: add what is wanting and there is no such excess. This must have been urged on Diderot; for, when he asks his interlocutor how the charming Madame Riccoboni could be, as she was, a very bad player while possessing exquisite sensibility, the friend answers: "It is apparently that the other qualities were lacking to such a degree that this could not compensate." Diderot evades the point by saying that the lady had a good figure, vivacity, proper bearing, and a satisfactory voice—very important attributes in an actor, but counting for little in the absence of the all-essential mimetic faculty, which Madame Riccoboni evidently lacked. Sensibility, indeed, may in a sense be said to cause bad acting, when, as in the case of most amateurs and many beginners, it takes the shape of an instinctive aversion to making a striking display of passion; such shyness keeping the performer's simulation trivial and ineffective; but even here, though it is possible he only needs practice to make him competent, the chances are that he is originally lacking in those creative and mimetic faculties which tend to neutralize the aversion to display.

The curious circumstance that shyness checks the display of deep and creditable feeling rather than that of mean and evil traits, points to one of the minor perplexities of the problem. An amateur will more readily and satisfactorily simulate hypocrisy, vanity, drunkenness, meanness, jealousy, avarice, or cowardice, than he will fine or generous feeling, even supposing him to be above rather than below the average in moral qualities: of which fresh paradox the explanation seems to be that, just because the performer is unpossessed by the evil feeling, he can the better represent it with the emphasis required by the optics of the theatre. Evil qualities, broadly speaking, demand only the rendering of outward physical symptoms—save in the cases of anger and jealousy, and perhaps in that of cowardice. In depicting hypocrisy, vanity, or heartlessness, the actor draws upon his observation and his æsthetic imagination; and we may say, not only, with Diderot, that an actual miser would be an ineffective Harpagon, but that, to take other vices, an actor who is heartless, or a hypocrite (supposing there is such a thing as a typical hypocrite), would probably represent heartlessness or hypocrisy ill on the stage, precisely because what powers of perception he had would be dull on the side of his own vice; though, considering the complexities of human nature, he may well have the mimetic faculty and be able to play other characters. It is thus reassuring to remember that there are more good comedians than good tragedians, and that the faulty or bad characters are less frequently ill played than the good, even when the latter are set in tragic situations. When a virtuous character is well played it is because the actor, as Diderot says, has imagined a great phantom, and consciously imitates that. He is showing what he would like to be, not what he is; but he must have goodness in him to create that fine phantom, and to call up in himself the nervous sensations proper to it.

Discussion of the technique of acting seems naturally to lead to reflection on the character of actors. It does so in Diderot's dialogue; and, were it only because the paradoxer has committed the gratuitous inconsistency of making wholesale imputations on the histrionic profession after he has highly praised some of its distinguished members, it is fitting that we should turn for a moment in that direction. Diderot, as has been said, varies in his attitude. "I have," he says in one place, "a high opinion of the talent of a great actor: he is rare; as rare as, and perhaps greater than, the poet;" and he remarks elsewhere that while the poet creates a greater being than the natural man, the comedian creates a greater still. But he is almost malicious when he discusses the comedian in private life.

> In the world, when they are not buffoons, I find them polished, caustic, and cold; ostentatious, dissipated, spendthrift; more struck by our follies than touched by our misfortunes; equally tranquil over an unfortunate occurrence and the recital of a pathetic incident; isolated, unsettled, obsequious to the great; with little morals, no friends, and almost none of the sweet and sacred ties which associate us with the pains and pleasures of another who partakes ours. I have often seen a comedian laugh off the stage; I do not recollect ever to have seen one weep. . . . . I have had good opportunities of studying these men; and I see nothing which distinguishes them from others, if it be not a vanity which might be called insolence, a jealousy which fills their circle with troubles and hatreds.

The evidence is too obviously adjusted to support the argument as to "sensibility." M. Daudet, portraying one actor and discussing the fraternity in "Fromont Jeune et Risler Aîné," gives a set of sketches consistent neither with the former view nor with the latter, though he too is unfavourable; and Mr. Traill, in a recent dialogue,* sets forth another hostile judgment, while implicitly countering it with a partial denial. "For my part," says one of his personages, speaking of painters, "I have found as much petty vanity, jealousy, and affectation, among these people as in any body of men, with, of course, the exception of actors. The actor, as we all know, is the incarnation of the two former of these feelings, and probably would not succeed in his profession if he were not." To which the other speaker replies; "As to the jealousy and vanity of artists—why, they are not exempt, of course, from human weaknesses; but I assure you I have found less of these two vices among them than among any class of men I know." If the last speaker is right as to artists, it may be that actors are equally misrepresented. There is, of course, some basis for the imputation, as for others equally common. All workers in the medium of sensations are liable to special nervous perturbations; and it may well be that the actor, who works, as it were, with the very material of sensation, is especially in jeopardy. Playing with his nerves and his cerebration as he does, how shall he be as capable as his average auditors of keeping cool prudence uppermost in the relations of life which so sufficiently try them? And that is not all. The actor is especially dependent on excitement for efficiency and happiness. Artists of all kinds, whatever some may allege to the contrary, crave human sympathy and approval in their work: even the musician has a less complete enjoyment in his solitary playing than before a sympathetic audience. But the actor above all needs an auditory. His art is nothing if not exhibitory; he cannot at all enjoy his own performance critically; and it goes without saying that such a situation has its moral drawbacks. No less obvious are the trials consequent on the subjection of every troupe of actors to all sorts of invidious comparative criticism. Not only do audiences applaud with imperfect judgment, cheering the glaring work and missing the subtle, but newspaper critics are constantly pointing out—of hard necessity, as the more scrupulous feel—that Mr. So-and-so is quite above the level of ability of his companions, and that Miss Blond is much more intelligent than Miss Brunette. When it is remembered how capricious and incompetent the criticism often is, how it varies from journal to journal and from town to town, it is abundantly clear that if the actor has special infirmities he has exceptional trials. No other artists are so pitted against each other while committed to intimate comity. Yet withal there is the amplest testimony to the unlimited generosity of the poor player to distressed colleagues; and some who know them have contended that the domestic affections are stronger in actresses than in any other class of women who work for their living.

---

* "Art and Life," *Macmillan's Magazine*, June 1884.

There were reasons in the status of the profession in Diderot's time why its *personnel* should be rather motley, and similar causes still operate here to some extent; but they are daily growing less powerful, and there is the less need to dwell on them. The change in the public attitude towards acting in this country consists rather in the disappearance of old prejudices than in the growth of sound opinion, but the latter will come in time. For of all the arts, perhaps none—perhaps not even music—has a greater future before it than that of the mime, whose pursuit, in the most comprehensive sense, connotes that function to which our Evolutionist philosopher points as promising a boundless development in the case of music—the promotion of sympathy. How enthralling the actor's life may be to a strong mind can be gathered from many a testimony, notably the enthusiastic outburst of Mrs. Siddons about the rapture of playing to the sea of faces in the pit. Surprise is often expressed at the tenacity with which actors stick to the boards into old age; but the wonder would subside if it were realized that these are artists enjoying the only means of exercising their art. To expect them to go willingly while they have any strength left is like looking to a painter to say that at a certain age he will paint no more, or to a musician to lay down his instrument for ever. Mrs. Siddons in her retirement, her niece tells us, grew apathetic.

On the perfect worthiness of the art there can be no great need to insist further, despite survivals of old prejudice and new developments of malice. Lamb * was moved by an extravagant eulogy of Garrick to protest indignantly against the judgment which classed a great actor with a great dramatist; and no doubt the protest was needed; though for the exaggerated fame an actor enjoys in his own generation there is a sufficiently potent Nemesis in the compulsory disregard of posterity. Observing that the player makes the same kind of impression and has the same kind of success in inferior tragedies as in Shakspere's, Lamb went on to draw the conclusion that "there is something in the nature of acting which levels all distinctions," Shakspere's plays "being in themselves essentially so different from all others." But as Lamb himself points out, this is no argument against acting. "It may seem a paradox," he had said before, "but I cannot help being of opinion that the plays of Shakspere are less calculated for performance on a stage than those of almost any other dramatist whatever. Their distinguishing excellence is a reason that they should be so." As he puts it in another paper,* Shakspere "has transfused his own poetical character in the persons of his drama—they are all more or less poets." But if the actors cannot rise to the height of the poetry-speaking "phantoms" of Shakspere, they can, on the other hand, put genius and life into the more realistic sketches of dramatists who are not poets. Every haunter of the theatres must have been struck by the ability of a good actor to make quite a thinly coloured part enjoyable by his mimetic skill. Then the true importance of acting appears. People are sometimes inclined to fancy that the drama tends to be superseded by the novel; but the actor transfiguring and vivifying a commonplace part at once refutes such a theory. He produces something the novelist cannot supply, a sample of a special art which cannot well fail to be always acceptable for its own sake. Deplorably far behind the novel as the drama undoubtedly is—especially in England—its destiny is to evolve on the same lines, and for the same reasons, from the manipulation of plot and incident to the psychological presentment of character; and it is obvious that the mimetic art must become more and more subtle and complex as it increasingly tends to mirror various phases of culture. To which end actors must assimilate culture at least as rapidly as does the educated public. It is essential to the highest success in any art that the performer have his mind cultivated in other directions, through it is his nature to express the results—his comments—though his own faculty; the actor in this respect being comparable alike to the poet, the painter, and the musical composer. When this is realized, there will be perceived the fallacy of the opinion candidly placed on record by Fanny Kemble, that there is a something lowering in the actor's profession. The proper answer of the actress's colleagues to such a confession would be that Naumann makes to Ladislaw in "Middlemarch" when the latter speaks slightingly of painting. The person who feels that any art is unworthy of being made a profession, simply ought not to practise that art. He or she is not a genuine artist. And the talented lady who won her fame as Fanny Kemble has frankly given us the means of judging of her fitness for the stage when she tells how her mother, so well able to judge, pronounced her performance of Juliet to be on some nights insufferably bad, though it was effective on others. How far it ever deserved the praise it received may be doubted by those who remember the circumstances of the actress's first appearance, and know the untrustworthiness of the judgment of a British audience on the performance of a Shaksperean play. The presumption is that Miss Kemble had "fine moments," and some that were much less fine.

---

* See his Essay on Shakespeare's Tragedies.

---

* The Essay on the Genius of Hogarth.

To conclude: many men have decided, after some trial, that painting was not a good enough pursuit for a lifetime; and many who can play the piano have felt that there would be for them something deplorable in a career of piano-playing; but we simply conclude therefrom that these would under no circumstances have been great artists or *virtuosi;* not that either art is unworthy a man's devotion. We might about as reasonably bow to the views of George II. on "bainting and boetry." The prejudice against any form of art among us is simply a survival of Puritan asceticism; and to all harbourers of that the answer is given by the great præ-Puritan poet:

> Nature is made better by no mean,
> But nature makes that mean: so, over [even ?] that art
> Which you say adds to nature, is an art
> That nature makes. . . . .
> This is an art
> Which does mend nature—change it rather; but
> The art itself is nature.

Perdita was not convinced, but then Perdita was a little Puritan rustic.

ART. IV.—WHAT WOMAN IS FITTED FOR.

THERE are women who have long held that even the physical incapacities of their sex are the result of circumstances; the frame adapting itself through ages of inheritance and natural selection to the surroundings that formed its destiny. But such opinions have been rather working underground than forcing their way to the surface, perhaps through the despair felt by their advocates of obtaining a hearing, since claims far less thorough-going have been denied with contempt and mockery, the time, seemingly, not being ripe for them. In spite of Darwin's great discovery, in spite of the word "Evolution" ringing in our ears on all sides and in connexion with every other topic, the same fruitless old ground has been gone over and over again in respect to the woman question, just as if no such thing as Evolution had ever been heard of! What are woman's qualities *now?* is she *now* man's equal, is she *now* capable of all that she aspires to be and to do?

Bebel, in his book on "Woman," says, "If a gardener or agriculturalist were to assert that a given plant could not be improved or perfected, although he had never given it a fair trial, or may be had even hindered its growth by wrong treatment, he would be regarded by his enlightened neighbours as a simpleton." Then, on the subject of genius, he says, "The amount of talent and genius in male humanity is certainly a thousand times greater than that which has hitherto been able to reveal itself; social conditions have crushed it just as they have crushed the capacities of the female sex, which has for centuries been oppressed, fettered, and crippled to a much higher degree." This far higher degree of fettering, then, has kept back the genius of women, in fact, often prevented it from arising at all, though the absence depends not on sex but on circumstances. Surely, it is impossible to live in the age which Darwin has enlightened, and refuse to believe that this *may be* and in all probability *is* the true view of the matter.

It would be a miracle indeed if the work which has been going on for ages among all things that have life should have passed over one-half the human race, suspending its influence over them alone, of all creatures on the earth's surface. If we admit this view, however, that women have become what they are by their circumstances, we have to admit that our present system of society is wrong and unjust, inasmuch as it still places one sex in a dependent and cramped position, and does its best to force all women, with their varied characters and powers, into the same kind of occupation. Women, after a long graduation in wrong and suffering, find themselves now, in the age of awakening, at an immense disadvantage in consequence of incapabilities which were *not* originally involved in their organization—a disadvantage which counteracts their efforts to advance, or worse still, which deprives them even of the desire of advancement itself.

"Man," it has been said, "is strictly his own creator, in that he makes himself and his conditions according to the tendencies he encourages. For tendencies encouraged for centuries cannot be cured in a single life-time, but may require ages for their cure."*

A little knowledge of the history of woman from the earliest times will show how her conditions were made and encouraged *for* her by men, who, through the circumstance of her motherhood (the *curse* might one not say, looking back along the terrible vista of the ages?), were able to enslave her to their will. But the fact of this long adverse race-education is invariably forgotten, when some back-movement towards her hereditary self, some little feminine weakness, overtakes the harassed footsteps of her who is striving to drag her weakened limbs out of the morasses of the past.

---

* "The Perfect Way," by Anna Kingsford and Edward Maitland.

At such a lapse what smiles, what head-shakings from the unconvinced, what sighs from fellow-strugglers! How much nobler, how much more knightly would be the attitude of man at this crisis, if, instead of standing cynically on the watch for these little womanly failings, he would hold out a brotherly hand to the sister who, after all, is only inspired by aspirations which in a man are held among the best and noblest of his nature—the love of freedom and the desire of development. For the honour of humanity it can be said that there *are* a few such men, and for their liberality of thought and generosity of sentiment women owe and feel towards them the deepest gratitude and reverence.

With regard to that old and favourite argument: the smaller weight and size of the woman's brain, of course there is the theory of evolution to account for it, but there is also this consideration, not generally allowed for. Certain parts of the brain, we are told, are employed, not in thought, but in directing the bodily machinery; that is to say, the entire brain is not a thinking organ. Therefore, man's larger frame requires a larger brain; but the extra size does not indicate extra thinking power in proportion. Moreover it appears that the weight of the brain varies enormously among intellectual persons of the same sex, and Bebel* suggests that the mere cerebral mass and weight (after a certain point) may not be a measure of mental strength, any more than bodily size is a measure of bodily strength. The organization, he thinks, is probably of more importance.† Possibly, therefore, women, even in their present state, are not so far behind in respect of thought-machinery as our methods of brain measurement seem to indicate. Be this as it may, however, no one has a right to prejudge the question of woman's future possibilities, and this is unfortunately exactly what every one does. Too many are inclined to view the whole question from the personal stand-point; one can generally discover what sort of women a man has associated with by his opinions on this movement. This is natural, but it is not fair. It throws too heavy a burden on the shoulders of women who are only fighting their way to freedom, and who have upon them still the impress of their former life, and of the lives of their mothers for countless generations.

---

* Bebel, who quotes Professor Redam.

† Bebel would probably admit that, *other things being equal,* size *is* a measure of strength, whether of the brain or of the muscles. Without guarding against the false impressions that are given by his assertion, he draws attention to the fact that size of brain and quality of brain substance (or organization) do not appear to have any necessary connection. He warns us to beware of judging a question without taking all the data into account.

To satisfy their judges such women must show themselves absolutely consistent, absolutely fair, absolutely logical, or their cause, in their judges' estimation, suffers with themselves. Are *they* fair and logical in attaching it thus to a personality? It is in vain for women to plead that these qualities are not considered imperative in man; this only embitters their opponents and foredooms themselves as one-sided controversialists. Though lacking a man's infinite advantages of training, health, absence of nervous susceptibility and keenness of feeling, a woman must out-Herod Herod in her logic and her "sweet reasonableness," keeping herself unspotted from all false, doubtful or even untimely argument. If she speaks the truth too soon—the truth that men themselves come to acknowledge a little later—she damages her cause in the present. Those who might have been willing to listen to mild half-claims and assertions are frightened off by the bold and simple whole. This may be good discipline, but it is very severe upon the new pupil. She must be panoplied with strength and tact and gentleness; her logic and her temper should be flawless; she must be prepared to listen with a smile to the most tumble-down old arguments; she must hold back the bitter answer that rises to her lips at some suave taunt or insult offered to her and to her sex, perhaps by some foolish young man who knows nothing of the hard places of her life, or the deep and stirring tragedies of womanhood. More pathetic still, it may be, she must listen to the arguments of some sister, steeped in the old traditions, and holding on with the fervour of ignorance to the solidities of the present which she fears to exchange for the unknown possibilities of the future. And what *are* these solidities of the present to which so many women cling? They are simply the remnants of the original savage state, wherein (as Leslie Stephens puts it) "a man obtained his wife by knocking her down."

> To him, therefore [he continues], the ideal feminine character must have included a readiness to be knocked down, or at least unreadiness to strike again; and as some of the forms of marriage recall the early system, so in the sentiments with which it is regarded, there may still linger something of the early instinct associated with striking and being struck.

Who can doubt that it does linger? Even in the higher kind of fiction the acme of female excellence seems always to be reached by a patient submission to the most detestable ill-treatment and tyranny on the part of a husband. The more abominable the man, the more perfect the woman who endures his ill-conduct without rebellion. And so all women, and alas! most easily women of the nobler kind, are preached into a moral suicide which makes it harder and always harder for those that come after them; their own well-endured sufferings piling stone on stone to the torture-houses of the future.

But side by side with all this there exists at the present moment a deep-seated, wide-spreading dissent from the old modes of feeling. Women are written about, and thought about as they have never been written about and thought about before; there are few thinkers who do not feel called upon to take some view of the matter, though it may be the strange unmodern one of Lecky, who sees a solution for the necessity of so many women to earn their living, in a return to the monastic system of the Middle Ages. Had he suggested the painless extinction of these inconvenient clamourers for their daily bread, his proposal would really have been more merciful. How does it happen that from men to women (between whom as individuals the greatest human love is supposed to be possible) there should be so little mercy, so little justice or sympathy?

Women are generally said to have concrete ways of thinking, while men deal with abstractions. But man appears unable to be just and merciful to *woman*, though he may be loving and tender enough to *one* woman who has pleased his fancy or won his affection. Does this show an abstract mind? That men do not know anything about the sufferings of women is not surprising, for the latter have been trained to conceal them from their male relatives lest the knowledge should give them pain. This care was scarcely necessary, as men are not quick at seeing the hardships from which their own lives and organization protect them, and they could have borne the knowledge of their existence, we may safely conclude, without unmanly wincing. But in fact no one is eloquent enough to bring before the minds of those to whom nature and circumstances for ever make such suffering impossible, a true picture of an average woman's life, with its thousand weary little burdens, its fretting anxieties and cares and pains, made doubly hard to bear by the flaw that will be almost invariably found in a woman's health, a flaw surely indicating some evil condition, whether inflicted on the sufferer by herself or others. Bebel affirms that experienced doctors assure us that the greater number of married women, especially in towns, are in a more or less abnormal condition. That one fact alone speaks volumes.

The want of refreshing congenial work goes hand in hand with unremitting claims upon the time and thought, ceaseless small duties, unrelieved by any space of time when the work is done and the mind is free to throw aside its worries, and recruit itself with study or recreation. There is no change, no alternate stringing and unstringing; the bow is always bent, and who shall say that this fact alone is not enough to account for the rapid exhaustion of their youthful energies now regarded as natural to women? Anyhow the normal woman's life—supporting as she does an elaborately cumbrous domestic machine upon her shoulders—is full of care and weariness with very little compensation, and when she also bears the burden of motherhood and the rearing of children, the position is one of severe and unremitting strain. What wonder that the health suffers, that the freshness of life is utterly gone, and that its good things are missed? In the beautiful "Story of Avis," by Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, this subject is pathetically worked out in the history of a girl who has resolved not to marry because she fears that marriage will make her false to her art, to which she has devoted herself ardently. Unfortunately her warm, enthusiastic nature, with its wide sympathies and strong feelings, cannot escape the passion of love. She does struggle, but she finally gives in, on her lover's strong assurances of understanding and sympathy. But after marriage he forgets his sympathies and his promises, anxieties accumulate and the result that Avis dreaded takes place. Domestic trifles encroach one by one.

> It was not much, perhaps [says the author], to set herself to conquer this little occasion, not much to descend from the Sphinx to the drain-pipe at one fell swoop, not much to watch the potatoes while Julia went to market; to sit wondering how the ironing was to get done, while her husband talked of Greek sculpture: to bring creation out of chaos, law out of disorder, and a clear head out of wasted nerves. Life is made up of such little strains, and the artistic temperament is only more sensitive to but can never hope to escape them. It was not much, but let us not forget that it is under the friction of such atoms that women, far simpler and so for that yoke far stronger than Avis, have yielded their lives as a burden too heavy to be borne.

Looking at this picture in the light of evolution, we can see before our eyes the more immediate process under which the womanly character has been formed; we can see the non-domestic proclivities being stifled, health undermined, nerves fretted, and the power of happiness teased out of existence. The system is one of combined starving and irritation. Happiness is partly a matter of habit, and if every minute that passes brings with it some little arrow of trouble, the mind losses its healthy tone, and the condition of distress and worry becomes ingrained. How this takes the sunshine out of existence, not only for the victim, but for her associates, any one can see for himself who looks around him. One of the causes of this burdensome home life in certain classes, is the absurdly elaborate style of living which these classes think it necessary to keep up, apparently as a voucher of gentility, for it certainly has no other effect except that of making the lives of its supporters miserable.

Again, the absolute banishment of the idea of co-operation in domestic life causes an incalculable waste of energy, as well as the evil of thrusting upon so many human beings work which is unsuited and uncongenial to them.

From all evils which affect humanity at large, women being of course handicapped by acquired weakness, suffer more severely than others. In the wage-earning class this is evident at first sight, while in the richer classes the evil is hidden under a cloak of luxury; but it is always there, wearing and corroding the heart. "The tyranny of times and laws is heavy upon them to the end." How these closely knitted evils are to be banished can only be seen, as, one by one, they are attacked from different sides and in different ways. But clearly the A B C of right and justice to women (to say nothing of right and justice to the whole race) is to open the gates of life to all and let them enter in and find their place there by direct experiment. That there are great difficulties to be encountered must be admitted. The present state of our society makes it hard indeed for women to go out into the world of savage competition and force their way among the strugglers. Still the removal of social .and legal disabilities is demanded by justice and is a step in the direction of progress. The consequences must be faced. History is continuous, and doubtless what women have endured in the past will haunt them and their descendants for many a generation to come, but we must face the spectres and live them down;[*] there will be pain and failure to endure: the moment is terrible with birth-pangs of the new order, but its coming is now certain.

It is constantly being pointed out to women—even by those who are ready to admit their possibilities of a high development—that the real woman's kingdom is in the home and, above all, in the nursery, and that the "mother's love and care" should still, and for ever, be a woman's "crowning joy and ambition." But this again is prejudging the case, for surely it is for women to find out what their crowning "joy and ambition" is to be, and if many in the future refuse to regard the mother's love and care in that light, the mere resulting variation in individual types of character will be a distinct gain to society. On the other hand, there is something more in prospect for women and for the race than would be achieved by a mere successful competing with men for the prizes of life, important as that step would be with its attendant improvement in position, and training, and independence. The real woman has yet to be born—the truly womanly woman who develops the power that is within her freely and without reference to artificial ideals. A cramped and distorted nature can be neither manly nor womanly, nor even quite human in the broadest sense. Real womanhood is a thing of the future. What it will be must of course depend upon the form of society, and that social form reciprocally will be influenced by the new standing that women take in it. So that their qualities will be in a certain sense in their own hands to determine. Mankind is tied to the wheel of evolution, but man can and does more and more as he develops in intelligence consciously make it run in the direction he may choose. What he *cannot* do is to make it stand still. All thoughts and acts of ours trace out the path of our development.

---

[*] See "Ghosts," by Ibsen, translated by Francis Lord.

Certain qualities peculiar to women have been evoked in the past; for instance, delicacy of perception, quickness of insight, grace, gentleness, and a self-control wonderful to think of in connexion with their susceptible physical temperament. These qualities are valuable: they have been dearly bought, and it is a pity to let them go. If women do not preserve the sweeter, more picturesque, and graceful aspects of life, what a sunless world we should have! And there is not enough sunshine as it is; it should be made brighter, not more grey and bleak. Surely there is something far better to be done than to offer to humanity a mere repetition of manhood, however perfect the imitation might be. This would be very "stale, flat, and unprofitable." Sympathy, not antagonism between the sexes should be the watchword of the future order, and indeed there is every sign that the new womanhood will have much closer sympathies with masculine nature than have the women of the older type; but the personality will perhaps differ still more from that of man, because the woman of the future will follow the lead of her own nature and not that of a deadening convention. For the same reason, too, the future will produce a multitude of types of womanhood, increasing the chances of making a happy choice in marriage, and opening a wide field for variety in the conception of married life itself. Then will be offered all possible range for individual taste and character, in place of the present cramped ideal, which demands that all who enter the gates of matrimony shall bring themselves into precisely the same attitude towards it as is held, or supposed to be held, by every other married person. Then, perhaps, the old fancy of the soul finding its other half may be actually realized. There is something very fascinating to the human mind in this idea of the two sexes being necessary complements of one another; it has always been a favourite apology of conservative thinkers for upholding the present position of women. But while the woman was not free it was an ideal impossible to carry out: men and women were then *different*, but not truly *complementary*: to make them that must be the work of the future. This generation cannot conceive the inspiring beauty that must come to pass in the relations between men and women when the woman shall have explored her own possibilities, and man has made the tremendous gain which this development must inevitably bring to him also. The world cannot afford to lose the best powers of half its people. In this crippled state it has been struggling miserably for ages. What will happen when the whole of those human powers become co-operative? What will happen when men and women are *spiritually* united? A new humanity will have arisen! * If the development of the future should tend to make women on the average less engrossed with maternal cares than they have been, the result will be a glad prospect for mankind. For at present children suffer miserably through the blind, unthinking self-immolation of their mothers. Mothers deprive themselves of efficiency, of health, knowledge and enjoyment of life, for their children's sake, and their children share the penalty. They are loaded with cares and caresses, and deprived all their days and nights of fresh air and rational clothing. Mothers stunt their own humanity in their children's service, and in revenge the children are stunted too; their minds are clothed with false ideas and petty prejudices, original growths are lopped off, and thus human beings grow up to perpetuate the mistakes and wrongs of which they have been the victims, and to hand them down as heirlooms to the next generation.

A more general intelligent sympathy and enlightened love of humanity, with less violent motherliness, would be a universal blessing to the community, though our devotion to the old idea makes this one difficult to admit. There are many who would rather have women in the old way, motherly, than that the children of the future should be wisely tended. If there were less maternal *instinct* and more human love, half the cruelties that children now suffer under the loving care of devoted mothers would undoubtedly be spared them.

How all these powerful citadels of error ever came to be attacked at all is one of the mysteries of our life, for the more rounded and complete the system of evil the less chance one might suppose would there be to get outside it and view it apart from the self that has been formed under its influence. That is probably why reforms do almost invariably come from without and not from within the circle of oppression. It is to human genius—the power of standing *without*, and bringing, as it were, an intelligence from another sphere to bear upon the problems of this one—that we for ever owe our salvation. Once the word from above has been spoken, the seed of reform has been sown. For the injured and the insulted the deliverer has come. "The spirit of the times, this secret but elementary force of Nature, the origin of all the material and spiritual currents in humanity, comes to their assistance." * But if this is to be our ideal—the free development of womanhood, and through it a larger development for all humanity—our present problem becomes a very difficult one.

---

* One remarkable saying, attributed to Christ by Clement of Alexandria, is sometimes quoted—for instance, in "The Perfect Way," before alluded to in these pages. Christ declares that "the kingdom of God can only come when 'two shall be one, and the man as the woman.'"

How is the existing crisis to be got over without injury to women and the race from the too great strain of competition upon their undeveloped systems? without also the sacrifice of those feminine qualities which are good to keep, and without the artificial division of women into two ranks—the one to remain single and to devote themselves to work outside the home, and the other to be relegated to the fireside and the nursery? To be satisfied with this last solution would be to abandon our brightest hopes and ideals, and probably to court defeat by the antagonism which it would set up between the intelligent and the affectional sides of woman's nature—an antagonism which should be avoided at all hazards, as it would tend to create two somewhat gruesome types of womanhood, the one all mind and no heart, and the other all heart and no mind. In the long run, too, heart would even tend to disappear altogether in favour of a stupid instinct; for, after all, it is really at the touch of intelligence that the higher kinds of love arise to beautify human life. Perhaps the simplest way of arriving at a solution of the problem is to find out what principally stands in its way, and to try little by little to overcome it. First and foremost among the obstacles are the cramped ideals of life that are so general, and especially the ideals of married life. It comes to this: that a woman has to purchase the gratification of her affections at the expense of her whole nature, and very often the man has much to suffer also from the narrowing influences of a conventionally arranged marriage.

The more love there is in the world, the better for the world, provided it does not confine the sympathies within the circle of the home. Two sides of the nature require to be satisfied and developed: the intellectual and the emotional; but the present world offers a stern alternative: One or the other, which will you have? The woman of to-day should answer "both." Thus an entirely new ideal of marriage will be a condition of the new order, if that new order is to embrace the best reforms that can be made, and yet to conserve the best qualities that the past has brought forth. In this new ideal the words "duty" and "right" would give place to "freedom" and "equality," while (almost as a consequence) a large family would be regarded as a bitter wrong, above all to the woman, but also to the children and to society. Little is to be hoped while the majority of women are doomed to this burden of incessant child-bearing, a system which, if it were not so common and therefore so unconsidered, would be seen to be the cruelest and most degrading bondage under which a human being can suffer; one which makes motherhood into a blight and a curse, and stands in the way of all hand-in-hand advancement for men and women. On these points of course arises a network of questions and problems, each requiring separate discussion; though they should not be discussed without regard to the intimate way in which they hang together and affect each other, the difficulty of the solution of one generally being the chaotic state of all the rest.

---

* Bebel, "On Woman."

But of this we may be assured: that every step we take in the improvement of our general social condition, makes just that much easier the question of the future activities of women, and *vice versa.*

The spread of education, while conducing to the solution of that question, will aid in the dispersion of prejudice, and in effecting such a fundamental improvement in our social arrangements as shall remove from the shoulders of the worker, be he in what so-called "class" he may, the burden of excessive labour for inadequate payment.

Such a state of affairs may be hard to attain, but surely with the help of goodwill, knowledge and patient experiment it is not unattainable; and if it *were* attained, if the present crazy race for wealth were slackened by the removal of the fear of poverty and the absurd mammon-worship of the century, women, married or single, might then safely take their part in the outside work of the then more brotherly and gentler world, which their presence would tend always to make *more* brotherly and *more* gentle. Such is the ideal to be worked for and hoped for. Meanwhile many women and the larger-hearted men will strive to realize it, and in the process, a nearer and nearer approach must always be made to the type of the ennobled humanity of the future.

All can make some effort towards the ideal, even if their own lot is cast in the deepest of the old dungeons; their cries may be faint but they will be heard and caught up by those who are more happily placed, those who are moving forward to the front of the battle and conquering by endurance and sacrifice new ground for themselves and their sisters. Such women will sow the good seed which will ripen into a harvest of well-being to be reaped hereafter, and the day is coming when their spiritual children of future generations will rise up with one accord and call them blessed.

ART. V.—THE ART OF GOVERNMENT.

"IS there such a thing as the art of government?" Are there any rules based on ascertained and reliable knowledge and available for practical guidance in political affairs? or, is government merely a cleverness in dealing with events as they arise, the result of practice or of natural sagacity, but dependent on no known principles—a rule of thumb and not an art?

Political theorists, from Plato to Comte, have, with few exceptions, either expressly asserted that there is such an art, or have tacitly assumed it as a basis of their speculations. Practical politicians, on the other hand, have for the most part either formally denied it, or have acted as if they disbelieved it; in which opinion they have been supported by the general sense and feeling of the community.

The question whether there is an art of government or not must be kept distinct from a question into which it is apt to slide—namely, which kind of government is best? It is obviously quite open to the advocates and opponents of different constitutional forms to fight their battles without pausing to consider whether government be a matter of art, of empiricism, or of simple guesswork; and, in fact, they have frequently done so. In times of sharp political controversy, and especially when life and liberty seem to be at stake, it would be pedantic to argue about the intellectual qualifications of the governing body; the all-important point at such crises is as to the title and moral competency of the body assuming to govern, to exercise any ruling functions whatever. But, excluding periods of revolution, it is as pressing to consider whether government is able to do its work as by what title it claims to do it. And yet, often as the incapacity of governments has led to their fall, how seldom have they been set up because of their ability?

So far as we know, the question of the scientific competence of government was first asked by Socrates, and it has been discussed and illustrated in a variety of ways and in a masterly manner by Plato. In the dialogue called the "Politicus," Plato formally examines the nature of government. He pronounces it to be an art—like weaving, navigation, or medicine, only more difficult; its true characteristic is to be found, he says, in knowledge, and in nothing else. The ordinary definitions and distinctions of government—whether it be carried on by one man, by few, or by many—are, he observes, quite beside the mark. The essential definition and true determining characteristic of government is, that it is carried on according to science, art, intelligence. As we should never think of entrusting our natural body to a layman or empiric who knows neither the causes of disease nor the method of cure, so we ought not to think of entrusting the political body to any one who does not possess true scientific competence. To hamper such a man with rules and laws is absurd; as absurd as it would be to dictate to your doctor what prescription he is to write, or to the captain how to steer and navigate the ship. It follows that there can be no real government by the people. Men immersed in their own concerns have not time, even if they had the ability, to acquire this difficult art—to learn how to weave what Plato calls "the web of government."[*] "We will not have in our State," says Plato, "any twofold or threefold men; let each man attend to the business he understands."[†]

Such is the Platonic view of government; the political theory which he opposed to the belief and practice of the Athenian democracy of his own day. That belief and practice was to consider government not as an art but as a matter of common-sense and common sentiment, standing in this respect in contrast to the special professional accomplishments which are confined to a few. In the "Protagoras" Plato has given us an illustration of the popular practice, and he has put into the mouth of the eminent public teacher and sophist, Protagoras, a formal vindication and explanation of it. Protagoras is represented as having visited Athens on a professional lecturing tour. Socrates, meeting him at the house of a friend, falls into conversation with him on the subject of politics, and takes occasion to state the practice of the Athenians at their public meetings in the following

> When we are met together in the Assembly, and the matter in

---

[*] Plat. "Polit." 306. Τὴν δὴ βασιλικὴν συμπλοκὴν, ὡς ἔοικε, λεκτέον, Ποία τ' ἐστὶ καὶ ποίῳ τρόπῳ συμπλέκουσα, κ.τ.λ.

[†] Plat. "Rep." 370 B.

hand relates to building, the builders are summoned as advisers; when the question is one of shipbuilding, then the shipbuilders; and the like of other arts which the Athenians think capable of being taught and learned. And if some person offers to give advice who is not supposed to have any skill in the art, even although he be good-looking and rich and noble, they will not listen, but laugh and hoot until either he is clamoured down or is ejected by the officers. This is their way of behaving about the arts which have professors. When, however, the question is an affair of State, then any body is free to have a say—soldier, sailor, tinker, tailor; rich and poor; high and low—any one gets up and no one reproaches him, as in the other case, with never having learned and yet giving advice.

This practice Protagoras undertakes to justify, and he does so by relating the following mythical story or fable:

There was once a time when the gods existed, but neither men nor animals had yet come into existence. At the proper time the gods made men and animals in the interior of the earth, out of earth, fire, and other ingredients, directing the brothers Epimetheus and Prometheus to fit them out with suitable endowments. Epimetheus having been allowed by his brother to undertake the task of distributing these endowments, did his work very improvidently and thoughtlessly; wasted all his gifts on the lower animals, and left nothing for man. When Prometheus came to overlook what had been done, he found that other animals were adequately equipped, but that man had no provision for clothing, defence, or other necessaries of life. Prometheus accordingly broke into the workshop of Athene and Hephæstus, and stole thence artistic skill, together with fire. Both these he presented to man, who was thus able to construct for himself by art all that the other animals had received from Nature, and more besides. Still, mankind did not possess the political or social art which Zeus kept in his own custody, where Prometheus could not reach it. Accordingly, although mankind could provide for themselves as individuals, yet when they attempted to form themselves into communities they wronged each other so much from being destitute of the political or social art, that they were presently forced again into dispersion. The art of war, too, being a part of the political art which mankind did not possess, they could not get up a common defence against hostile animals; so that the human race would have been soon destroyed had not Zeus interposed. He sent Hermes to mankind bearing with him justice and shame, "the bonds and ornaments of civil society drawing men together in friendship." Hermes asked Zeus, "On what principle shall I distribute these gifts among mankind? Shall I distribute them in the same way as artistic skill is distributed—only to a small number—or shall I give them to all alike?" "To all," replied Zeus, "and let all have a share of them; for communities could not exist if these gifts were confined, like artistic skill, to a few only. And ordain, by my authority, that the man who cannot take a share in justice and the sense of shame is to be killed as a public nuisance."

This fable illustrates in a lively way the theory of the origin and distribution of common-sense in political affairs. That sense is declared to be at once a necessity and a condition of social union—a natural aptitude, not an acquired skill, forming part of the original equipment of every human being. This has been the working hypothesis of every democracy in ancient and modern times. Special study is requisite for special subjects, but politics, as it is a matter of general concern, is assumed to be a matter of general knowledge. On this hypothesis government is not an art.

The distinction insisted upon by Protagoras between politics and other departments of knowledge, derives some support from the authority of Lord Bacon. In a well-known passage of the "Novum Organum," Bacon is arguing against the view that the general acceptance of a system of philosophy may be alleged in favour of its truth. This position he denies.

> So little [he says] ought consent—even a real and widespread consent—to be deemed a confirmation of the truth of a philosophical system, that it raises in fact a violent presumption the other way. In matters intellectual the worst of all auguries is that from consent, except in religion and politics, where there is the right of vote. *Exceptis divinis et politicis ubi suffragiorum jus est.**

Bacon here distinguishes politics and religion from other intellectual pursuits, declaring that in politics consent and popular suffrage may be relied on as tests of truth, whilst in all other cases they are indications of error, the very worst of all auguries, a *pessimum augurium,* raising a violent presumption against any opinion which is supported by the popular voice.

It is true that in the "Advancement of Learning" he qualifies this opinion by saying that "it cannot but be a matter of doubtful consequence if States be managed by empiric statesmen not well mingled with men grounded in learning."† But this rather half-hearted vindication of the political art must be set aside in favour of the explicit statement in the "Novum Organum"—his most carefully revised and important philosophical work.

Moreover, it is quite consistent both with Bacon's intellectual aims and with what he calls his "civil ends" that he should have carefully distinguished politics from science. The radical distinction between ancient and modern philosophy is that the former sharply divided the sciences relating to Nature from those relating to man, whilst the latter embraces both in one and the same system. In Bacon's time the modern view had not yet obtained a footing, and his own attention was chiefly devoted to the task of reforming the methods applicable to the physical sciences. His civil ends, in other words, his favour with James I. would have been seriously compromised by his trenching on the field of statecraft—a department of learning which the king had marked as peculiarly his own.

---

* Nov. Org. i. Aph. 77.

† Adv. Learn. i. 270.

It is not possible, within the limits of this article, to give a complete historical account of the variations which the idea of the art of government underwent; but it is important to mention an important modification of this idea derived from the political philosophy of the eighteenth century, and supported by Edmund Burke—the doctrine of the agency of government. The relation of subject and ruler, formerly supposed to be supported by a divine sanction, was in the eighteenth century generally regarded as a mere matter of convenience. It was assumed, in accordance with the doctrines made popular by Rousseau, that sovereignty belonged of right and by nature to the people. The people, it was said, cannot, by reason of their numbers, exercise their powers themselves; they therefore delegate them to a committee of their number, who stand to them in the relation of agent to principal, or servant to master. The so-called subject is the real master; the so-called ruler is the real servant;

> the people [says Burke] are the masters. They have only to express their wants at large and in the gross. We are the expert artists—we are the skilful workmen to shape their desires into perfect form and to fit the utensil to the use. To follow, not to lead, the public inclination—to give a direction, a form, a technical dress, and a specific sanction to the general sense of the community—is the true end of legislation.

Such is the opinion of Burke, as good an example as can be found of the union of the practical and speculative faculties; not only fearless in his advocacy of popular rights, but by nature and training inclined to rest them on a broad and rational basis. In his view government is not an art, but an executive authority.

More lately, the opinions both of literary politicians like Carlyle, and of systematic thinkers like Comte and Mr. H. Spencer have been swinging round to the Platonic point of view. Carlyle's doctrine of hero worship and of the heroic in history is only an exaggeration of the Socratic theory.

> The finding of your able man [says Carlyle]* and getting him invested with the symbols of ability—with dignity, worship, royalty, or whatever we call it—so that he may actually have room to guide according to his faculty of doing it, is the business, well or ill accomplished, of all social procedure whatsoever in this world. Hustings speeches, parliamentary motions, Reform Bills, French Revolutions, all mean at heart this, or else nothing. Find in any country the ablest

---

* "Heroes and Hero Worship," Lect. vi.

> man that exists there; raise him to the supreme place, and royally reverence him. You have a perfect Government for that country; no ballot-box, parliamentary eloquence, voting, constitution-building, or other machinery whatsoever can improve on it a whit. It is the perfect State—an ideal country.

That, says Plato in the "Politicus,"* is the only distinctively true State, in which you find rulers who truly know their business, and do not only seem to know it. Whether they rule according to law or without law, whether over willing or unwilling subjects, whether over rich or poor—such matters should not enter into our calculations at all.

For very different reasons, Comte, in his "Positive Polity," rejects both the agency theory of the eighteenth century, and the theory of the ancient democracies that the people had a right to govern directly.

> For the people to take a direct part in government, and to have the final decision of political measures, is a state of things which in modern society at least is only adopted to times of revolution. Positivism rejects the metaphysical doctrine of the sovereignty of the people. It refuses, as a rule, to submit the decision of political questions and the choice of rulers to judges who are obviously incompetent; and who, under the influence of Positivism, will, of their own free will, abdicate rights which are subversive of order.†

Such are some of the leading opinions on the important question of the intellectual qualifications of government. Before attempting to discover what amount of truth they may contain, it will be expedient to make a few observations on them by way of criticism, with the object of bringing out their drift more clearly.

Plato proceeded on the analogy of the arts. To weave the web of government he considered to be a matter of skill and training, exactly like that of the ordinary weaver, carpenter, or other craftsman, with the single exception that it is more difficult.

Now, there are three chief respects in which the technic arts differ from politics. In the first place in the arts there is little or no question as to the object to be obtained. The ship has to be taken into a given port; the dyer has to produce a certain colour; the weaver to make a web of particular texture and pattern, and so on; but in politics people are not definitely agreed in their objects. They desire happiness, prosperity, or some other general good, but they do not define their objects with the precision requisite and usual in the arts.

Secondly, there is in the arts but little doubt, comparatively speaking, as to the means. The best processes, the proper instruments and materials, are as a rule known to contemporary artists, or may be known to them, and no great discussion takes place on this subject. But in politics there is as wide a discrepancy between the professors as to the means as there is doubt and want of precision among the people as to the ends. Suppose, for instance that the education of the people is an end agreed on. How can this be best reached? By State agency or by voluntary effort? If by State agency, then by free schools or by schools in which a payment is made? By a teaching limited to a few and what subjects, or by a rapid canter over things in general? These are the points on which practical difficulty exists and which give rise to differences of opinion and discussion.

---

* Polit. 293 c.

† Pos. Polit. i. 59, Bridge's transl.

Lastly, the craftsman knows beforehand how his processes will turn out. Some certainty is the result of his operations, even in new and untried cases, is the very quality which distinguishes the skilled professional workman from the empiric or amateur. Any one can tell how a dish tastes: only the cook or culinary artist can tell beforehand how it will taste. Prevision is the perquisite of the cook.

But in politics no prevision is possible. Guesses may be made, and confident people sometimes state these guesses in very absolute terms, but the result of the complicated movements of a society cannot be foreseen. We cannot even forecast the course of the money market. To class politics with the technic arts, or even with an art like medicine, and to draw direct inferences, as Plato has done, from the one to the other, is to overlook these distinctions. The reason why Plato overlooked them is very simple. He saw clearly enough that knowledge was the most important point in common between the art of government and other arts. But he did not so clearly perceive the great difference in the degree of knowledge of their subject possessed by statesmen and by handicraftsmen and other artists. He did not see that the artistic knowledge of the carpenter, weaver or steersman is tolerably exact, whilst that of the politician is in the highest degree vague and inaccurate. He hardly appreciated the relationship which exists between the art of government and the science on which that art must be founded. Indeed we may say generally that the distinction between science and art was not always present to his mind nor clearly marked in his writ[illegible]gs? By an art we understand a set of practical rules founded [illegible] and provable by one or more sciences. A political art implies a [illegible]ence of politics; but there can be no science where there is [illegible]niformity. In Plato's time it was not yet recognized that [illegible]an affairs were subject to law, and it was only imperfectly recognized that any phenomena were so. That human actions follow invariably from certain antecedents, and that, given those antecedents the laws of their motions and the requisite powers of calculation, the course of political events can be predicted—were propositions not admitted or even conceived in Plato's day. Yet unless they be admitted no true political art can possibly exist. Plato was therefore wrong, from our point of view at least, if not from his own, in saying that government was an art. On the other hand, before we can exactly appreciate the force of Plato's criticism, we must remember that in his time at Athens the Government as the organ of the State undertook many duties and was intrusted with many powers with which in modern times the Government as such has no concern; and further, that public authority was directly exercised by the citizens themselves in public meeting assembled, and not delegated as in modern times to representative bodies. Religion and fine art were as much State business at Athens as law and politics. The same assemblies made laws and directed their execution. One magistrate often performed duties never now entrusted to the same person. A citizen might be called upon to preside at a trial, to lead an army, to act as the representative of the State on a foreign embassy, being at the same time a prominent politician and party leader. The distinction between legislative, judicial and executive functions was not unknown at Athens—it is indeed distinctly noticed by Aristotle in the "Politics"—but it was not so clearly drawn and insisted upon as with us. The Greek State was a much smaller, less highly organized body than the States to which we ourselves belong. Plato's criticism tells therefore forcibly against the assumption of political power by unskilled persons when the exercise of that power made it likely that they might be called on to discharge a variety of duties all demanding trained professional skill. For all that it is not sufficient for his purpose, which is to show that the political art differs only in degree of difficulty from the arts of common life, and that because there is an art of shoemaking, carpentering and navigation, it follows that there must be one of statesmanship. All that follows is that there *may* be one of statesmanship. The difference of difficulty between the two cases is so great as to constitute a difference of kind and not merely of degree. That there may be in the remote future an art of statesmanship it is not necessary to deny; but for reasons appearing hereafter we are warranted in saying that there is none at present.

Lord Bacon was perfectly aware of the scientific character of those branches of knowledge which are concerned with nature, and he explained with precision the methods of investigation applicable to them. But he only half believed that the same methods were applicable to human actions, either in the individual or in society. He placed politics, as he placed religion, in a border land between knowledge and ignorance. He accordingly excepts politics from the rule he laid down in the "Novum Organum" as to the influence of authority in intellectual matters. And when in the eighth book of the "Advancement of Learning" he proceeded to deal with civil knowledge, and arrived at the point "when he should presently handle the art of government—writing to so great a king, who is such a master in that art wherein he has been trained from his cradle" —Bacon considers "that he should better approve himself by silence in such a matter than by speech." Accordingly his treatment of the art of civil government is confined to a few general reflections and a collection of maxims of civil policy. It is difficult to believe that a man of Bacon's great intellectual power omitted to treat of the art of government because he thought that the subject had been exhausted by King James the First, and we can more reasonably account for his silence by supposing him to have felt that politics was not ripe for scientific treatment, or subject to scientific methods.

Burke's view is a compromise, and one, moreover, which shifts without removing the point of difficulty. To say that it is for the people to determine the ends, and for their rulers to find the means, is surely a strange way of avoiding those practical difficulties of government which the agency theory was brought in to remedy. In politics, to decide what is to be done is precisely the problem of greatest difficulty. For one man who can tell us where we ought to go, there are plenty who can find a way. If the people may be entrusted with the most responsible part of government, there seems no possible reason why they should not act directly and immediately in every administrative and executive capacity. A substratum of truth does underlie Burke's statement. The people are good judges of what they want in one sense. They know that they would like fewer taxes, more leisure, more health, peace and quietness; and they often have higher and less selfish desires than these; but wishes so expressed are no instructions for political action; they do not constitute a policy, and are barely enough for a good party cry. To carry out the wishes of the nation on such imperfect and vaguely expressed information as to its wishes as the nation usually gives, really throws the difficulty and responsibility of government upon the shoulders of the ruler, who has to do far more than "give a technical dress to the general sense of the community."

The recommendation of Carlyle to find the ablest man, and to trust everything to him, is rather a pious ejaculation than a piece of practical advice. Who is the ablest man? How is he to be known, and where is he to be found? Where shall wisdom be found, and where is the place of understanding? To put your finger on the very ablest man, and to select him from his other able competitors, is almost as difficult as to be the ablest man one's self. It is certainly beyond the competence of the mass of mankind, who differ about nothing so much as about the character and capacity of their able men. But suppose him chosen; there is no certainty of his going right. He will pursue a vigorous policy no doubt, but a man who is energetic in the wrong way only goes further astray than the slower people whom he distances. If we assume him to be always right, we must also assume him to have solved a problem usually considered to be insoluble. Lastly, it by no means follows that this phœnix will consent to take on himself all the trouble and worry of the single-handed management of other people's affairs. If he is as wise as he is supposed to be able, he will probably prefer to appoint himself to a snug post in his own Government. Carlyle's remedy creates as many difficulties as it seeks to remove, and expresses rather the aspirations of a good man than a condition realizable in actual practice.

Auguste Comte was the first to place social inquiries on a definitely scientific basis. He regards society as an organism, in the literal, not in the metaphorical sense, subject to the same general laws of life and growth as animal organisms, with special and superadded laws of its own. Among the general laws of the animal organism is this: that in the earlier forms of life there is little specialization of organ and function—one organ discharging many functions—whilst in the later, and as we say more perfect, forms of life, different functions are discharged by separate organs. Societies exhibit the same law. In their earlier and less civilized forms there is comparatively little division of duties among classes and individuals. We find many twofold or threefold men; but increasing civilization is marked by increasing division of labour and duties between classes and individuals. Of these duties government is one of the most important. Accordingly, with the advancing civilization of communities, and especially in what Comte calls "the normal state," government, so far as there is any government, will be exclusively carried on by a small class, whose special character will be intellectual power. So far, Comte agrees with Plato. The class in question, thought Comte, will inevitably govern in the best way, for they will certainly govern in accordance with the rules laid down in his systematic treatise. The confidence of this great but erratic thinker in his systematic treatise is unlimited and almost touching. It is said to be believed in America that the earth revolves on its axis subject to the constitution of the United States. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that Comte believed that the whole course of Western European civilization would be unfolded exactly in the manner laid down in the four volumes of his "Positive Polity."

It appears, therefore, that there is considerable difference of opinion in the authorities. Plato, Carlyle, and Comte all concur for varying reasons in stating government to be a matter of special skill, and which can only be properly exercised by a small minority of men: in the language of Plato, artists; in the language of Carlyle, able men; in the language of Comte, philosophers. Popular opinion, on the other hand, backed by authorities so weighty as Bacon and Burke, considers government as a matter specially within the competence of the many; it is a case in which you may count heads without weighing them, and rely as the Athenians did upon the popular vote in the weightiest affairs of State.

Let us attempt to give some precision to our idea of government. Government, whatever its form, is the instrument by which the public business of a State in its external and internal relations is carried on, and its duties divide into two main channels—regulative and administrative. In its regulative capacity it acts as the father of the State, and undertakes to prescribe as a good and wise ruler what is best for the community at large, giving laws like the Cyclops for wife and children. It forms and alters constitutions, it directs foreign policy; it decides on war and peace; on finance; and it fixes general rules of conduct in certain cases, forbidding this and enjoining that; and all this is done, or supposed to be done, in the interest and for the well-being of the State, of which the government, as *parens patriæ*, is presumed well able to judge. In its administrative capacity government is solely concerned with carrying into effect the orders transmitted to it by its head. It is not the business of this branch of government to judge what is right or expedient; it has only to work out in detail the practical problems submitted to it. Such are the raising and equipment of armies and navies; the collection and appropriation of the revenue; keeping the public accounts, and the organization and maintenance of the various State services.

Now, between these two branches of governmental agency there is this distinction, that the exercise of the regulative branch assumes a knowledge of political or social science; whilst the exercise of the administrative branch assumes only an acquaintance with the simpler sciences which give birth to the arts in ordinary daily use. To the extent that government acts—we are not considering how far it is desirable that it should act—as a builder, accountant, civil or military engineer, there can be no question that it is an artist and its business an art.

But this is not what is usually meant by government. It is not government in the sense in which the term is used by Plato, Bacon, or the other writers cited. They were thinking of policy, of direction, of regulative government, of ends, not of means. If government in this sense be an art, it must be based on a corresponding science. All art is founded on science, and the art of government can be no exception. The science in question is political or social science, the object of which is to discover the laws of the action of men in society, with the view of predicting what their future action will be. There are two indispensable and preliminary conditions of any such science—first, that we should know the facts about the society; and secondly, that we should know the causes of those facts. Now the ultimate social facts—the groundwork of political science—are the actions, feelings, and beliefs of the members of the society; their causes are the antecedent facts which are connected with them, and on which they depend. On the possibility of satisfying these two preliminary and necessary conditions, political science, and, therefore, artistic government, depend, and neither of them can, in fact, be satisfied.

To begin with the first requisite—the knowledge of the facts. The condition of the individuals forming the social aggregate, as regards their physical condition—education, external circumstances, and modes of thought and feeling—can never be precisely ascertained, even for the simplest case. To take a case much simpler than arises in any considerable legislative change: Suppose it is required to know beforehand the opinion, not of the nation, but of a majority of voters of the nation, on a given question. Let this question be one of great public interest; let it have been talked about in private and in public for weeks and months, illuminated with floods of literature and daily articles in all the papers; let a highly organized machinery have been in operation for the very purpose of ascertaining how people think; and let the interests of those who drive and work this machinery be a good deal affected by their success in arriving at a right conclusion. We know from repeated experience that even in this case no accurate forecast can be made. Or, to take another instance: A condition of commercial depression exists, or is said to exist. The Government desires to find out what is the matter, with the view of prescribing a remedy. It is referred to a committe of experts to ascertain "the nature, extent, and probable causes" of this depression, and "whether it can be alleviated by legislative or other measures." Those are the terms of the reference to the commission presided over by Lord Iddesleigh, and they state with logical accuracy the nature of the problem presented to the political inquirer. A series of questions are thereupon addressed by the commission to chambers of commerce, diplomatic and consular officers, trade societies, and others. A great body of oral evidence is taken. After patiently investigating the matter for several months the committee find that a question not within the scope of their reference, or the terms of their commission—which had not been thought material—the currency question, in short, is so bound up with their inquiry that they must needs suspend their labours until it has been separately examined. That is the present position of the Committee of Inquiry on Trade.* Now, if this be the difficulty in getting at the facts in a comparatively limited field of inquiry—an economic question only—what must that difficulty be in matters which affect not only trade and commerce, but the whole life and interests of a great nation? But suppose it overcome, and that reliable stores of information are ready to the hand of the political inquirer. His main difficulty then begins. He has to find the causes—that is, the antecedents of the phenomenon under examination. Now, among the countless antecedents which the social order presents, how is he to eliminate those which are unconnected with the phenomenon he is studying, and to lay his finger on those connected with it? None of the methods which have yielded such brilliant results in the natural sciences avail him here. He cannot use the arm of experiment at all, he can only imperfectly use the arm of observation; neither the method of agreement, nor the method of differences, nor that of concomitant variations, nor, in short, any of the resources of the inductive inquirer, are applicable. Without going further into the details of logical method, it is enough to say that no one who has attacked this subject from the point of means of evidence and methods of proof, has yet shown how this difficulty is to be surmounted, or has pretended that we are at present able to forecast with any tolerable probability the effect of any change in the structure of society, or assign the true causes of any observed condition of it. Those who attempt to predict or to deal with societies from the point of view of the artist—who both knows what he wants and has the power of doing it—are seeking to frame an art in the absence of the science on which that art must depend.

This conclusion of theory is amply verified by experience and not least by that of our own country. We have not been worse governed, on the whole we have been better, because less, governed than most other people. But turn to our history;

---

* Since this was written, there has, we believe, been a further Report.

look at our statute-book. It presents one long series of legislative failures and Government mistakes. Have we succeeded in the avowed and ostensible object of any great foreign war which we have ever undertaken? We fought France for a century to maintain the claims of the Plantagenets on the French crown and territory. After many brilliant exploits, we lost both all that we claimed and all that we before had. We fought our American colonies avowedly to support our right of taxation. In the end we killed the goose, but we did not secure the golden egg. We fought against the French Republic, and in support of the dynastic claims of the Bourbon family. The French Republic survives. The House of Bourbon is politically dead. We made war with Russia to preserve the balance of power in the East. The Treaty of Paris is to-day not worth the paper it is written on. It is not necessary to say that in any of these cases we should have been better off if we had done otherwise. It is not even necessary to say that we could have done otherwise; but what may truly be said is that kings, governments, and nations alike were totally unable to foresee even the proximate results of these dangerous and costly experiments. Look again at the numerous well-meant endeavours of Government to increase the national wealth and prosperity. Laws to regulate wages, laws to regulate prices, laws to fix the interest of money, laws against exportation, laws against importation, laws as to the cultivation of land, as to the dress that was to be worn, as to the sports and amusements that were to be indulged in. One and all admitted failures. But it will be urged, these things happened in the Middle Ages, and we are wiser now. Then take the legislation of the present reign—the legislation of this and the last generation, for which we and our fathers are responsible—the legislation of an enlightened and progressive period. In the fifty years between 1837 and 1886 we have been passing Acts of Parliament at the average rate of over 103 per annum; 5,173 Acts in fifty years. But we have been repealing these very Acts nearly as fast as we have been making them. The statutes of this session and the last have not had time to be repealed. But take the twenty-five years between 1837 and 1863. Twenty-five years is not a long time for a wise and knowing and artistic Government to look forward to. In that quarter of a century 2,887 public general Acts have been passed, and 2,472 have already been wholly or partially repealed. Judging by results, and weighing successes against failures, it would seem that government, if an art at all, is an art scarcely more trustworthy than astrology.

But it by no means follows that even in politics one man is quite as good as another, or that no trustworthy propositions can be laid down. There may be and there are generalisations of great value, not extensive enough to furnish the basis of a science, but infinitely more reliable than the loosely framed formulæ which do duty as political principles —middle axioms, *axiomata media*—on the practical value of which Lord Bacon so justly insisted. In the works of the great philosophers, historians, and poets, many such are to be found, and if they were collected, sifted and verified, they would form an invaluable manual of information for the practical use of the statesman. By way of illustration only may be mentioned a few of these.

Mr. Buckle has observed that the influence of climate in countries subject to a great variations of temperature, by suspending outdoor work during a large part of the year, is adverse to habits of steady industry; whilst the tendency of a temperate climate, by rendering continuous labour possible, is favourable to such habits. This is an *axioma medium*, deduced from physical laws and inductively verified.

Cabanis has remarked that there is a relation between the average duration of life in a country and its average progressiveness; that, other things being equal, countries where a large number of the population live into old age tend to be conservative, owing to the preponderating moral influence of the old and cautious. This is an *axioma medium*, generalized from facts of human nature and inductively verified or capable of being so. "Some people think," says Aristotle in the "Politics,"* "that the question of wealth is the chief factor in orderly government; for this is the subject which has occasioned all revolutions." And again, "Revolutions happen, never from slight causes, often on slight occasions." †

In the eighth book of the "Advancement of Learning," Lord Bacon has collected several of what he calls "maxims of civil policy," expressed in his own quaint language:—

> The blessings of Judah and Issachar will never meet—that the same people shall be both the lion's whelp and the ass between burdens. Neither will it be that a people overlaid with taxes should ever become valiant and martial.
>
> Let States that aim at greatness take heed that their gentlemen and nobility do not multiply too fast; as you may see in coppice woods: if you leave your staddles too thick you shall never have clean underwood.

Propositions, of which the foregoing are cited merely as examples, arrived at by deduction from known laws either of Nature or of human nature, and verified by a sufficient induction—this latter process is indispensible—would afford something real and tangible on which to proceed in politics. It would not be sufficient for prediction, but it would be of practical use in guidance. The *axiomata media* in present use consist mostly of the *obiter dicta* of popular politicians, or of supposed principles, arrived at, no one knows exactly how, but which are assumed to be beyond the reach of discussion. "Force is no remedy." "Representation and taxation must go together." "The voice of the people is the voice of justice and truth." "Remedial legislation must go hand in hand with the restoration of social order." "State education is necessarily free." These maxims may be all perfectly true; it forms no part of our present purpose to question them. But, if politics is a serious pursuit and not a game of words, it should be worth somebody's while to prove them true and to show on what evidence they rest. So far as we are aware, this process has never been performed; the maxims are simply assumed, and used, often with considerable effect, to persuade popular audiences. This practice exhibits just that "licentiousness and wandering in framing axioms" which Bacon denounced;* it would not be tolerated in any scientific inquiry, and that it is tolerated and even largely used by eminent statesmen only proves that politics is still considered as a subject in which truth may be arrived at by other methods than those of ordinary proof.

---

* Arist. "Polit." ii. 7. 2. † *Ibid.* v. 4. 1.

If for these easily assumed and uncertified principles we were to substitute generalizations legitimately verified, the intermediate truths of political science, we should possess a valuable body of knowledge applicable to State government. Other things being equal, the man who has at command the greatest store of this accumulated wisdom is best furnished, as regards knowledge at least, for becoming a political artist. If, in addition, he possesses coolness, tact, and discretion, and knows enough to be aware that his rules are not laws of Nature—that they are only transitorily and provisionally true, and always liable to interference from other laws, he will have come as near being a political artist as the present state of social knowledge admits. We may borrow an illustration from the history of an art which in point of complexity and difficulty approaches most nearly the art of government—the medical art. Before the discovery of the circulation of the blood, before the invention of the microscope, when chemistry did not exist, and it was supposed that food was cooked in the stomach by animal heat, and that the lungs were a cooling apparatus designed to moderate this excessive heat; when, in short, anatomy and physiology were in the state in which we find them recorded by Aristotle, it might be supposed that the treatment and cure of the human body was altogether a matter of chance. So no doubt it was in most cases, and in common hands. Yet we know that even in that day great surgeons existed, far superior to all their cotemporaries in knowledge and in success; men who contented themselves with acting on the middle axioms of medical art, and, refraining from heroic measures and critical operations, were bold enough to leave their patients alone, and who declined to cut, burn, and bleed, *secundum artem*. It takes a great deal of knowledge to be aware of one's ignorance, and a great deal of nerve to do nothing.

---

* Bacon, "Nov. Org." i. Apl. xvii.

It may be claimed for government that in judicious hands it is capable of being as much an art as medicine was in the time of Aristotle, and for what are called political principles that they are true in the sense that medical rules were true before the leading facts of anatomy and physiology had been established.

In practice, no doubt, in free countries, government must in the long run be carried on in conformity with the national will. The chances of error being infinite, and the national will entirely without guidance, popular government is pretty sure to be misgovernment. That cannot be helped. It is the price we pay for liberty. But it is probably better that we should be free to go wrong than that we should be dragooned into going right by Carlyle's ableman. His government would only be the government of a prig.

The reconciliation of these two opposing conditions—government by reason, and the satisfaction of the popular wish—was the great political problem of the past, and remains the great political problem now. Plato sought this reconciliation in a moral order of society, in which each member was confined to the duty for which by nature and training he was most fit—some for government, others for defence, and others for the task of supplying the material needs of all. In the ideal State, as he conceived it, this distribution of duties was performed by the governing body. Plato sought to prevent any jealousy of the action of this body by a rigorous and continuous State discipline and education, commencing in infancy and lasting through life, the result of which would be, he thought, to produce a general acquiescence in the arrangement by which each man did his own business without interfering with the business of any one else—a state of things termed by him "justice." The society in which this condition is most completely realized Plato pronounces to be the happiest.

Comte sought this reconciliation in a consensus of the body politic, brought about, not by government or any external agency, but by the operation of a strictly organic law—a harmony or equilibrium of the various orders and members of the State, corresponding to that consensus or equilibrium of organs in the individual body which constitutes what we call health. This consensus corresponds in the Comtist system to what Plato called "justice" in the State; and under its influence, aided of course by the study of his own systematic works, Comte confidently predicts that the proletariat of the future will frankly recognize that, whereas they are unfitted for the task of government, their interest and their duty alike forbid them from attempting to exercise it.

We state these opinions as we find them. We hope they may be true. But at present, and in England at any rate, we seem not yet to have arrived at the normal state. The tendency is rather towards diffusion than towards a specialisation of political power, and there are few signs of a disposition either to recognize the difficulty of government itself, to impose any limits on its activity, or to admit that any one soever is unfitted to exercise it. Perhaps the chief reason of this is that our public men—from whom on the whole the people get so much of their political training, approach politics rather from the literary than from the scientific point of view, and that they are not as a rule acquainted with the methods of the sciences which come nearest to politics—those of the life of individual organisms.

> There is a history in all men's lives
> Figuring the nature of the times deceased,
> The which observed, a man may prophesy
> With a near aim of the main chance of things.

This is a poet's dream. We not yet arrived at that point. We cannot prophesy—even with a near aim— of the main chance of things. Government, in the large sense of the word—so far as it seeks to anticipate, to direct, and to foresee—is not an art but a mere groping—*mera palpatio*—and statecraft is only guesswork. But the less ambitious task of administrative government is well within our powers. There are certain comparatively simple things, which are absolutely necessary to be done, which we can do, if we like, and do them well. Those who will take the trouble to do most thoroughly that which does admit of being fairly well one in some way or other are the truest political artists, and weave, so far as it can be woven, the great web of government.

> For forms of government let fools contest,
> Whate'er is best administered is best.

ART. VI.—THE BISHOP OF CHESTER'S OXFORD LECTURES.

Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Mediæval and Modern History and Kindred Subjects. Delivered at Oxford under statutory obligation in the years 1867-1884, by WILLIAM STUBBS, D.D., Bishop of Chester and Honorary Student of Christ Church, late Regius Professor of Modern History, LL.D. of Cambridge and Edinburgh, a Member of the Court of the Victoria University, and an Honorary Member of the Imperial University of S. Vladimir of Kieff and of the Royal Bavarian, Prussian, Irish, and Danish Academies. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. 1886.

IN our last number we reviewed the lectures of the present Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford on "The Methods of Historical Study." We now call our readers' attention to the volume of lectures published by Professor Freeman's predecessor. The Bishop's volume is in every respect inferior to that of his successor. It wants the unity of design of Professor Freeman's work. It begins with the Bishop's "Inaugural Lecture." This is followed by two lectures "On the Present State and Prospects of Historical Study." These again by two "On the Purposes and Methods of Historical Study." Thence we diverge to "Learning and Literature at the Court of Henry II.," which form the subject of two lectures. Then comes a solitary lecture on "The Mediæval Kingdoms of Cyprus and Armenia," followed by two lectures "On the Characteristic Differences between Mediæval and Modern History. We have then "The Reign of Henry VIII.," and "Parliament under Henry VIII." These are followed by two lectures on "The History of the Canon Law in England." We then make a retrograde movement to "The Reign of Henry VII.," which is the subject of two lectures; and the volume ends with "A Last Statutory Public Lecture."

The Bishop assigns as his reason for preferring Mediæval to later Modern History for the subjects of his lectures that he thinks that "for the training of the judgment the former furnishes material more readily applicable to educational purposes than the latter. It is further removed from the arena of political controversy, and whilst it possesses interest quite sufficient to awaken every sentiment that may lawfully affect the judgment, it stirs no emotion that could reasonably be expected to pervert or overbalance it."*

---

* "Lectures," p. 208.

Not only are the contents of this book miscellaneous and unconnected, but the Bishop, as he himself admits, is both desultory and discursive in his lectures. Moreover, his style is, as an Edinburgh reviewer—to the Bishop's evident annoyance—observed, "remarkable for its excessive dryness."* In this respect his book compares very unfavourably with the style of his successor, which, in clearness and a certain subdued power and eloquence, reminds us of Cardinal Newman. Perhaps Professor Freeman's Lectures are open to a like criticism to that passed on a distinguished Regius Professor of Modern History at the sister University—Sir James Stephen. Dr. Whewell spoke to Sir Henry Taylor of Sir James's Lectures "with admiration from one point of view, and with dissatisfaction from another. He said they were fitted to take a permanent place in the literature of the country, and, for that very reason, were not adapted to the merely academical purposes which the Lectures of the Professor of History were intended to serve."† Professor Freeman may not always be right, but at least he always knows what he means, and never fails to convey his meaning to his readers; but there is a haziness both about the Bishop's views and his style. This no doubt arises from his avowed opinion—

> That there are few questions on which as much may not be said on one side as on the other, that there are none at all on which all the good are all on one side, all the bad on the other, or all the wise on one and all the fools on the other; that the amount of dead weight in human affairs, call it stupidity or what you will, is pretty equally divided between the advocates of order and the advocates of change, giving to the one party much of its stability and to the other much of its momentum; that intolerance is no prerogative of heterodoxy, nor tolerance the inseparable accompaniment of the conscious profession of truth, a condition which might of all others the best afford to be tolerant, the most merciful and pitiful of error; that all generalizations, however sound in logic, are in morals and practical matters *ipso facto* false; that there is no room for sweeping denunciations or trenchant criticisms in the dealings of a world whose falsehoods and veracities are separated by so very thin a barrier, to learn that simple assertion, however reiterated, can never make proof; that a multitude of half believers can never make faith; that argument never convinces a man against his will; that silence is not acquiescence; that the course of this world is anything but even and uniform; that such bywords as reaction and progress are but the political slang which each side uses to express their aversions and their propensions.‡

This indifferent—if sceptical be not the fitter term—habit of mind is not the best for a teacher of history or of any other subject. A writer in the New York *Nation* described the Bishop as entirely free from political bias, and added, "what is more surprising, he appears to be scarcely influenced by ecclesiastical sentiment or prejudice." The Bishop's self-complacent assent to this remark is amusing. "Well, I thought, when I read that notice, here at last is a man who takes a right view of the clerical character. Here am I, steeped, as I fondly believe, in clerical and conservative principles, and yet able to take such a view of matters as scarcely to betray ecclesiastical prejudice or political bias; seriously speaking, this is just what I wish."* We do not doubt the sincerity of the Bishop's wish, but, with all deference to the New York critic, we must say there is much of clerical obscurantism in these lectures. What Lord Macaulay apprehended and Dr. Freeman has realized, was also the Bishop's experience.

---

* "Lectures," p. 377.
† "Sir H. Taylor's Autobiography," vol. ii. p. 29.
‡ "Lectures," pp. 17-18; cf. also pp. 19-20.

> His lectures [he tells us] were written under the pressure of statutory compulsion and against the grain. . . . . The feeling of compulsion, the compulsion to produce something twice a year which might attract an idle audience without seeming to trifle with a deeply loved and honoured study, was so irksome that never once in the course of my seventeen years of office did I think that there would come a time when I could look back on this part of my work with pleasure or grateful regret.†

And this complaint is often reiterated. Like his successor the Bishop had to complain of his very scanty audience. "I have had," he relates, "to deliver them to two or three listless men."‡

Such of our readers as read our review of Professor Freeman's "Lectures" in our last number§ will remember his eulogium on his distinguished predecessor Arnold; very different is the Bishop's estimate of that distinguished man. It will be seen that he thinks Arnold did little or nothing in historical work at Oxford, and that he was not particularly qualified for his professorship.

> We come to the great name, never to be pronounced without reverence even by his opponents, of the man whose sincerity, energy, and power of training, made him the prime mover of this generation. What Arnold might have done for the study of history in this place had his time been given to it, or been prolonged sufficiently to produce any appreciable effect on it, may be estimated by the effect of his work on other branches and in other places of education. I say it with diffidence, rather because I fear your criticism than because I

---

* "Lectures," p. 29.

† Preface, pp. v.-vi. "Lectures," p. 27. Cf. Freeman's "Lectures," p. 20.

‡ "Lectures," p. 32. Cf. Freeman's "Lectures," p. 234.

§ WESTMINSTER REVIEW for October, 1886.

have any doubt of the truth of the assertion. I believe that the one thing which Arnold wanted to perfect the balance of his admirable judgment, and to direct the current of his overflowing sympathies, was that experience of critical difficulties and moral incompatibilities which becomes practically, to the devoted student of history, a training in itself.*

It is interesting to compare the Bishop's estimate of other eminent historians with those of his successor. Describing the review of his inaugural lecture by his successor, he says:

> It was an article full of blessing and good omen, with a sufficient amount of dogmatism to prove that the writer believed himself entitled to criticize; and it contained, with all its precious balm, enough of the element of blister to produce a wholesome irritation, for the one or two points in the lecture on which I had bestowed especial pains were described as praiseworthy but illusory.†

Professor Freeman's style could not be more accurately described. Elsewhere the Bishop speaks of the present professor "as the great champion and representative of that branch of historic literature on which I believe the success of the study here to depend. Not that he is eminent in this alone."‡ It is noteworthy that throughout this volume there is no mention either of Gibbon or Hume. Of Macaulay he says:

> How can we recommend the man who wants to get up the rights of a case to a history like Macaulay's? How easy must have been the victory of Macaulay's hero if all his adversaries were the pitiful knaves and fools that they appear to him to have been. I am not calling him a slanderer—I do not believe that he was one; or ignorant or careless, for he was most learned and accurate; not insincere, for he was most sincere; but for all that he was as much a party writer as Clarendon, or Prynne, or Burnet, or Collier. And where such a man, with such power of portraiture as would make us believe his pictures, if not true, more lifelike and real than if they were true,—where such a man, with such knowledge, such memory, such transparent honesty of belief in his own version of history, cannot be relied upon, what shall we poor mortals do? §

Of Hallam he says:

> Hallam knew himself to be a political partisan, and wherever he knew that political prejudice might darken his counsel, he guarded most carefully against it. He did not claim the judicial character without fitting himself for it, and where he knew himself to be sitting as judge he judged admirably, so admirably that the advanced advo-

---

* "Lectures," pp. 6, 7. † *Ibid.*, p. 26.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 385, for the Professor's estimate of the Bishop. *Vide* Freeman's "Lectures," pp. 10, 11, and WESTMINSTER REVIEW, *ubi supra.*

§ "Lectures," p. 108. Cf. Freeman's "Lectures," p. 105; and see WESTMINSTER REVIEW, *ubi supra.*

cates even of his own views have long ago thrown him over as too timid and temporizing for their purpose. Yet, where he was not awake to his own prejudice, in matters, for instance, regarding religion and the Church, in which he seems to have had no doubt about his own infallibility of negation, how ludicrously and transparently unfair he is! *

Professor Freeman thinks that the distinguished German writer whom the world has lately lost—Von Ranke—made so little of English institutions when he came directly to grapple with them from the lack of that practical understanding of free institutions which can only be gained by living among them. The Bishop's estimate of Von Ranke differs widely from that of Professor Freeman:

> Leopold von Ranke is not only beyond all comparison the greatest historical scholar alive, but one of the very greatest historians that ever lived. Unrivalled stores of knowledge, depth of research, intimate acquaintance with the most recondite sources, have been, in his case, supplemented by everything which could be conferred by a long life, continuous study, close association with the great political actors and thinkers of the greatest part of the most eventful century of the world's history. Scarcely less eminent as the founder of the German School of History than as an historian himself, he has had the singular felicity of living to gather up the results of the labours of men whom he himself started in the career of study. It seemed to me, and it was the idea in which the work was begun and carried out, that for Englishmen in their own tongue to have from such a man a reading of the most critical period of English history, would be a boon of incalculable value. Not that we regarded him as infallible, not that we looked for him to have the sympathies of an Englishman, but that we did look to have for a period on which no Englishman can look or speak without prejudice, the evidence of a witness and critic who brought unparalleled qualifications and entire impartiality to bear upon it. The reception of the boon by scholars has been most grateful; that our literary guides have condescended to look on Ranke as one of the ruck of German professors, to treat his work as on the same plane with those of the ephemeral writers whose reputation is so carefully nursed in what is called literary society, does appear to me to be one of the discouraging signs of the times to be set against our more sanguine hopes.†

In our last number we called attention to a passage in Professor Freeman's lectures, which apparently refers to Carlyle,

---

* "Lectures," p. 109. Cf. Freeman, pp. 281–283; and WESTMINSTER REVIEW, *ubi supra.*

† "Lectures," pp. 57–58. Cf. Freeman, p. 289; and see WESTMINSTER REVIEW, *ubi supra.*

and unfavourably criticizes his style.* The Bishop takes a widely different view:

> Carlyle's Frederick II. is really the only great work on German or European history which has appeared in England for nearly half a century. It will scarcely be claimed for Sir Archibald Alison's valuable works on the period immediately following that of Frederick, that they owe their importance to their character as works of historical research. They were read and are read as any other very interesting book on a very interesting subject, but they do not reach even to the stature of Von Sybel's French Revolution, or Lanfrey's work on Napoleon. Carlyle's Frederick is primarily a work of a different sort; although, in the prophetic sight of the writer, that most remarkable book may, at the moment it was written, have borne a conscious reference to events which were still future, but have since most wonderfully illustrated its great theme, the world in general recognized nothing of the sort in it. The author, if he knew himself to be a *vox clamantis* at the time, must have been astonished at the rapidity with which his Gospel of Force triumphed as soon as it had its chance. Some of us shook our hands over it; one great man amongst us, whose place I am proud to occupy—I dare not say to fill—did not hesitate to speak words of summary condemnation: but the doctrine itself was esoteric, the words, like much else of Carlyle's, were φωνᾶντα συνέτοισιν but συνέτοισιν only; to the ears of the many they required the sacred interpreter. Shall I be thought hard if I say that the popularity of Carlyle's Frederick was not an intelligent appreciation: that it was Carlyle's reputation and manner that made men read it; and that it was for the Carlyle and not for the Frederick that they cared, whilst they wholly missed the prophet's lesson. Such as it is, however, Carlyle's Frederick stands alone in recent historic work.†

In another passage, which curiously exhibits the Bishop's hazy if not sceptical method of looking at things, we read:

> From a very incomplete study of history Scott could create a Richard, the truth of whose portraiture careful historical scrutiny seems to assure. Out of an enormous amount of material, Carlyle reconstructs for us Frederick William I. of Prussia, a living, moving, tantalizing reality. In both there is the eye and the hand of genius, different as is the workmanship, distinct as is the result. But although genius can reconstruct character, it cannot reconstruct events: it flashes its lightning into the dark, and for the moment we see battles and alliances, life and death, growth and decline of heroes, cities, and nations; but it would require many such flashes to produce one permanent impression; and for even an approach to an understanding of the vision we must go down and map out the land, photograph the heroes, and classify the populations of the cities. Patient study may not have much to do with genius; it has less to do with generaliza-

---

* Freeman's "Lectures," pp. 100, 101; and WESTMINSTER REVIEW, *ubi supra*.

† "Lectures," pp. 60, 61.

tions: but without patient study genius will flash with no productive efficacy, and generalizations will become mere formulæ, useful neither to teachers nor to learners, neither to statesmen nor to scholars; and even with patient study, what results? Surely that scientific generalizations are but by-play diversions and amusements, not real lessons; formulæ that are convenient for a moment now and then, but quite unsafe for implements of investigation or even as helps for memory: truisms, or fallacies, or both: or if containing truth, or aiming at universality, diluting the truth until it is useless; assuming a universality of rule which, when it comes to be applied, is met with a universality of exception.*

Of one of the Bishop's predecessors, he, agreeing with Professor Freeman, expresses this opinion: "I do admire the learning, acuteness, earnestness, and eloquence of Professor Goldwin Smith—learning, acuteness, earnestness and eloquence never more signally admirable than when employed on the behalf of Christian truth against philosophic sciolism." †

On the subject of the unity of history, which Professor Freeman, following the teaching of Arnold, holds to be "the truth which ought to be the centre and life of all our historic studies," ‡ the Bishop gives an uncertain sound. From the following passage he appears to agree with his successor:

> In this new, and modern, and living world there has been, since the era began, such a continuity of life and development that hardly one point in its earliest life can be touched without the awakening some chord in the present. Scarcely a single movement now visible in the current of modern affairs but can be traced back with some distinctness to its origin in the early Middle Ages; scarcely a movement that has disturbed the world since the invasion of our barbarian ancestors but has its representative in the chart of law, or thoughts, or territory to this day. Not a dynasty that is trembling out its little span of days now but represents, in its shattered, tottering throne, some great hero, some great heroic movement that has won the gratitude of the mediæval world. Not a country revolutionized and levelled until it hardly knew itself, until it scarcely remembered the names of its rivers and mountains, has been able utterly to obliterate the boundaries, or the customs, or the affinities of its old divisions. The dynastic traditions of Europe are rooted and grounded in the distant past; the principle of nationalities, new in its fashion of announcement, and most unlucky in its prophet, is rooted and grounded in a past more distant still; the principle of freedom, in their effect on which only the dynastic and national ideas have their true political value, rests on a yet more ancient foundation, but on one that is peculiar to the modern field of study, for it was brought into the world, and proclaimed and made possible by the Church.§

---

* "Lectures," p. 93.

† "Lectures," p. 7, cf. Freeman, p. 8; WESTMINSTER REVIEW, *ubi supra.*

‡ Freeman's "Lectures," p. 5.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

Another passage, in which the Bishop evidently refers to Professor Freeman, is a remarkable illustration of the Bishop's faltering, hesitating mood:—

> But I can hear at least one critic say, "Is not this assuming the truth of a doctrine that you are always practically denying—that the very designation of your professorship, your very *raison d'être,* forces you to deny the unity of history, the continuity of historic growth, the education of the world?" Well, if the unity of history means what I have said, I certainly believe in it; but that is not the meaning in which I have so often had to do battle with the idea. The false idea, or that which to me seems practically misleading in the term the unity of history, is the acceptance as a practical rule or maxim that there are no new points of departure in human history; that modern life is a continuation of mediæval, of ancient and mediæval, history, by a continuity and unity that is not at all points equally important—of the same consistency in fact. Now this idea has a truth only in the very highest regions of speculation. Every human soul has an equal value in the eyes of the Christian missionary and religious philosopher, but every human life does not convey lessons of the same practical value to the social investigator; every national history does not contribute equally valuable results towards the general progress of mankind, and so neither does every chronological epoch. That, perhaps, we will allow. Why, then, should not cycles of history—two, three, or more cycles of history—be allowed to exist, within which all the really important factors have their origin and development, and, it may be, work out their full destiny? successive great dramas of ages, the interest of which is self-contained, although there is enough of common ground between them and those which precede and follow to give them a simple continuity, and although there is doubtless in the Divine Mind one great plan of cosmical action, in which each drama of the human ages serves as a single act, or even a single incident? Let Scripture history, classical and ecclesiastical history, mediæval history, and modern history be read successively and connectedly, so much the better; but why deny that classical history, and mediæval and modern, can be advantageously studied apart? why confine the thoughts to the points on which they are conterminous, continuous, and agreed, to the exclusion of those in which they differ, when it is on the points in which they differ that the great contributions to the real history of man are to be traced? In any other sense than that in which I have attempted to limit it, and have accepted it, the unity of history is either the crotchet of a Socialist or the dream of a universal philosopher.*

Elsewhere he says:

> The unity and continuity of ancient and modern history is an idea which is realized on a great and intelligible scale in ecclesiastical history only; and even there the unity is to some extent a unity of

---

* Freeman's "Lectures," pp. 83, 84.

ideas, a coincidence of religion and moral motive influences, and not merely of historic continuity. It is in it that the continuity of the Latin civilisation, of the Holy Roman Empire and of the Latin language, Roman law and Latin literature is traceable, and to it that we owe them. To it, or to influences which it nourished or provoked, we owe the Renaissance, that revival of ancient culture, the very title of which is a denial of the continuity which its influences seem to claim for it.*

On the question—Is there a science of history? the Bishop speaks in the same hesitating tone.

I come to the region of abstractions and generalizations, and to the old question, How about the science of history? As I hope I made clear before, I do not intend this lecture to be a systematic exposition of my own views or any one else's; and I certainly do not intend to attempt an analysis of history as the subject-matter of a science or philosophy. I am only trying, if possible, to adjust my own impressions to the maxims of our theoretical instructors, and to say a word or two on subjects which recent discussions suggest. It certainly seems curious that, although the advocates of the unity and continuity of history, and the believers in the science and philosophy of history, imagine themselves to be diametrically opposed to one another, the weakness of their respective positions seems to be the same. Both prefer to work out generalizations and collect coincidences, rather than to study the drama in its plot and *personnel;* both decline to look at the subject, as we might say, all round. It is true that this is a fault of theory rather than of practice: a really good historian may, as we all know, combine an earnest faith in the unity of history with a power of creating most exact and minute reproductions of periods, scenes and characters; and such an advocate might almost convince us of the truth of his doctrine, because his practice is so completely free from the faults which that doctrine seems to the outside critic to involve. I am perhaps in error, too, on the other side, in speaking of the science of history and the philosophy of history in one breath; for certainly there is a philosophy of history which is not content with abstractions, but busies itself with following up causes and following out consequences, goes behind the scenes of the drama as well as directs a microscopic vigilance on the stage; and there is a sense in which the unity of history is itself a philosophy of history. I will then leave out the philosophy of history, and finish the lecture with a few words on the theory of a science of history. Shall I be saying too much if I say at once that one great objection to the very idea of reducing history to the lines and rules of exact science lies in the fact I have already stated, that generalizations become obscurer and more useless as they grow wider, and, as they grow narrower and more special, cease to have any value as generalizations at all. Is not a historical science liable, if it can be elaborated at all, to become on the one hand a mere table of political formulæ, and on the other a case-book of political casuistry? And, in either case, is it not as a

---

* Freeman's "Lectures," p. 87.

> mere political weapon that it is sought for, not as an increase of knowledge, not as an investigation of truth, nor as a study of history for its own sake? And is not the fact that the idea of a science of history finds acceptation, not among practical historians, but among high-paced theorists, a proof that such a possibility belongs to theory and not to practice; that it is aimed at as a new grace for the all-accomplished doctrinaire, rather than as an object to be sought by those who seek after wisdom.*

As is to be expected from the Bishop's ecclesiastical training and position, he attributes more importance than does his successor to ecclesiastical history:

> Whilst of all studies in the whole range of knowledge, the study of law affords the most conservative training, so the study of modern history is next to theology itself, and only next in so far as theology rests on a divine revelation, the most thoroughly religious training that the mind can receive. It is no paradox to say that modern history, including mediæval history in the term, is co-extensive in its field of view, in its habits of criticism, in the persons of its most famous students, with ecclesiastical history. We may call them sister studies, but, if they are not really one and the same, they are twin sisters, so much alike that there is no distinguishing between them.†

Again:

> It is Christianity that gives to the modern world its living unity, and at the same time cuts it off from the death of the past. The Church in its spiritual work, the Church in its intellectual work, the Church in its work with the sword, or with the plough, or with the axe; the soul and spirit of all true civilization, of all true liberty, of all true knowledge; the Church in its work of evil, in the abasement of its divine energies, in the vile fetters of priestcraft, in the blind paroxysms of public fanaticism, in the strange, varying fortunes that allies Ireland with Rome, Scotland with Geneva, setting father against son and husband against wife, the herald of peace with a sword; such an influence, so wide in its extension, so deep in its penetration, so ancient in the past, and in the future eternal, could by itself account for the unity, the life of modern history: the life, the soul of a body which thrills at every touch, the student cannot handle his subject matter as he can a skeleton; if he is a true student, he knows himself to be at work among living influences, some active, some slumbering, but all of which are so vital and so entangled that he cannot move without making some one feel, or without being himself affected in his process and in his judgment, by the system of which he is himself a part.
>
> Modern history is the history of ourselves, of the way in which we came to be what we are, of the education of our nation, of the development of our government, of the fortunes of our fathers, that caused us to be taught, and governed, and placed as we are, and formed our

---

* "Lectures," pp. 89, 90. † *Ibid.*, p. 9.

minds and habits by that teaching, government and position. As for the soul, that other portion of us, unchanged by education, government or fortune unchanged and untrained in the development and education of the world, unchanged except by the Spirit of God beginning at the beginning in every one that is new born in Him—that gift in which almost alone we trace the unity of our nature with that of the ancient world, in its waywardness, and short-sightedness, and self-will, what can all history tell us other or more than this, how God sent light into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, how they have perverted, but not closed the way of eternal life? *

The bishop sums up "the characteristic differences between mediæval and modern history in this passage:

"Mediæval history is a history of rights and wrongs; modern history as contrasted with mediæval divides itself into two portions; the first a history of powers, forces, and dynasties; the second, a history in which ideas take the place of both rights and forces. The point of time at which we should mark the separation in the latter is the first French Revolution. There is a continuity of life through the three; the fundamental principle, which still holds its ground in the struggle of ideas, is distinctly traceable in the primitive struggle of rights and wrongs, and far more and more distinctly in the more modern struggle of the balance of power; but in the first and second period, ideas have little weight compared with rights and forces; in the first rights are more potent than forces, in the second forces are more potent than rights; and now rights, forces and ideas are matched in the arena of modern politics in such a way as to make right and force themselves ideas. At this moment—I use an illustration which ought properly to grow out of something that must show further on—Austria may be regarded as representing the more ancient form of right, Russia as representing the form of force, and Germany, Italy and France different forms of leading idea. I do not mean that Austria is justified on appeal to right, or that Russia relies solely on force, or that the other three States have not ample grounds both in right and force for their present position, but that historically those are distinctions essentially characteristic.†

The two lectures on the reign of Henry VIII. will probably be found the most interesting by the generality of readers. The Bishop (referring to the Government publications relating to that reign) says that before the year 1900 it may be possible that some of us gifted with strength, sight, and perseverance, may write a complete history of the most critical of all reigns.‡ The Bishop portrays the king in these words:

I do not condemn him. God forbid, in whose hand are the hearts of kings. I do not believe him to have been a monster of lust and blood, as so many of the Roman Catholic writers regard him. I can-

---

* "Lectures," pp. 15, 16. † *Ibid.*, p. 209. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 379.

not accept at all the picture which Mr. Froude has drawn. I think that even Lord Herbert's estimate of him is deficient in the perception of his surpassing self-wilfulness. I do not attempt to portray him after my own idea; but I seem to see in him a grand, gross figure, very far removed from ordinary human sympathies, self-engrossed, self-confident, self-willed; unscrupulous in act, violent and crafty, but justifying to himself, by his belief in himself, both unscrupulousness, violence and craft. A man who regarded himself as the highest justice, and who looked on mercy as a mere human weakness. And with all this, as needs must have been, a very unhappy man, wretched in his family, wretched in his friends, wretched in his servants, most wretched in his loneliness: that awful loneliness in which a king lives, and which the worst as well as the best of despots realizes. Have I drawn the outline of a monster? Well, perhaps; but not the popular notion of this particular portent. A strong, high-spirited, ruthless, disappointed, solitary creature: a thing to hate, or to pity, or to smile at, or to shudder at, or to wonder at, but not to judge.*

To us it seems that to describe a man as "self-engrossed, self-confident, self-willed; unscrupulous in act, violent and crafty," is as strong a judgment as can be passed on any man.

According to the Bishop, "we are still living under religious or ecclesiastical conditions that owe very much, even of their present force, to Henry. You will, I hope, know me too well to misinterpret me in these expressions, you will not suspect me of making Henry VIII. the founder of the Church of England."† We wish the Bishop had told us—if not Henry—who was the founder of the Established Church. This ambiguity is to be accounted for by the lecturer's clerical position. Cobbett is on this subject a better historical authority than any clerical Regius professor. In his "Legacy to Parsons" he accurately says, "Yours is a Church founded solely on Acts of Parliament sitting at Westminster."‡ Surely Lord Beaconsfield must have had this sentence in his mind when he put into the mouth of the Cardinal in "Lothair" the words, "Parliament made the Church of England." The Bishop tells us "that Acts of Parliament, when they are tested, may, and often do, turn out very unsound and unsatisfactory in their statements of fact, and disputable and inconsistent in their statements of law."§

We do not venture to entertain the supposition that the Bishop ever so much as looks at so heterodox a publication as the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, but should some inquisitive chaplain venture to do so and whisper the fact in the Bishop's ear, we should be glad if the Bishop would tell the world what there is unsound or unsatisfactory in the statements of the Acts of Parliament to which we beg leave to call our readers' attention. We quote from Cobbett:

---

* "Lectures," pp. 290, 291.

† Ibid., p. 262.

‡ Second edition, p. 15.

§ "Lectures," p. 268.

> The preamble of the Act of Parliament (1st and 2nd Edward the Sixth) tells us that "the King, in his great goodness, has appointed the Archbishop of Canterbury (Cranmer) and others to draw, and make, one meet order, rite and fashion, of Common and open Prayer and administration of Sacraments, to be had and used, in his Majesty's realm of England and Wales; the which at this time, by aid of the Holy Ghost, with one uniform agreement is of them concluded, set forth, and delivered to his highness (eleven years of age) to his great comfort and quietness of mind, intituled, The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church after the use of the Church of England. Wherefore, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in this present Parliament assembled, considering as well the most godly travel of the King's Highness (eleven years of age), of the Lord Protector, and of other his Highness' council, in gathering and collecting the said Archbishop and learned men together, as the godly Prayers, Rites, and Ceremonies, in the said book mentioned; and the considerations of altering those things which he altered, and retaining those things which he retained in the said book, but also the honour of God and great quietness, which by the grace of God shall ensue, do give his Highness most hearty and lowly thanks for the same."*

Edward VI. died. Mary came to the throne, and Parliament passed the Act of the 1st and 2nd of her reign, cap. 3, of which the following is the preamble:—

> Whereas since the twentieth year of King Henry the Eighth of famous memory, Father unto your Majesty our most natural Sovereign, and gracious Lady and Queen, much false and erroneous doctrine hath been taught, preached and written, partly by divers the natural born subjects of this Realm and partly being brought in hither from sundry other Foreign countries, hath been sowen and spread abroad within the same: By reason whereof, as well the Spirituality as the Temporality of your Highness' Realms and Dominions have swerved from the obedience of the See Apostolick, and declined from the Unity of Christ's Church, and so have continued, until such time as your Majesty being first raised up by God and set up in the Seat Royal over us, and then by his Divine and gracious Providence knit in marriage with the most noble and virtuous Prince the King our Sovereign Lord your Husband, the Pope's Holiness and the See Apostolick sent hither unto your Majesties (as unto persons undefiled, and by God's goodness preserved from the common infection aforesaid) and to the whole Realm, the Most Reverend Father in God the Lord Cardinal Pole, Legate de latere, to call us home again into the right way from whence we have all this long while wandered and strayed abroad; and we, after sundry long and grievous plagues and

---

* "Legacy," pp. 22, 23.

calamities, seeing by the goodness of God our own errors, have acknowledged the same unto the said most Reverend Father, and by him have been and are rather at the contemplation of your Majesties, received and embraced unto the Unity and Bosom of Christ's Church, and upon our humble submission and promise made for a declaration of our Repentance, to repeal and abrogate such Acts and Statutes as had been made in Parliament since the said twentieth year of the said King Henry the Eighth, against the Supremacy of the See Apostolick, as in our submission exhibited to the said most Reverend Father in God by your Majesties appeareth: The Tenour whereof ensueth. We the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and the Commons, assembled in this present Parliament, representing the whole Body of the Realm of England, and the Dominions of the same, in the name of ourselves particularly, and also of the said Body universally, in this our Supplication directed to your Majesties, with most humble suit, that it may by your Graces' Intercession and mean to be exhibited to the most Reverend Father in God, the Lord Cardinal Pole, Legate, sent specially hither from our most Holy Father Pope Julian the Third and the See Apostolick of Rome, do declare ourselves very sorry and repentant of the Schism and Disobedience committed in this Realm and Dominions aforesaid against the See Apostolick, either by making, agreeing, or executing any Laws, Ordinances, or Commandments, against the Supremacy of the said See, or otherwise doing or speaking, that might impugn the same: Offering ourselves and promising by this our Supplication, that for a Token and Knowledge of our said repentance, we be and shall be always ready, under and with the Authorities of your Majesties, to the uttermost of our powers to do that shall lie in us for the Abrogation and Repealing of the said Laws and Ordinances, in this present Parliament, as well for ourselves as for the whole Body whom we represent: Whereupon we most humbly desire your Majesties, as Personages undefiled in the offence of this Body towards the said See, which nevertheless God by his Providence hath made subject to you, so to set forth this our humble Suit, that we may obtain from the See Apostolick, by the said most Reverend Father, as well particularly and generally, Absolution, Release and Discharge from all Danger of such Censures and Sentences, as by the Laws of the Church we be fallen into; and that we may as Children repentant be received into the Bosom and Unity of Christ's Church, so as this noble Realm, with all the members thereof, may in this Unity and perfect Obedience to the See Apostolick, and Popes for the time being serve God and your Majesties, to the furtherance and advancement of his Honour and Glory. We are, at the intercession of your Majesties, by the authority of our holy Father Pope Julian the Third of the See Apostolick, assoiled, discharged and delivered from the Excommunications, Interdictions, and other censures Ecclesiastical, which hath hanged over our heads, for our said defaults, since the time of the said Schism mentioned in our Supplication; It may now like your Majesties, that for the accomplishment of our Promise made in the said Supplication, that is, to repeal all the Laws and Statutes made contrary to the said Supremacy and See Apostolic, during the said Schism, the which is to be understood since the twentieth year of the reign of the said late King Henry the Eighth, and so the said Lord Legate doth accept and recognize same.*

Mary died, and Elizabeth succeeded her, and the very first act of her first Parliament repealed the Act of which we have just quoted the memorable preamble, and by the second act, as Cobbett truly says, "brought back the Prayer Book again;" and with equal accuracy, he continues: "This Church was created by the Acts of Parliament; it has no existence as a Church; it has no rite or ceremony, no creed, no article of faith, which has not sprung out of an Act of Parliament."† The Bishop says of Elizabeth: She did not revive the Act of Henry VIII., which had asserted the King's headship to the Church.‡ If this assertion be true in the letter it certainly is not so in the spirit, for the first Act of Elizabeth's reign, to which we have already referred, imposed on clergy and laity alike the duty of making this declaration: "I, A.B., do utterly declare and testify in my conscience, that the Queen's Highness is the only supreme governor of this realm, as well as in all spiritual and ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal."§

We will quote the only personal reference or anecdote which this volume contains. Speaking of the late John Richard Green, the Bishop says:

> John Richard Green, the dear friend of many amongst us, has left behind him a name which cannot soon be forgotten. His books are by themselves the warrant of the fame which he so widely gained; the extent of his reading, the power of his grasp, the clearness of his insight, the picturesque reality of his narration, are patent to all who are capable of judging. We, who knew him better than the world of his readers, know too of his great, unwearied industry, his zeal for truth, and the inspiring force of his conversation. For twenty years he and I were close friends; with countless differences of opinion, we never quarrelled; with opposite views of the line of history and of the value of character, we never went into controversy; his letters were a delight and honour to me; I believe that my visits were a pleasure and in some way a comfort to him. In the joint dedication of his book, I confess that I received a compliment which I place on a level with the highest honours I have ever received.
>
> I am tempted to modify the excessive dryness, as the Edinburgh Reviewer puts it, of my discourse, by telling the story of our first introduction to one another, chiefly because it has been made the subject of a myth which has made us both a little, and not a little, ridiculous. Some of you, I dare say, remember a paragraph that went the round of the September papers years ago; and told how two

---

* "Legacy," pp. 30–34. † *Ibid.*, p. 39. ‡ "Lectures," p. 323.
§ "Legacy," p. 36.

persons, a stout and pompous professor and a bright ascetic young divine, met in a railway carriage; how the burly professor aired his erudition by a little history lecture (an anticipation of the informal instruction of the Commissioners), on every object of interest that was passed on the road, and how each of his assumptions and assertions was capped by an answer from the ascetic divine, which showed that he knew it all, and knew it better. The professor at last, exasperated by the rejoinders, broke into a parody of the famous address of Erasmus, Aut Morus aut diabolus, substituting for Morus, Johnny Green. Could this be true? It was in 1863 that we met. I was not yet a professor, he had not begun to wear the air of an ascetic. We were invited to Wells, to a meeting of the Somerset Archæological Society, to stay with a common friend,* whom you will have no difficulty in identifying.

I was told, if you leave the station at two you will meet Green and possibly Dimock, the biographer of S. Hugh, whom I knew already. I knew by description the sort of man I was to meet. I recognized him as he got into the Wells carriage, holding in his hand a volume of Renan. I said to myself, if I can hinder, he shall not read that book. We sat opposite, and fell immediately into conversation. I dare say that I aired my erudition so far as to tell him that I was going to the Archæological meeting, and to stay at Somerleaze. "Oh, then," he said, "you must be either Stubbs or Dimock." I replied, "I am not Dimock." He came to me at Navestock afterwards, and that volume of Renan found its way uncut into my waste-paper basket. That is all; a matter of confusion and inversion; and so, they say, history is written. Well, perhaps a friendship between two historical workers may be called a historic friendship, and, to be historical, should gather some of the mist of fable about its beginning: anyhow it was a friendship that lasted for his life, and the loss of which I shall never cease regretting.†

The remark about "confusion and inversion" illustrates the sceptical habit of the Bishop's mind, and his preventing his friend from reading Renan's great work illustrates his obscurantism. A student and future writer of history might surely have been permitted to read a historical sketch, which, however heterodox may be the thought, in style exhibits that marvellous charm of literary form, in the command of which the French are the first among European nations, and, according to a very capable judge, M. Renan among the French.‡

But we must bring our remarks to a close. We do not think the publication of this volume will enhance the Bishop's reputation. He evidently doubts whether it will be read.§ His reputation rests on other and surer foundations. It has been truly said in reference to the valuable papers published by the Public Record Office: "To Professor Stubbs belongs pre-eminently the honour, not only of having in many cases collected and edited them, but in having illustrated their full significance, and in having shown what reconstruction in our scheme of the early history of England they necessitate."* .

---

* *i.e.*, Professor Freeman.

† "Lectures," pp. 376, 378.

‡ See Renan's "Hibbert Lectures," pp. 209, 210.

§ See Preface, p. vi.

ART. VII.—PLATO'S MORAL MISSION.

1. *Œuvres de Platon.* Traduites par VICTOR COUSIN. Paris. 1828.
2. *Plato and some of the Companions of Socrates.* By GEORGE GROTE. London. 1866.
3. *The Dialogues of Plato.* Translated into English, with Analysis and Introductions, by B. JOWETT. Oxford. 1875.

IT is no exaggeration to affirm that a correct estimate of the philosophic genius of Plato—he who lived and taught at Athens 400 years before the commencement of our era—has mainly been the work of the moderns, and that it has been reserved for the erudition of this century to present to the world the real Plato divested of all adventitious gloss and false colouring. It is well known that some centuries after his death the personality of the philosopher underwent a sort of hero-worship, and that his name was invested with a homage akin to that accorded to divinity. Out of the enthusiasm of his admirers—particularly during the era of the Neo-Platonic development—a vast mass of new and heterogeneous matter was grafted on his teaching, all of which currently passed under the common term of Platonism. To separate the false from the true, and set the judgment right regarding his exact place in the realm of thought, nothing, even now, will suffice short of the actual study of his writings as a whole; and the three works we have placed at the head of this article will greatly assist this end. In their respective spheres they are excellent guides; but, as they each approach the subject from different points of view, we think there is great advantage to be derived from referring to them concurrently and grouping them together. Victor Cousin—himself a philosopher of the Idealistic school—seems to view Plato as a bright star at an enormous distance from our sphere, and we can easily see that he is not quite able to divest himself of the traditionary homage attached to a great name. Plato certainly loses nothing of his dignity under his handling, and his rendering of the text is by far the most elevated and impressive of the three. His translation also is exceedingly close and literal, while all the spirit of the original is preserved; and there is, moreover, a certain harmonious ring in the well-turned periods which, though somewhat rhetorical, is singularly captivating to the ear. M. Cousin was the earliest in the field, his work having appeared fully thirty years before Mr. Grote's analysis, and its advent may in a measure be considered phenomenal in literature; for it gave an undoubted impetus to philosophic speculation, and, as Descartes' method had done two centuries before, helped to enthrone the Ideal on a rational base, and rehabilitate the creed of the Academy. Perhaps some also will be of opinion that a philosopher should always be translated not only by a philosopher, but by one who sympathizes strictly with his creed. In this judgment we fully concur, and we have no difficulty in recognizing the evidences of kinship and harmony of sentiment which pervade Victor Cousin's labour of love. But we still think that the French writer is all the better for being placed in juxtaposition with his two less fervid *collaborateurs* in the same walk, as they serve to sober down, and perhaps to correct, the effect produced on our imagination. Mr. Grote is an admirer of the severe Aristoteleau order of mind, and under his calm and impassive analysis Plato certainly seems to lose something of his traditional transcendentalism, though nothing whatever of his intellectual force; while Professor Jowett—whom we might, without any irreverence, call a Christian Platonist—presents us with a version of the "Dialogues" pitched in so appropriate a key, and in a style so nearly resembling the original, that we might almost commit a pardonable anachronism and imagine he had been present as a listener, and took notes of the conversation, so vivid and real is the picture he presents. Here Plato certainly does not dwell apart, but is actually with us and amongst us; and in this respect the translation of Professor Jowett may fairly be pronounced to be a true and unvarnished reflex of the thoughts and manner of the philosopher. As regards the precursory influence of Schleiermacher and other German writers, that movement was of an entirely different order from the above essays, though Mr. Grote has occasionally travelled along the same path, and ventured on elaborate solutions of disputed points. The German expositions were essentially scientific and critical, not *epideistic*, nor intended to make converts. They were mainly devoted to the elucidation of the text, and written in an *esoteric* spirit for the learned; while the three authors we have taken for our text wrote with the more interesting purpose of diffusing the Platonic sentiment, and making it popular and intelligible.

---

* "England," by F. H. S. Escott, p. 487.

He who has been accustomed to form his estimate of the founder of the Academy from detached passages selected from his works—as is the case with the majority of readers—will perhaps at first experience a sense of disappointment as he searches through the text for those potent and pervading thoughts which have revolutionized the convictions of mankind. The presence of the Plato of rumour and fame still haunts him, and in exploring the text it may be that he even hopes to make some new discoveries of his own which have escaped the eye of criticism, or which may still be unveiled by deeper research—since even Prof. Jowett thinks that much still lies hidden in Plato destined one day to be brought into fuller light. As such discoveries, however, are not to be made by all, and no startling novelties are apparent, a sort of revulsion takes place in the mind of the reader. Plato, after all, seems to him no Titan; and perhaps some may even ask themselves why he gets so much credit for being an innovator. This impression results simply from the fact that at this very hour, unconsciously to ourselves, we are using Plato's dialectic method, and, it may be, conforming our ways and morals to his original teaching. It was his works, in short, which imparted the impetus which has been in action with more or less fluctuation now for upwards of two thousand years. Out of the system of self-search which he inculcated, a new spiritual morality has been diffused over the world, and the marvel is—not to find nothing new or startling in Plato, but to find in his works the exact image and counterpart of our own moral impressions. We look for novelty, and we discover exactly what we find in the higher convictions around us. In other words, Plato has simply anticipated modern thought. What we now understand by the abstract terms, Justice, Virtue, Temperance, Truth, Courage, was first formally defined by him. It was he who first undertook to indicate the dual nature of man, as consisting of distinct spiritual and corporeal elements. It was he who first formally affirmed that this life is but a probationary existence, and that the soul is immortal—most of all, that we must conform everything to the necessities of the soul. Though many of these tenets had been floating in the minds of serious thinkers before his time, it was philosophy which first gave them a voice, and made them a part of necessary instruction. If Socrates was the martyr in the cause, Plato was the expositor and the apologist. He has with great justice, therefore, been regarded as the high-priest of philosophy; for his influence was far-reaching, and the spirit of his teaching ramified afterwards into the doctrines of the four great schools which sprang up after his death—the Peripatetic, the Stoic, the Epicurean, and the New Academy. He has also at all times been the especial favourite of the intellectual. Cicero not only admired, but took him as a model.* The Emperor Julian made him the constant companion of his campaigns. Philo of Alexandria founded his theory of Neo-Platonism on his ideas. The writers of the Talmud, the Gnostics, Plotinus, and Porphyry, were all either more or less imitators or borrowers. The early fathers of the Church vied in extolling the excellence of his morality. Saint Augustin availed himself of the "Republic" to construct his treatise, "De Civitate Dei," which is an accepted authority in Catholic theology. The mystical schools of the Middle Ages borrowed freely from his thoughts—sometimes without suspecting the source. Florence in the fifteenth century prided itself on founding a new Platonic School; and in England in the seventeenth his votaries were numerous. Henry More became almost a disciple pure and simple; and Ralph Cudworth, a Christian Platonist, labours perpetually to discover parallels between his doctrines and those of revealed religion. In all cases, however, it was the fate of the philosopher not to be interpreted literally, to lose almost entirely his Hellenic aspect, and to be made use of mainly to furnish forth and set off the lucubrations of subsequent thinkers who prided themselves on being Platonists. Just as the temples of antiquity supplied the materials, as well as the models of modern fabrics, so the works of Plato became in after time an inexhaustible mine to the founders of new intellectual systems. It must be admitted also that out of his original teaching not only the tenets of the four great philosophic schools, but many of the phases of modern thought—nay, even of some modern religious systems—were liable to flow, once the springs of inquiry were opened, and the rational method of examination was instituted. On the basis of the dialectic system he propounded an inquiry which was by no means destined to pause at the point where he left off. It was Plato, however, who sowed the good seed, and ever since his day it has been fructifying and assuming more expanded forms. But, as we have observed, until very late years, a correct appreciation of his relative place as a philosopher was not arrived at; only moral portions of his works were known or quoted even by the learned down to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. People admired Plato without reflecting. They were delighted with his consummate art, his imagination, and his flowing style, and looked for nothing more. It was enough for them and for his fame, that 400 years before the Christian Revelation he had insisted on the doctrine of the soul's immortality.

---

* Cicero says of his philosophy that it is not the intellect of man, but of something instinct with the Delphic Oracle. "Orat." c. 20.

It is important, however, to bear in mind that Plato inherited much from others, and that philosophy had been at work in Greece, making guesses at truth, for upwards of two centuries before his time. The first step of progress in this direction was the loosening among intelligent minds of the popular belief in supernatural agencies and the rejection of polytheism; the second was the recognition of a supreme first cause operating in Nature; and the third, the systematic employment of the process of self-examination, and the turning of the mind inwardly on itself to discover its own capacities and constitution. The crowning acquisition, which only came later with the development of the language, was the employment of abstract ideas. Greek philosophy in its dawn was, in a measure, a return to the Ionian Nature-worship, traces of which tendency in the Greek mind are observable even in its latest manifestations. In Homer, we see that religion holds a mid-way point between Nature-worship and the introduction of rites and ceremonial. In the tragic writers the latter influence becomes more marked, and more acceptable to the popular idea. But that which is perhaps the highest evidence of an original Nature-worship is the inveterate tendency to personification in the language: not only rivers and mountains, and all material objects which strike the eye are invested with personal attributes, but even the most insignificant phenomena. Thus Æschylus speaks of the "white-winged snow" (*λευκοπτέρω νιφάδι*), or the fine metaphor quoted by Aristotle, as indicative of the sun's action, "sowing the god-created flame" (*σπείρων θεοκτίσταν φλόγα*), would be unintelligible to a people whose minds were not either more or less impregnated with the instinct of personification. Before Plato's time, however, many tentatives had been made, and the spirit of *subjective* inquiry was carried to such a point by the Eleatics as to lead them to deny the existence of an exterior world. The evidence of the senses this school considered to be altogether illusory and misleading, and they centred everything in thought—in point of fact, identifying thought with being, and being with Deity. They propounded an all-pervading unity in creation—their two leading principles being, that "The all is one," and "The one is God." They thus reversed the order of natural experience, and considered that exterior creation was merely, as it were, a mirror reflecting the operations of the mind. But, by the astounding boldness of their assertions, the Eleatics gave an important impetus to mental philosophy. Their distinguishing characteristic was, their war against materiality. They puzzled themselves and others with subtle discussions regarding the *τὸ ὄν* and the *τὸ μὴ ὄν*. They asked, "What is being?" but they failed to find an answer, just as later philosophers have failed. We have reason, however, to think that they placed existence (*τὸ ὄν*) solely in contemplation, and in the absolute immutability of the individual. Thus, the mind of man is as the Deity contemplating his work, and the soul the unmoved spectator of the universe. There is, of course, in such a system neither past nor future, beginning nor end, and in reality we never die, because non-existence (*τὸ μὴ ὄν*) is impossible. Even Berkeley's idealism pales by the side of this daring conception. The Eleatics reached the border-land which lies in the absorption of individuality into unity, but they could not pass the bounds. Xenophanes, the Eleatic, who was born about 620 years before our era, opens a series of thinkers, who find their climax in Pyrrho and Pantheism of modern days. The Eleatics, however, have been but dimly reported; yet, as Mr. Grote candidly admits, their doctrine is "a fire not yet quenched." In short, extreme Idealists are found to crop up in every age—the most advanced and fascinating types of this order in modern times being Bishop Berkeley and Schelling. The force of the Eleatic doctrine lies mainly in the fact that our existence is in itself a miracle. So Plato is never quite able to get rid of his awe of Parmemides, even while disputing his doctrines; but, however he may hesitate on the brink of the ideal, and seem almost to lose his balance, he never shows any sympathy with the advocates of the materialistic theory of the universe.

How far Socrates was the inspirer of Plato will probably for ever remain the subject of doubt. For five-and-twenty years, however, the former was a remarkable figure in all the public resorts of Athens, and gathered round him a school of distinguished followers, who seem to have accepted all he taught as indispensable. Though he indirectly confessed his belief that he possessed a divine mission to propagate truth, his teaching surpasses all philosophy, whether ancient or modern, in its eminently mundane and practical character. His doctrine, in point of fact, was that "the proper study of mankind is man"[*]—a doctrine which the Delphic Oracle had in substance enjoined when it enunciated the *γνῶθι σεαυτόν*. When Cicero affirmed that Socrates brought philosophy down from the heavens to the earth,[†] he ought perhaps to have said that he supplanted religion by philosophy, and superstition by reason. The belief of Socrates in a tutelary demon of his own (Xenoph.,

---

[*] *αὐτὸς δὲ περὶ τῶν ἀνθρωτείων ἀὲι διαλέγετο σκοπῶν.*—Xenoph. "Mem.' 1-16

[†] *Tusc.* Disp. 4-10.

"Mem." i. 4, iv. 3) does not appear to have been accepted by Plato, whose conception of the supernatural is of a more abstract spiritual character. With Socrates there seems to have been a certain personality associated with the idea of a divine guardian dwelling within the body. It was a doctrine which certainly made no way, as it was not embraced by any of the subsequent schools, though in the Roman Republican period fervent thinkers, like Brutus, seem to have believed at least in an evil genius.

It is somewhat remarkable to find that Socrates, though he had served in the wars, did not consider it necessary that a man should first enlarge his experiences by travel in other countries in order to be eligible to enunciate wisdom. On the contrary, he hung about the streets and market-place of Athens, and could hardly be persuaded to go beyond the walls. Plato, though a loving disciple, is a mind of a stamp very different from that of his master. He seems, like so many other philosopers, to have recognized the advantage of examining personally the manners and customs of other nations, though he does not record his experiences or suggest comparisons like Herodotus. Before he opened his school at Athens he thought it advisable to fortify or correct his impressions by an intercourse with some of those masters in philosophy who were then famous beyond the limits of Greece. He visited Cyrene, Sicily, and Southern Italy, where he appears to have particularly sought the society of the Pythagorean school. Nor was it mere vague curiosity or Hellenic restlessness which led him to visit Egypt. He must have naturally hoped to glean rare knowledge in a land which the Greeks had always traditionally regarded as the remote source of their own civilization.* Egypt was still for them the country of a strange, mysterious superstition, which seems to have had a particular fascination both for the credulous and the sceptical. Even had he held no communion with the priesthood, and made no inquiries, as Herodotus did in his categorical manner, Plato as a simple traveller could hardly have wandered

> Amid stupendous columns and wild images
> Of more than man ;—where marble demons watch
> The zodiac's brazen mystery, and dead men hang
> Their mute thoughts on marble walls around,

without being deeply impressed. It was also impossible for him to have visited a land where such care was taken to preserve the body intact after death without asking the why and the wherefore. When he observed so ancient and religious a people concern themselves so intimately with the idea of corporeal perpetuation—though in a manner repugnant to Greek sentiment—he must have had his early impressions confirmed, and felt the conviction of a universal leaning towards a belief in a future life. It has also struck us—viewing the spirituality which pervades so many of his writings when placed in juxtaposition with those of his contemporaries, and remembering that spirituality did not attain its maximum intensity nor reach its full height until the promulgation of Christianity—that Plato must have been largely indebted to ideas borrowed from Eastern sources. Between his age and that of Philo, who is a disciple and an imitator after his mystical fashion, nearly 400 years elapsed without any advance on the Spiritualism of Plato, but rather retrogression. It is a trait observable in no other Greek writer to anything like the same extent as in him. How then can we account for the strong affinity on the part of Philo of Alexandria for Plato's ideas—for that Plato whom one of his followers styles the Attic Moses—unless those ideas had their original source in Eastern influences, as we have observed?[*] We must not assume that no such spiritualistic philosophy existed in the East because we have no historical record of the fact—or because profane history at least, is silent on the subject—or because Plato suppresses all mention of the sources of his inspiration. Who will be bold enough to say that the Egyptian priesthood, whom we are taught to regard as the most enslaved instruments of a dark, superstitious creed, may not have communed freely among themselves in an *esoteric* spirit on the subject of a future life, the immortality of the soul and its incorporeal essence.[†] All this they might have devoutly believed in and yet have hidden from the outside world as things non-essential in religion, a slavish devotion to the traditional deities being in their view the best test of piety and the most natural exercise of pliant humanity. In short, they may themselves have possessed the light and yet withheld it. So, we have often asked ourselves:—Why did the Spiritualism first revealed in Plato lie dormant for 400 years and then suddenly burst into overpowering brightness on the border of that very land he had visited in his travels? We consider, therefore, that Plato's travels constituted an important feature in his career and education, and that they had much to do in shaping the character of his philosophic system, in giving elevation and solemnity to his creed, and in removing any narrow lingering prejudice in favour of local Hellenic preferences. As regards his visits in his mature years to Sicily, and the story of his having been sold as a slave by his capricious host the tyrant Dionysius, most modern critics are sceptical. Its marvellous character made it acceptable to antiquity, anxious to exalt the fame of a writer who held so distinguished a place. If true, it certainly was a singular situation for a philosopher who insists so much on freewill to find himself in, and perhaps too severe a test for equanimity the most philosophic. If an invention, the story to be perfect should have ended by Plato, the slave, morally reversing the conditions, and exercising the ascendency over his master.

---

* Aristotle tells us in one of his works that the passage-money in his day to Egypt was only two drachmæ. The communication, therefore, must have been easy and frequent.

---

[*] Νοῦς, which is the "Divine Mind" of the Alexandrian school, is obviously the legitimate issue of Plato's doctrine of Ideas; though perhaps the "thought is God" of Parmenides betrays a closer affinity with the conception of Philo.

[†] Herodotus tells us in plain terms that the Greeks got their ideas of the immortality of the soul from the Egyptians.—"Euterp.," p. 123.

The Greek mind, as we know, was intensely inquisitive, and had the happy faculty of appropriating many good things from exterior sources, and giving them new and more intelligible forms. In his travels Plato—who admits wonder to be the source of knowledge—must have picked up many floating traditions strange and marvellous, though still admitting of credence; and as his mind was intensely assimilative, it would not be surprising if he incorporated in some of his mystical speculations ideas and fancies which were not strictly Hellenic. His richly coloured version of the fabled Atlantis, for example, regarding which there was a tradition as old as the age of Solon, may have been due in a great measure to the influence of these early experiences. Further, as our knowledge of remote times is enlarged by discovery from day to day, we are compelled to admit the vast obligation under which Greece, and Athens in particular, lay to the expiring nationalities around. Social and political life, it must be remembered, had manifested itself in many important phases centuries before the age of Plato. The development of knowledge, either technical or speculative, was not confined to Greece. Its starting-point is rather to be sought among those nations whose civilization was in actual decadence when Athens rose to perfection. It is the brilliancy of the dawn which dazzles us. We consider every manifestation of art or culture as native and indigenous, instead of regarding them as the outcome of a long series of intellectual progression. There is nothing irrational or far-fetched, therefore, in the notion that Greece was, after all, only an inheritor, and that the savage state amid a serene nature, hinted at by the poets, when wild beasts held possession of the territory, and men crept about in search of fallen acorns as their natural food, was once a reality.*

But whatever may have been the source from which Plato drew his inspiration, the dialectic, at least, in which he expressed his thoughts, is truly Hellenic. And here again the question arises, whether Socrates is not entitled to claim the merit of the work, the disciple being only the expounder. For our part we incline to believe that Socrates, a mere conversationalist at most, imparted the hint, and that the fine fabric was due to the pupil. Socrates was not a writer, but a talker and disputant. From all the characteristics handed down of him by Xenophon and Plato, in which they both nearly agree, he was not a man to formulate a system. His mind was too much of the negative order for that office. His great force seems to have lain in exposing the absurdity of the notions of his rivals. But Plato is deliberate and constructive. He builds up a system, and there is a perpetual harmony visible throughout. He employs negation, it is true, but synthesis is always predominant. In order to combat the system of the Eleatics, who had for some time been in the ascendant, he undertook to propound an original theory of his own. This was his doctrine of Ideas, as the source of all true knowledge.

---

* Mr. Grote, however, considers the Platonic philosophy as purely Hellenic, without any amalgamation with the Oriental views of thought. "The Orontes

The Ideas, in Plato's view, are unchangeable archetypal forms of which both the soul and reason have cognisance, and which have existed from all eternity. They are, as it were, emanations of the soul, which, however, is by no means identical with mind (*νοῦς*), though in intimate connection with all its operations. Objective truth is only to be discovered by the exercise of the reason, and nothing is true unless it is proved to be so dialectically. Plato, therefore, by proclaiming that there exists in the mind certain innate ideas or faculties which have the power of discovering truth if the inquiry is logically pursued, gave for the time a fatal blow to the idealism of the Eleatics, who regarded the evidence of the senses as only a deceptive appearance. Further, he held that our ideas do not originate from experience, but have simply been developed by it. Or, to borrow an illustration from the dialectic of St. Paul—experience is not the cause, but the thing caused (*ὀυκ ἀίτιον ἀλλ' ἀιτιατόν*). In order both to refute the views of the Eleatic school, and to establish a theory of his own, he brings on the scene the leaders of certain philosophic schools, and makes them speak for themselves. The dialogues are simply imaginary conversations conducted dialectically; and though Plato never introduces himself by name, we see that he is always intellectually present. He is at once a critic and an expositor of a counter-system of his own. Where he dogmatizes and announces a new doctrine Socrates is

---

and Jordan," says he, "had not yet begun to flow Westward. Both the rea and ideal world present to the mind of Plato and Aristotle are purely Hellenic.'

generally the speaker, and anything that falls from his lips is final and irrefragable. He cross-examines as a counsel, and sums up as a judge. No plan, therefore, could be better adapted for elucidating truth and sifting a question to the bottom. No test could possibly be fairer or less objectionable. It added, beyond doubt, great weight to his opinions thus to place Socrates in the front rank; for Socrates was a martyr who had died for the cause. This was an advantage which attached to the exposition of no other philosophy, whether ancient or modern. It is more than we can accord to that of Aristotle, Philo, Descartes or Kant. They made no sacrifices, they had no heroic founder of the faith to show, and can only be estimated by the value of their enunciations. Further, it is a proof that Plato did not take up the cause of philosophy lightly or as a mere literary exercise, but on profound and serious conviction—nay, not without well weighing beforehand the dangerous consequences attending the propagation of truth. This free use of the personality of Socrates, therefore, is, in our judgment, one of the main reasons why his philosophy took so different a rank from that of any of his compeers, and partly explains why his teaching came afterwards to be regarded in the light of a religion, as well as to be a perpetual source of fascination with minds religiously inclined.

We can easily see by the dialectic method employed by Plato, both what was the mode of refutation adopted by Socrates in dealing with the Sophists, who were his chief antagonists, and what sort of men the Sophists were. Modern critics are not quite agreed as to what they taught or professed; but they all agree in admitting that the Sophists were exceedingly troublesome wranglers, and difficult to refute. In our opinion their subtlety lay on the surface, and they were the types of those metaphysicians common to all periods, who, to use Dr. Johnson's phrase, "argue for victory," who are skilled in starting objections but feeble to enunciate truth. The Sophists were obviously not the favourers of any particular philosophy. They were disputants who supported themselves evidently on popular prejudices. Anything, however, advanced by them was superficial, and did not go to the root of knowledge. Further, they dogmatized at random, and hence the employment of the *reductio ad absurdum* process, such as we find it in Plato, was the most effective mode of confounding them. The "lawyers" in the New Testament who stood up as "tempters," belong evidently to the school of the Sophists. The parallelism, indeed, in many points of view is most striking, particularly as regards the mode of refutation. The Eleatics, however, had already made use of the dialogue form, and the system of question and answer which Plato may be said to have perfected. The process, as we have observed, is very much the same as that pursued in debate or in courts of law, and therefore differs widely from the modern mode of metaphysical exposition, which is in the form of a treatise or lecture. Socrates, who appears to have been the especial foe of all dogmatism, took up strong ground in affirming that the natural state of man was ignorance; and in order to elicit truth he sought to prove a negative by means of the cross-examining *elenchus*. His principle was *search*—by which we shall either find the truth or be compelled to admit our ignorance. As he always sought to get his opponent into a dilemma, as it were, by checkmating him, the negative mode of argument preponderates throughout the dialogues. There is also a constant, though informal, process of induction going on from beginning to end, by which a theory is built up. Plato did not condemn the advantages of experimental knowledge, as has been sometimes affirmed; but he held that rational, *intuitive* knowledge is the foundation of philosophy, which is the only true and permanent knowledge—the world of sense around us presenting only passing and unstable conditions, and a duration of feeble import compared with the infinite life of the soul. Human life, in his opinion, is only an accidental, temporary condition, which should occupy us merely so far as to give us the opportunity of perfecting ourselves for a higher state of existence. Nothing, however, can be more practical than the mode of proof and illustration employed. To define the nature and purport of the cardinal virtues, he enjoins Justice, Temperance, Wisdom, Courage, Love; * he appeals to the best experiences of all time, bringing in proofs and instances drawn from the reflections of sages, the actions of men who have made notable sacrifices for the advancement of their species; and likewise he presents the experiences derived from the exercise of the most familiar trades and professions—the carpenter, the smith, the potter, the pilot, the flute-player, the physician, the husbandman. Moreover, he appeals especially to the authority of the poets, and here the extent and variety of his literary resources and the richness of his imagination are particularly manifested.

As an example of his general mode of dialectic we might cite a passage from the "Minos," where the nature of Law is discussed. Socrates asks his companion, "What is Law?" The companion, before he replies, puts the question: "Respecting what sort of law do you inquire?" "What!" returns Socrates, ironically, "Is there, then, any difference between one law and another? Gold does not differ from gold, nor stone from stone; in like manner one law does not differ from another. It is about Law as a whole that I ask you—therefore, what is Law?" To which the companion replies interrogatively: "What should Law be, Socrates, other than the various consecrated customs and beliefs?" On which Socrates asks: "Do you think, then, that discourse is the things spoken; that sight is the things seen; that hearing is the things heard; or are they distinct in the three cases? And is not Law also one thing; the various customs and beliefs another." "Yes," returns the companion; "I now think that they are distinct." Upon which Socrates adds, by way of elucidation, "Law, then, is that whereby these binding customs become binding. What is that?" To which the companion replies: "Law can be nothing else than public resolutions. Law is the decree of the city." "You mean that law is social opinion?" asks Socrates, to which definition the companion gives his assent. "But stay," continues Socrates. "Let us examine; you call some persons wise, then they are wise through wisdom; you call some just, then they are just through justice? The lawfully behaving men are just, the lawless unjust?" The companion replies that it is so. "Then," continues Socrates, summing up, "we must consider Law as something honourable, and seek after it under the assumption that it is a good thing? But stay—you defined Law to be the decree of the city; are not some decrees good, others bad?" To which the companion replies: "Unqestionably so." "Then," rejoins Socrates, "it is incorrect to say that Law is the decree of the city; an evil decree cannot be law." So it will be observed that the subject is always referred to a moral standard, by which it must finally be judged—the cardinal virtues overruling all conditions. It is needless to say that the above method of search would be pronounced in these days altogether circuitous, though it may be a safe and exhaustive one Comparing Plato with Cicero, who also adopts the dialogue form of question and answer, we recognize a great step in advance in the manner of treatment of the latter; and in the mode of illustration by parables, the method is even more succinct and decisive. To prove "Who is my neighbour?" Plato would have extended the series of illustration over at least a dozen pages, and many negative tests would have been introduced to prove formally who was *not* entitled to that appellation. In the examples given in the New Testament, two are negative instances, and their conduct forms a striking contrast to that of the Good Samaritan, who fulfils the requirement. It is quite evident that the benevolence of the latter is brought into strong relief by the introduction of the negative instances, and no mode of proof could be more irrefragable. On the other hand, the Aristotelian method, which is more formal and concise, leads to frequent obscurity, and sometimes to a misapprehension of the meaning of the author. This is rarely the case with Plato, whose abundant instances and exhaustive treatment may be regarded as a species of induction, but, like all induction, is either more or less imperfect, inasmuch as there is always a limit to the examples. What we arrive at, therefore, after a study of one of his themes, is approximative truth—the highest possible attainment short of a revelation.

---

* Xenophon in the "Memorabilia" attributes the use of these abstract terms to Socrates.

The dialogues run over a vast variety of subjects, and have been classified as those of investigation, or search, and those of exposition, though there is generally a conjunction of both. The dialogues are strictly examples of a somewhat informal *synthesis*—analysis is entirely absent. Plato's mind was discursive, and essentially of the versatile order, though directed to philosophical examination. Politics as well as morals came equally within his ken, and he possesses the supreme art of blending them together, a course, however, by no means pursued by practical statesmen. Sir Robert Walpole would certainly not have tolerated a Plato in his Cabinet, if the king's government had to be carried on. But in the "Statesman" our author displays a good practical knowledge of the art of government, and sets out in detail the rules which should guide the conduct of the Chief Magistrate. In the "Protagoras" he deals with the Sophists, in the "Parmenides" with the Eleatics, in the "Theætetus" the question discussed is knowledge, in the "Meno" the nature of virtue, in the "Lysis" friendship, in the "Cratylus" philology and the resources of language, in the "Symposium" the universal sway of love, in the "Timæus," the law of physical change, in the "Phædo" love and philosophy join hands. In the "Symposium" we are told that the highest love is not that of a person, but rather the love of the pure abstract. Love, in his conception, is a great power; it will lead men willingly to death: "did not Alcestis die for love?" Never has there been greater misconception, however, than in the use of the modern term, "Platonic love," which is popularly supposed to imply affection without passion. The love of woman with him is not the theme, but the love of one man for another—not the universal brotherhood of men, but rather the intensity of friendship and devotion to each other among companions; but we think there is here a strong infusion of mysticism, in which excercise Plato seems to have delighted, perhaps with the consciousness that his language would stir the imagination of his readers, and this is truly the case, for each reader attaches a special interpretation to the word, and fashions an ideal of his own. Bacon, for instance, has gone far beyond Plato when he tells us that "the Platonists hold that the spirit of the lover doth pass into the spirit of the person loved, which causeth the desire of the return into the body." Professor Jowett considers the "Symposium" the most perfect in form of all the dialogues, "having the beauty of a statue," and essentially Greek in style and subject. Plato here tells us that love desires not only the beautiful but the good—that is, the eternally good. Love runs through all Nature and all being; poets and artists wander about in search of objects of love. In his view, therefore, it is something more than æsthetic—an ideal instinct which we ought to cultivate. It is also essentially of an eclectic nature, and must not be dulled or dissipated by being too readily extended to all without discrimination or dissent; hence it is in all respects a transcendental emotion of a character in intimate kinship with his general creed.

If we were asked to say what is the royal, distinctive mark in the teaching and system of Plato, we should certainly answer that it is his intense liberality of mind, the credit for virtue and the freedom to act which he accords to all. He does not forget to tell us by way of encouragement, that "Virtue is liberal." His two leading principles are—that no one is willingly evil, and that every one possesses in his own will the power of changing his character for the better. Further, that the soul, which is divine, is his director, and always tends towards the good and true. Thus, as was said of Montesquieu, Plato "restores to humanity its titles." What a high and flattering compliment does Plato pay to man when he tells him that if he only seeks diligently to purify his nature, he may rise almost to a godlike stature! What a contrast to his teaching is that of those who start with assuming that man is morally degraded. How different the premises in each case. In insisting so much on freedom of will, we see that liberty *par excellence* is the distinguishing character of Greek philosophy. Contrary to the spirit of the Semitic creeds, which inculcate fatalism and mental submission, it encouraged effort. With the former, Deity is everything: man powerless and contemptible. In the Greek view the individual is exhorted to exercise his reason, and so to approximate to the attributes of the Deity; in the Semitic system he is to be content to adore what is beyond his power to approach. Hence it is only among a community eminently free that Greek philosophy could possibly have ever had an origin. It was, however, by means of the introspective process that Plato obviously found his theory of ideas. In his view they have existed from all time, and the mystical veil of reminiscence which he has thrown over the conception has doubtless served to render his philosophy more striking, as well as particularly captivating, to minds of the imaginative order. If, after the manner of our modern Positivists, he had made the Ideas mere operations or faculties of the mind, and invested them with nothing immortal or divine, his fame would have been comparatively limited. But Plato virtually conjoins religion with philosophy. "What the Ideas are to the objects around us, God is to the Ideas. He is the Idea of Ideas—the last term of the generalization, the Supreme unity, the principle of principles." * But the doctrince of a reminiscence of a former existence, though it lends a rich mystical colouring to the dogma, is purely hypothetical. If in Neo-Platonism the doctrine rose to ecstasy, and passing the bounds of reason lost its balance, it was because it was not controlled by the practical *dialectic* test employed by Plato, which was substantially that of St. Paul—namely, to "prove all things and hold fast in that which is good." Plato's doctrine is simple and tangible, though it lies amid a heap of profusion, which is in a great measure due to his desire to afford abundant proofs and instances. He tells us that we possess within us certain innate Ideas which have existed from all eternity; that these Ideas are good, and in opposition to worldly error; that we must give them the ascendant by the cultivation of virtue; and that finally, so purified, the soul—which is the substance and essence of the Ideas—rejoins after death its former state of pre-existence and dwells with its essence.† Further, that the great struggle of life really consists in the separation of the soul from the body. In this contest, however, both reason and wisdom must be supreme over all. This, in point of fact, is substituting reason and self-interrogation for superstitions and sacerdotal influences. It is a system of psychology, also, which tends to identify the individual with Deity, and virtually leads up to the doctrine that "the Kingdom of God is within you." It is, however, to be observed that the enforcement of the doctrine of immortality—though perpetually recurring in his works—is only, as it were, a slight vein of comment running through the dialogues. With the exception of the "Phædo," the "Apologia" and the "Meno," it is not by any means the predominant motive of any of the treatises. Their purport and object is to enforce the truth of certain cardinal abstract moral principles by a system of dialectic, and by copious illustrations drawn from actual life and experience.

It is in the "Phædo" especially that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is formally and distinctly stated. Socrates—soon to suffer death—is here the speaker, and Plato shows great skill in making use of the martyr-philosopher to enunciate a theory of future life which in many respects is doubtless due to himself; and his rich imagination has thrown an attractive halo over the revelation. The *pre-existence* of the soul is almost as much insisted on as its future destiny. According to Plato, it is immortal in the sense of having been pre-existent; and we cannot be certain that this present body is the last with which the soul is to be linked. There is always, therefore, a lingering belief in a metempsychosis which bears obvious traces of a Pythagorean origin. In the Christian view of immortality the future state alone is taken into account, and individual responsibility is more strictly inculcated. In Plato's system reminiscence and futurity join hands, and absorb the present, which, like a point in mathematics, becomes infinitesimal by comparison. Thus regarded, his doctrine is simply the perpetuation of an eternal thought by infinite stages of progression.* The operation of reminiscence, therefore, is to suppress the present as accidental; since the ideas we evoke and subsist by belong to the infinite. In substance, therefore, his idealism is the exact converse of that of the Eleatic school, which, as we have seen, enthrones the present and ignores both past and future. Whether Professor Jowett is quite justified in saying that "the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls stands or falls with the doctrine of ideas," we will not affirm; but, if this were admitted, some might perhaps even go further, and think the converse also true—namely, that the doctrine of ideas is dependent on a belief in a pre-existent state. The Brahminical creed has perhaps the most affinity with the Platonic doctrine in its psychological aspect. How then can we explain the existence in both of a common dogma—a dogma still current on the banks of the Ganges? Our general conclusion on this point is that speculative philosophy originated in the East, and probably had a footing in Egypt; that Plato borrowed from Pythagoras, and that Pythagoras found his doctrine of Metempsychosis lingering in the creed of some branch of the Indo-European family, and preserved it for the West. The parallelism which exists between the ethical relations of the East and West is only a counterpart to the well-known affinity of language; and the two facts, taken together, go far to prove the common origin of the Aryan races.

---

* M. de Remusat.

† In one of the homilies of the Church of England, adopted from the teaching of the early Fathers, we find a similar admission of the perpetuation of good which has its origin in the Deity—"All our works begun, continued, and ended in Thee."

This doctrine of a future life is thus formally enunciated:

> A man ought to rejoice [says Socrates] when death comes to sever his soul altogether from his body, because he is throughout all his

---

* In the Christian system it is not until after death that we shall have the stationary present—when, in the conception of Milton, as rendered by Cowper, "one eternal *now* shall be the only measure of our being."

> life struggling to separate himself from the passions, appetites, impulses and aspirations which grow out of the body, and to withdraw himself from the perceptions of the corporeal senses, which teach no truth and only lead to deceit and confusion. Until his mind be purified from all association with the body, it cannot be brought into contact with the pure essence; nor can his aspirations for knowledge be satisfied. Hence his whole life is really a training or approximate practice for death. When associated with the body he feels imprisoned, unable to look for knowledge except through the deceptive *media* of sense. From this durance philosophy partially liberates him, purifying his mind, as in the Orphic or Dionysiac Mysteries, from the contagion of the body, translating it out of the world of sense, uncertainty and mere opinion, into the invisible region of truth and knowledge. But it is the privilege only of him who has spent his life in trying to detach himself from communion with the body to be relieved of the obligation of a fresh embodiment; so that the soul may dwell in a sphere of its own, in presence of the eternal ideas, essences and truth, in companionship with the Gods, and far away from the miseries of humanity.*

How greatly are we tempted here to exclaim, in the words of Sir Walter Raleigh, on summing up his "History of the World": —"Oh, eloquent, just, and all-powerful death!" Can we be surprised if the reading of Plato produced in some over-sensitive minds such a contempt of life as to hurry them into self-sacrifice.

Socrates, it will be observed here, admits both that the doctrine of a future state was taught before his time in the Mysteries, and also acknowledges the Pythagorean belief in a transmigration of souls. This latter doctrine, conjoined with that of reminiscence, is likewise enunciated in the "Meno," where Socrates is again the speaker, and is made to say:

> Priestesses and poets tell us that the mind of man is immortal, and that it has existed throughout all past time in conjunction with successive bodies, alternately abandoning one body, or dying, and taking up new life, or reviving in another. In this perpetual succession of existences it has seen everything, both here and in Hades, and everywhere else, and has learnt everything. But, although thus omniscient, it has forgotten the larger part of its knowledge. Yet, what has been thus forgotten may again be revived. What we call learning, therefore, is such revival. It is the reminiscence of something which the mind has seen in a former state of existence and has forgotten. All research and all learning, therefore, are nothing but reminiscence. In our researches we are not looking for what we do *not* know, but we are looking for what we do know and have forgotten.*

There is certainly something peculiarly transcendent in the idea that our power over the resources of knowledge is infinite, and that by the exercise of virtue and reason we are only regaining a lost possession. Plato thus completes the cycle of eternity—he unites the two worlds, and sends us back to the past to find the infinity of the future.

---

* Grote, ii. 161.

We see everywhere that Plato has ever before him a profound consciousness of the future, and a conviction that his doctrines are destined to become a power in the world. He shows also his tendency to take singularly wide views in historical matters. His estimate of time, for instance, is much larger than we find in any of the writers of antiquity; and he almost startles us when he speaks of an empire of Athens which existed 9,000 years before his own age. In his view the world is not young, but rather time-worn and antiquated, and he measures the date of empires by the standard of an imagination accustomed to contemplate time and existence on a stupendous scale. So, in the "Laws" he tells us, in his grand way, that "infinite time is the origin of States;" by which we are led to infer that progress towards perfection is slow and gradual, and not accomplished by leaps and bounds. He admits, however, a primitive state of man and a deluge, and that there is an onward progress of society to higher civilization, which has been interrupted by repeated accidents and ever-recurring revolutions. Change and reconstruction, indeed, is with him the law of creation. "Let us look where we will around us, we shall everywhere perceive a passing procession; the objects which compose the material world arise, change and perish, and are succeeded by others which undergo the same revolutions."* He is so far optimist as to tell us that in the early ages discord and war did not prevail because men had not then invented the instruments of destruction. In those ages, also, the limited number of men, in his opinion, induced them to approach each other with confidence and the desire of communication. We can see that it is always towards the Greece of the early ages that Plato fondly turns his eyes; we need not, therefore, be surprised if the aspect of social and political life around him did not satisfy his ideal. Accordingly, the two longest of his works—the "Republic" and the "Laws"—are devoted to sketch out in detail a possibly perfect society and government, where order will reign and differences be composed. Plato, indeed, seems in his works perpetually to cry "Peace, peace!" and this yearning for a better state betrays both his dissatisfaction with things around him and his belief in the social corruption and decay of Athens. It must, however, be remembered that he wrote during the most desponding period of Athenian history—the period of reaction and humiliation after ascendancy, when the country was paying the penalty of the political madness of those entrusted with State affairs, which ended in defeat and the effacement of national independence.

---

* "Timæus."

The "Republic," the most renowned of all the works of Plato, may be said to be the picture of a State in which unity and absolute equality reign, and where morality and politics are conjoined. The "Laws," its counterpart, is obviously the product of his more mature years, and in the opinion of some is the recantation of the former. But wherever he moves Plato never fails to supplement his practical suggestions by a revelation of the future life of the soul. There is, therefore, a certain solemnity of purpose infused into the scheme of government which gives it an exceptional character. "The King of the Universe," says he, "has imagined the plan the most useful and the best, so that the good may have the ascendant over the bad in the economy of the world. It is in that view that he has made the entire system, and determined the place that each thing must occupy. But he has left to the dispositions of our own free will the good or evil qualities of each of us, and hence each man is ordinarily such as it pleases him to become according to the inclinations to which he abandons himself and the character which he gives to his soul.* This insistance on free will (ἀυτοκράτης) is worthy of note, as marking the essentially liberal character of his philosophy, which, in in fact, has moulded the opinion of the civilized world, and even helped to fashion some forms of religion. His doctrine is: "You have the divine faculty of virtue within you; you have also within you the free will to exercise it; go, therefore, and exercise it." But it may be objected that, if reason and conscience should pronounce Plato's view to be correct, he shows no means of enforcing it, no authority or command from a higher power. His lever is persuasion, and by the examples he gives we see that there is every natural inducement to exercise it. As regards political concerns, in the "Republic" he is an obvious favourer of government by the *élite*—the submission of the many to the few, the superposition of intelligence over ignorance. He does not, like Horace, angrily despise the vulgar crowd, but he has faith only in certain leaders. Among his favourite figures of speech are those of "The Shepherd King," "The King Herdsman," "The Divine Shepherd;" by which we recognize the strong conservative bias of the writer, and a latent inclination for the calmness of patriarchal life. The "Republic" in truth is only an attempt to find a peaceful solution of that eternal antagonism between man and man, which in some form has found a place in every society since the beginning of the world. Nor is it to be overlooked that in this scheme Plato either more or less suppresses the *individuality* of man—a feature in strong contrast to the whole tendency of Greek sentiment. But this is a philosophic bias, for Schelling, who follows Plato, makes individual will a disturbing force which, as the origin of evil, should be suppressed in favour of the Universal Will. Hence it is harmony and concord that he has mainly in view in his ideal State, rather than national ascendancy or progress. If progress, it must be a moral one, with the grand end always in view. In this respect his system differs *toto cœlo* from the aims and aspirations of modern Socialism.

---

* "Laws."

Though many of the views in the "Republic" have been justly condemned as visionary and chimerical—and some even as dangerous—in our judgment, that Utopia, which has inspired so many subsequent efforts on the part of others, has its value as a tentative moral exercise—the pursuit of virtue never being lost sight of. We know, moreover, that we are always moving in a philosophic atmosphere, and that the suggestions are not arbitrarily enforced. Further, here as elsewhere, Plato always conjoins power and authority with wisdom. "Peace and harmony," he urges, "can only reign in States when philosophers shall be kings, and the kings and princes of this world shall understand the spirit and power of philosophy, and the two conditions shall meet in one." Assuredly the Socialism which has been charged against the "Republic" is not the Socialism of modern equality. All things, it is true, are to be in common—wives as well as goods—but there is to be no levelling of rank and intellect. This idea of a community of women—regarding which we find no previous hint in any Greek writer, and which was repugnant to the sentiment and prejudices of the race—is certainly very remarkable, and seems to have been suggested to Plato's mind through the desire of suppressing the selfish instincts of family, which probably had begun to show themselves in Athens. This, it must also be admitted, is the motive avowed by the modern Socialists. In both cases it is not the relaxation of marriage ties, but rather the suppression of the right of special appropriation. This is a vast leap forward from the sentiment of the Heroic period, when the highest reward of valour was the jealous and exclusive possession of a beautiful captive. The "Republic" would almost seem to be especially addressed to those who have an inclination to renounce the world, rather than to face its difficulties, and we know that in after times its tenets had considerable influence on monasticism. It appears also to have been a favourite exercise with many Greek writers of that period to try their hands on a Utopia. It is the resource of those advanced thinkers in all ages who are denied the opportunity of shaping the destinies of their country, or who keep in the background out of the strife of parties, because they despair of being able to do any good. But it is the weakness of Utopiasts of every class to place themselves outside the pale of their own system, in order that they may regard their work with serenity. They are the shepherds, the people are the flock. Just as Xenophon sketched an ideal Persian State, corrected by Spartan discipline—which was a condition virtually at the opposite pole of Eastern laxity—so Plato, as the "King Herdsman," brings the corrective of Spartan and Cretan to bear in framing his scheme of a perfect government. The *Politeia* of Aristotle, though constructed on more practical constitutional lines, is still a Utopia. And we even question whether the history of Herodotus, so valuable from its store of facts, is not either more or less chargeable with being written under Utopian inspiration. This search after a political ideal was a confession that social and political corruption had set in in their own country, and that a root and branch reform was required. The conviction, however, of a falling nationality, which in after time acquired increased ascendancy over the Greek mind, gave an undoubted impetus to the progress of philosophy. Men began to lose faith in patriotism. The only good was virtue—that abstract, ideal good which could be sought out in any clime, and practised under any condition. From this to faith in a religion was an easy step; but it was necessary first that many systems should have a trial, and that a general scepticism should take hold of the public mind. But with the advent of religious faith Plato's doctrines again took the ascendant, mainly, no doubt, from the intensely spiritual infusion which pervades them, and the renunciation of temporal attractions which is a cardinal principle of his creed.

As regards the place of women in society, Plato's views, as expressed in the "Republic," are marked by the same indulgent liberalism as is visible in other departments. He complains that the conditions of the female state have been until then almost overlooked by the legislators; and, while he admits that woman's nature is inferior to man's as regards "the capacity for virtue," he would give them a larger sphere in social concerns and active employment. This expression shows the characteristic gentleness of Plato's animadversion. Shakespeare, as we know, makes frailty the very synonyme for women; and Milton speaks of them as "that fair defect of Nature." Plato is here decidedly opposed to seclusion and restraint,* but he does not dream of extending to them "rights" in the modern sense of the term, nor does he seem to consider that they are too much subordinated. He would rather utilize their services, which, by the severe sedentary arrangements then prevailing in Athens, were in a great measure lost to the State. He strongly recommends gymnastics—not to convert them into amazons, but, it would appear, rather to develop health and personal attractions. It is not, therefore, in their mental development that he has hope, but in their better physical training and utilization generally. This confession, coming from one who has laid such stress on the advantage of the employment of the reasoning faculties, is perhaps even now not unworthy of being remembered. In the "Republic" also Plato shows himself to be a decided Malthusian, and something more, for he considers it necessary to the constitution of a perfect State that the number of children should be limited. Had not the pressure of a superabundant population began to show itself at Athens in his day, we think he would hardly have ventured to advocate so cruel an expedient. What he recommends, however, under this head, we must remember had long been recognized as a commendable feature of legislation in Sparta. It is almost needless to observe that certain recommendations in the "Republic" for the amelioration of society—though they did not shock antiquity—have been condemned in modern times by an almost unanimous voice as inconsistent with sound morality. Even here, however, we have no doubt of his sincerity, and possibly also of his conviction that he had the opinion of the enlightened on his side. Notwithstanding its errors and social heterodoxy, the "Republic" will always be rescued from oblivion by the earnestness of the style and the faith which animates the writer. Other schemes for the perfecting of mankind have been doomed to perish as much from their feeble enunciation as their absurdity. The creation of Plato will never be regarded as old-fashioned, and can only die with the language.

---

* He calls it "a life of darkness and fear"—*δεδοικὸς καὶ σκοτεινὸν ζῆν.*

As he got older Plato obviously felt "an ebb in his philosophy," and became less hopeful regarding human perfectibility —certainly more inclined to admit the great and mysterious fact of the power of evil in the world. His later experience leads him especially to condemn ignorance, which he defines thus:

> What then shall we call the greatest ignorance? It is, when, judging a thing to be good or beautiful, instead of loving it, we dislike it, and love and embrace that which we know to be both bad and unjust. It is the opposition which arises between the sentiments of love or aversion, and the judgment of our reason, which I call ignorance. It reigns in the State when the people rise against the

magistrate and the laws; it reigns in the individual when the good principles of his soul have no longer credit with him, and he acts in direct opposition to what they suggest.*

This dictum, which admits the propensity to relapse, still upholds the truth of the cardinal Platonic doctrine that man has the virtuous principle within him, and impliedly likewise, the guidance of the conscience. Ignorance is, therefore, the thing to be avoided. It is the counterpart of right reason (*ὀρθὸς λόγος*), which stands at the opposite pole. It is not difficult to recognize the source of the stress laid by all the succeeding philosophic schools on right reason, for nothing can possibly transcend it. Nowhere, however, in his works do we find any attempt at an explanation of the accident which has placed man under the necessity of making an effort for liberation. He never alludes to a judgment for former sins, the transmission of an hereditary taint, or the envy of the Gods, as is usual with the tragedians and poets; nor does he concern himself with inquiring into the cause of this perpetual strife between good and evil; but his teaching is always consolatory and hopeful, and his tone invariably rises to a solemnity which marks conviction when he refers to a future life. Thus, he tells us that, "of all things which a man has next to the Gods, his soul is the most divine and most truly his own;" and again that "a man should honour his own soul." This is only one of the numerous instances in which we are startlingly reminded of the phraseology of the New Testament, where the pregnant question is put: "What shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" We may here remark that Plato, in alluding to Deity, makes use of both the singular and plural—*θεὸς* and *θεοὶ*—a difference in the conception of Deity of great import. There is, however, obviously no pure monotheistic conception in his mind. Nor does he appear to hold the Deity in any particular awe or even veneration—least of all, is there any idea of terror associated with the supreme power; and in this respect he is quite as Epicurean as Lucretius himself. The existence of the Gods, as agents of good and evil, is not specially ignored, still less treated with sceptical ridicule or contempt. Like mortals they are subject to the sway of fate; but he does not identify fate with Deity. In these notions he obviously does not divest himself of a certain leaning towards the popular belief, though he condemns occasionally the absurdity of many of the prevailing superstitions. Thus, he objected to the Orphic Mysteries on principle, because they promised salvation in return for the mere performance of rites. In point of fact, Plato is an enlightened sceptic, but is far too guarded and far too wise, with the fate of Socrates before him, to turn iconoclast. It is impossible to say how far the leading spirits of Athens in his day believed in the national creed. Demosthenes, we know, in his most famous oration, commences by making an appeal to "all the Gods and Goddesses,"* with apparent sincerity and conviction. In the following prayer, addressed to Pan, which is put in the mouth of Socrates at the close of the "Phædo," we trace a spice of quaint irony, and might almost incline to doubt the sincerity of the speaker:—"Beloved Pan, and all ye other Gods which haunt this place, give me the beauty of the inward soul, and may the outward and inward man be at one. May I reckon the wise to be wealthy, and may I have such a quantity of gold as none but the temperate can carry and bear." But prayers to the Gods, we must remember, as given in the "Iliad" and "Odyssey," were rather impatient remonstrances than contrite, submissive appeals. The Greek temper claimed an enormous licence of address on all occasions, and the independence which was the mark of freedom. The modern conception of prayer was a thing then undreamt of. The popular religion, however, dealing with virtue and justice and human responsibility, was obviously the inspirer of philosophy. Religion, though disfigured, was a prior influence, and dealt with similar moral themes, personal reformation being one of them;† but, having a false foundation in a fanciful superstition, was ultimately displaced by philosophy, which made reason the test of truth. The change, in substance, was to put it in the power of every thinking man to examine what the priest had taught or the poet divined. This also was the very process enjoined by early Christianity, which supplanted the priest by making the individual a priest unto himself. With Plato the Gods are merely representative ideas, and have no human emotions, while in the popular mythology they are concrete personalities, with the sympathies and antipathies of men. Philosophy tended to show that the popular religious conception was a mere guess at truth, and had no other foundation than in time-honoured tradition and the fancies of the poets. Herodotus, indeed, goes even so far as to affirm that Homer and Hesiod created the mythology of Greece. Further, it was an easy step to suppose that qualities which men had attributed to the Gods might really, after all, be only a part of man's own nature—an emanation of his thought, and hence the high platform was ultimately reached which extended the blessing of immortality even to the meanest. It is quite an error, however, to suppose that the doctrine of the soul's immortality was, at any time, a prevailing belief with the Greeks. It was rather in the nature of a heresy, not only offensive to popular prejudices, but an idea repugnant to most of the enlightened. Plato, therefore, in maintaining such a doctrine, had almost the entire public conviction of his age against him. Aristotle denied the immortality of the soul —perpetuation being, in his opinion, only in the offspring. With him happiness consists in ἐνέργεια—the exercise of our powers. A man, therefore, cannot be happy after death, which destroys our potentialities.* This is also substantially the creed of the tragic writers, where death, as the painful suspension of all activity, is regarded with intense sadness. Further, it will be observed that in the popular belief the εἴδωλον finds its future habitation in the infernal regions, while Plato assigns to the spirit a place in "the heaven above the heavens"—a region which is not definable by any earthly parallel.

---

* "Laws."

---

* *πᾶσι καὶ πᾶσαις* ("De Corona").

† Æschines, at one period of his life, as Demosthenes tells us, had, with his lustral bowl and faun-skin, led about processions of young persons, who exclaimed, "I have renounced the bad, and prefer the good."—*De Corona.*

The two great moral forces ever present in Plato are the love of truth and the zeal for human improvement. "In him all antecedent and contemporary Greek speculation is summed up and takes a fresh start." † He girds himself up for a great effort, and the cast of the discus is enormous; the mark can only be sought for in the far future. Greek philosophy certainly reached in his age its most transcendent point, and afterwards began to decline, though it may have taken more practical forms. But if it lost something in quality in its descent, its reign and influence became wider, and with every enlargement of its area the dogmas of the old faith receded into the background in favour of a purer morality. But as the superstitious tendencies are not likely ever to be effaced, men of the Platonic order of mind will always be wanted in the world. It is such men who proclaim the natural brotherhood of man, who undertake to combat the evil of selfishness and egotism, and continue to have hope in their species, when others despair. Plato, with all his seriousness, has also the charm of a perpetual cheerfulness. He is likewise the least obtrusive and the most liberal of teachers, taking the reader affectionately into his confidence, and putting him on a perfect equality with himself. There is, therefore, nothing *esoteric* in his doctrine—nothing written only for the initiated. He speaks *orbi et urbi*. Nearly all other philosophers are either more or less dogmatic; and many have even derived great force from the emphasis and absolutism with which they have enunciated their doctrines. Bossuet and Dr. Johnson are notable examples of the triumphant expositor whose strong conviction will tolerate no contradiction. It is remarkable that, however exquisite his taste, there are no traces of a fastidious temperament. Plato stands modestly in the background and suppresses his personality. Every page bears the mark of perfect urbanity and good breeding, and, once admitted into the circle of disputants, you feel that you are consorting with gentlemen—in fact, with the best society of Athens. But Plato, though unobtrusive, never forgets the resources of art, and writes obviously with an eye to persuade a living audience, as well as with an eye to posterity. Thus, the skill with which at the outset he lays the scene and describes the persons and peculiarities of the speakers—not in detail, but by a single touch—gives of itself an air of life and reality to the picture, and relieves the dryness incident to the treatment of an abstruse, didactic subject. It may, indeed, be a question whether, in treating of questions essentially serious, he does not frequently err in seeking too much to amuse and entertain. But to gain the ear of an Athenian audience, however exalted the individual, such sacrifices were necessary. It was incumbent on all aspirants to success to make things pleasant; and it is beyond doubt that his popularity in after ages is greatly due to his tact in telling a story or in bringing in an illustration. Plato thus only shows himself to be a consummate artist in a land where artistic effects were not only prized but exacted. Yet digressions, it is true, are exceedingly numerous, and sometimes, it must be confessed, interruptive of the purpose in hand, and we long for an analysis or an abstract; but, like all great authors, he gives full measure, and no more stints us in his abundance of proofs and instances than Homer stints us regarding his knowledge of anatomy or the technicalities of art, or than Shakespeare suppresses his endless experiences as a naturalist. The tone of his mind is invariably that of a man of erudition and culture, but, though his knowledge is varied and extensive, it is not of the encyclopædic order like that of Aristotle. As regards style, perhaps our Addison most resembles him of any of the moderns; indeed, the mental resemblance of the two men may be pronounced as striking; in both we have good breeding, good taste, calmness, impartiality, and we may also add quiet humour. How greatly does the following description of a mock patriot resemble the manner of the English writer? "Democracy may be defined as a pleasant and lawless institution, giving equal rights to unequal persons, and it is pervaded by a marvellous freedom of speech and action, and a strange diversity of character. Each man does what he likes in his own eyes, with a magnanimous disregard of the law; he obeys or disobeys at his own pleasure, and, if he be sentenced as a criminal to death or exile, you will probably meet him the next day come to life again, and parading the streets like a hero."* The style and language of Plato have at all times been greatly extolled. In our opinion his diction rather wants pith and condensation. It is not muscular like that of Demosthenes, nor does it possess the critical conciseness of Aristotle; but, on the other hand, it is never enigmatical; it is ornate and fluent, rather than florid or rhetorical. Compared with other writers Plato is not much given to the use of metaphor—Demosthemes, and the orators generally, infinitely more so. For a writer of such fame, and occupying so distinctive a place, it is remarkable that we are able to extract so very few striking passages or sentiments of weight out of his works; if we judged him by mere extracts, happy antitheses, or even forcible turns of language, we should form a very inadequate idea of his genius. His works to be appreciated must be studied as a whole, fully analysed, and, in a measure, undergo a process of codification. Even Professor Jowett admits that Plato's method is desultory, that he is incapable of sustained composition, and that his genius is essentially dramatic and conversational; but, even admitting this, and allowing that his purely synthetic method is not sufficiently convenient and compact, we cannot help thinking that there is a trace of art in this apparent concealment of a purpose—and Plato's purpose, it must be remembered, is the most stupendous we can imagine, and that he undertakes to accomplish it by the most simple means. The fact of his having dispensed with system may possibly have been one of the sources of his strength, and we are well aware that there are many great authors who have had no philosophical object in view, and yet from whose works a perfect system of philosophy might be culled.

---

* "Ethics," I. x. 2.

† Sir A. Grant, "Aristotle's Ethics."

We have said that there is no evidence of what we might call a Titanic power in any of the dialogues of Plato, and in this distinctive aspect none of them can bear comparison as an intellectual feat with the "De Augmentis" of Lord Bacon, which of all philosophic treatises, ancient or modern, is perhaps the one which evinces the greatest power and grasp of mind, being at once singularly dignified and impressive as regards style, almost oracular in the solemnity of its enunciation, rich and ornate in illustration, startling in its revelation of new truths, and prophetic of mighty changes to come. No one can rise from a reading of the "De Augmentis" without feeling, from first to last, that he has been under the power of the sorcerer. Plato has never reached so high and sustained a pitch; but, as he always regards both past and future in the same glance, his perspective range is wider. This world for him is all too narrow; and utility, which is everything with Bacon, is in his conception at most only the means to an end, the desired goal being immortality, and the close of life the portal of happiness. What the one regards as "the greatest birth of time" the other would have estimated merely as an unstable and fleeting condition. With Plato the parallax of the mind is unchangeable, whatever be the revolution of ages; with Bacon even truth is subservient to time. It is almost needless to observe that in our age not only is the school of Bacon —the scientific, experimental, and utilitarian school—in the ascendant with all advanced thinkers, but Idealism in any form is regarded as having no stable foundation—nay, as a positive hindrance to the discovery of scientific truths. Men in these days look for facts which lead to substantial results, or search for higher laws from which useful inferences may be drawn; and the most beautiful hypothesis is considered worthless which can exhibit no material triumphs. The *à priori* test, in short, no longer subsists by assumption, and is only tolerated in scientific walks when it appears as the handmaid of investigations conducted *à posteriori*.

---

* "The Republic."

Sometimes the moral teaching of Plato takes a latitudinarian tinge, and he betrays a love of paradox when he prides himself in drawing over-nice distinctions; as where he undertakes to show the difference between the noxious and the harmless lie. The lie, in his opinion, in certain cases is "useful and not hateful," as in dealing with enemies, or as "preventive of the madness of your friends," or in ancient traditions, "where we make falsehood as much like truth as may be." We fancy there is a dash of irony in all this. M. Thiers, in his "History of the Consulate and the Empire," rather startled us by commending the falsehood of Napoleon in giving out, near the close of the battle of Waterloo, that it was Grouchy, not the Prussians, who had arrived. This "mensonge utile," we fear, would hardly have been accepted by the philosopher as so far *λυσιτελὸν* as to be worthy of being included in his category of admissible misstatements. With some rare exceptions, the moral counsel of Plato is everywhere above objection, and the careful and conscientious manner in which he treats a subject in order to elicit truth is a proof of this. Thus, he invariably makes a point of approaching the subject on all possible sides, or, as expressed literally, "looks both before and behind" (*ἅμα πρόσσω καὶ ὀπίσσω*).

As regards the mysticism so frequently attributed to Plato—that nebulosity in the ideas, even where the language is clear—we think it to be the result of his essentially poetic nature; as the same instinct often shows itself among poets of the highest order, a good many of whom have Platonised without knowing it. Petrarch's *canzone* bear obvious traces of this tendency, and Shakespeare's sonnets are strongly tinged with the same influence, which in both cases was, no doubt, derived from secondary sources. So likewise Plato's cosmic creed—which is mystical—is to be found summed up in a passage in "The Merchant of Venice," where Lorenzo draws Jessica's attention to the beauty of the starry heavens:

> There is not in the smallest orb that thou beholdest
> But in his motion like an angel sings;
> Such harmony is in immortal souls—
> But while this muddy vesture of decay
> Doth grossly close it in, we cannot hear it.

Thus, in Plato's contemplation all Nature is vivified with a quickening spirit; even the planetary bodies are animated, and, in harmony with man, the world itself has a soul. It is this mystical blending of the physical with the spiritual which so eminently distinguishes him from his contemporaries. Yet, of all the ancient exponents of philosophy, he is the least swayed by a contemplation of the material aspects of Nature, which he invariably subordinates to the divine idea, which has its seat in the soul.

Next to Plato, the Stoics have undoubtedly exercised the greatest influence over the morals and convictions of mankind. Long before the advent of Christianity a species of eclecticism was at work, culling out the best thoughts of the various philosophical schools, and seeking to combine them into a system. This we especially observe in Cicero, who is essentially an eclectic. But eclecticism cannot take effect until many tentatives have been in operation and many failures have been acknowledged. We cannot "hold fast in that which is good" without having previously "proved all things." However, as Sir A. Grant well observes,* Plato is to be regarded "rather as a dynamical force than as the setter-forth of a system." It is for this reason that his thoughts have become so thoroughly incorporated with the thought of civilized Europe. Had he been more dogmatic, his range would have been less infinite. That which doubtless has lent him his greatest force, and imparted the impetus to the latest ages, is that he calls in perpetually the aid of psychology to emphasize his propositions, and crowns them all with a reference to immortality and a future existence. In some religious systems the inculcation of immortality has led to an exaggerated contempt for the things of this life, to the petrifying of all effort, and the subjection of the faculties to mere contemplation. This is never the case with Plato. Activity is the very essence of his creed, improvement the process, happiness the end. But he does not, like the Epicureans, make happiness the main inducement. He appeals rather to duty, to the nobler instincts of humanity, to all that has been consecrated by good example, to the admitted beneficial experiences of time, and, above all, to an infinite future of progression. To find his abstract cardinal virtues—temperance, wisdom, courage, justice, love—he searches in early tradition, in the records of poetry, in oracular injunctions, in venerated ordinances, in gnomic wisdom, in the practical experiences of life and business; and so builds up his system. No induction, therefore, can be more enlightened or exhaustive, and it has the further merit of being essentially Greek. But it is undeniable that, if philosophy subsequently took a wider range in its mundane acceptation, with every revolution it became more positive in its aspect. The Stoics were the first to preach a large humanity and to proclaim the universal brotherhood of men; and with the practical Romans this had an important influence in making them feel they had a mission to unite all races under their sway. If these are shortcomings in Plato—and to modern discernment this is apparent—they do not arise from any deficiency of moral purpose, but rather from the weakness of his system as a system—a condition to which all philosophies are liable. We must regard the bent and influence of his teaching as a whole, and its indirect effects rather than its special expositions. It is clear that great good may result from the propagation of a doctrine, the exact terms of which are merely conjectural, and have no absolute, authoritative support. It is also obvious that in his judgment there were many things in heaven and earth far beyond the ken of any philosophy; and if it be true, as Professor Jowett affirms, that "some of his greatest thoughts have slept in the ear of mankind ever since they were uttered," there is still a wide scope for the speculations of future Platonists.

---

* "Aristotle's Ethics."

But it may be asked: Why did Plato become so great a name—why does his figure stand out in such bold relief? The answer is: From the variety and copiousness of his works, and particularly from their harmonious connection; from the subjects of eternal interest which he broaches, but does not finally solve—because the solution belongs to the infinite; from his confident and favouring optimism as regards human progress; and most of all from his elegant and fluent style, which is free from all effort or mannerism. Further, he inspires a comfortable hope by proclaiming the possible reign of moral virtue on earth. He has confidence in his species and in himself, and succeeds in infusing into others a portion of his own sympathy—perhaps some of his own inspiration. Plato's aim in uniting the two worlds is so stupendous, that he may be truly said to be the man who had "the largest soul" of all antiquity. Further, he puts reason on a par with revelation: All men possess "the liberty of prophesying," and his perpetual injunction is: "Go thou and Platonize as I have done." Hence the special characteristic of Plato is his flexibility in contrast to the hard and fast lines of the moderns. His system is at once untrammelled and inclusive, and for that reason will always make converts of every shade of thought. Different from Aristotle, who reasoned away the immortality of the soul,* he looks upward for light, and regards the universal rather than the minutiæ of things. With Aristotle the process of learning by experience is that of the infant, who builds up knowledge by a slow and painful effort. With Plato knowledge is a thing already natural and perfect, and in the form of the eternal ideas comes forth into life by a creative touch, full-armed and all-wise, like Minerva from the head of Jove. If the error of Aristotle is the excess of formalism, we may say that that of Plato is the want of consecutive method. In a word, the bias of Plato is essentially metaphysical, as that of Aristotle is logical. The forte of the latter, best seen in the "Ethics" and "Rhetoric," lies in his subtle analysis of the mind in all its abstract relations. He is also superior to Plato as a pure critic, even of metaphysics; for he is in all things a critic rather than a creator. As regards the preference of the world, there has been a perpetual oscillation of opinion in the most ignorant, as well as in the most enlightened ages. If Plato is the greater name, Aristotle has been the cause of a wider and more varied activity in all departments of thought. They travel in different spheres, and in parallel lines which can never meet, while their respective followers stand irreconcileably aloof from each other. Aristotle, in subordinating the *à priori* faculty to hard experience, without reasoning upwards, produced a moral slavery of the soul which, if allowed to have had sway, would have suppressed all religious development; while Plato is the herald of religion—the intellectual voice proclaiming a great advent. A beautiful calmness, moreover, pervades his writings—something greatly in contrast to the fever of our age, which is in such haste to grasp the material infinite, forgetting that there may be much beyond this life—forgetting, most of all, that almost divine injunction on which he lays the greatest stress —moderation in all things. In his vast system there is no need of haste, for there are many stages of progress and an infinity of worlds to pass through after death before we reach the goal. With him it is possible within the compass of a single life—and there lies the marvel—to grasp infinity in our contemplation, but by no means possible to make all material things our own, which is the madness of our generation. We have no need, however, to become cenobites in order to be philosophers; but with such a companion in hand we think it is in our power to forget the world for a time with advantage. Moreover, certain signs of the times are ominous. Professor Huxley, on lately retiring from the chair of the Royal Society, complained feelingly of the devouring passion of the day to heap fact on fact, and the exhaustive consequences which attend it. The wealth of inquiry which aims only at enlargement, and has no supreme moral end in view, is assuredly an incumbrance. The lesson contained in the confession of the Professor should not be lost sight of. When scientists of the Aristotelian order of mind thus cry out, we may well hope for a short pause of contemplation.

---

* Aristotle considered that the soul is only related to the body as sight is to the eye. ("De Anim." ii. 1–12.)

ART. VIII.—THE RENT QUESTION IN IRELAND.

THE Irish, like the poor, are always with us. For many a long year the air has been rent with the constantly reiterated cry of Ireland, Ireland, Ireland! and in all human probability the day is yet far distant when the affairs of Ireland will cease to absorb a very large proportion of the time and energies of our statesmen and public men. True it is, no doubt, that at different periods different phases of the Irish question emerge and come into view, but it is only at extremely rare intervals that the nation is permitted to devote its attention to any other subject, and even when these times of refreshing come at last their duration is unfortunately provokingly brief.

It is now many years ago since Mr. Bright expressed a desire that we might have "an Irish session of the Imperial Parliament." On more than one occasion his wish has been quite recently fulfilled, yet it may well be doubted whether its fulfilment has been attended by all the blessed consequences to which he fondly imagined it would give rise. During the year which has just drawn to a close, Ireland has, beyond all doubt or question, been the one absorbing topic of the time. In the earlier portion of the year it was the question of Home Rule for Ireland, in the later portion it was the question of Irish Land, that engrossed the attention of the nation to the exclusion of almost every other topic, yet no man of sense would think for a moment of asserting that the last word has been spoken on either of these most pressing and capitally important matters. Indeed, the remarkable thing is that, although so much has been said and written about Ireland, we have yet so much to learn with regard to the condition of the country and the wants and wishes and grievances of her people. The anti-Irish prejudice is still very strong amongst us, and it leads us to take most unfair and distorted views of even the most recent events in our history. Of these events we may ourselves have been eye-witnesses, or, if we have not been fortunate enough to be eye-witnesses of them, it is at all events open to us to acquire trustworthy information with regard to them from authentic public documents that may be said, without exaggeration, to be known and read of all men. But we deliberately close our eyes to the light, or, to speak more accurately, our minds are so inflamed with passion and so warped by prejudice, that, instead of sifting evidence and providing ourselves with something worthy of the name of history, we readily and unsuspectingly accept as the sober and literal truth the merest caricature of what has actually taken place. "I have constantly observed," writes Burke, in his "Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents," "that the generality of people are fifty years, at least, behindhand in their politics. There are but very few who are capable of comparing and digesting what passes before their eyes at different times and occasions, so as to form the whole into a distinct system. But in books everything is settled for them, without the exertion of any considerable diligence or sagacity. For which reason men are wise with but little reflection, and good with little self-denial, in the business of all times except their own." Nor is prejudice against Ireland and all things Irish the only thing with which the advocates of justice to the Sister Island are obliged to be constantly contending. A very large section of the British public is consumed with a fanatical hatred of Mr. Gladstone, and when hatred of Ireland and hatred of the leader of the Liberal party find a lodgment in the same breast the result is such as one may easily imagine. Mr. Gladstone, as all the world knows, is the bugbear of the Tory party. Needless to say he has been the author of untold mischief and disaster throughout the long course of his political career, and it is, therefore, only in accordance with the eternal fitness of things that he should still be doing evil, and that continually, in the sight of the numerous crowd of gentlemen who have constituted themselves his critics and detractors. The great offence of which he has most recently been guilty is, it appears, that he has become the preacher of an anti-rent crusade.

"The new rent war," we are solemnly assured, "was practically opened by Mr. Gladstone on the first night of the recent session —August 19." Such is the charge. Let us consider for a moment the very slender foundation on which it rests. In taking a survey of the political situation, Mr. Gladstone was, of course, bound to make some reference to the position of the land question in Ireland, and this he did in the following terms:— "We know," said the right honourable gentleman, "the opinion that prevails in Ireland—that of, at all events, the larger portion of the community—in consequence of the changes in agricultural values, that there is a difficulty of maintaining the judicial rents. I am not qualified," he continued, "to give an opinion on that subject myself, and I give no opinion." This, then, is the head and front of Mr. Gladstone's offending—that he had the audacity to refer to a state of public opinion notoriously existing in Ireland with respect to the inability of the tenants to pay the full judicial rents, whilst he at the same time carefully guarded himself from expressing concurrence in the Irish view. Upon this slender foundation a tremendous superstructure has been raised, and we are actually invited to see in these apparently quite innocent words clear and irrefragable proof that a second Kilmainham Treaty has been contracted. "The author of the Separation Scheme," as it is now the fashion to describe the leader of the Liberal party, has, it seems, added this to the many other offences of which he has been guilty—that he was the first to suggest to Mr. Parnell "the idea of founding a demand of 50 per cent. reduction in rent upon a fall in agricultural values, which cannot yet be said to have been proved." Consider for a moment what is the meaning of this most ridiculous and astounding allegation. On August 19, forsooth, Mr. Parnell learns for the first time from the lips of the late Prime Minister that there has been a considerable fall in the price of agricultural produce! Is it possible that those who make such statements are really so ill-informed as they would have us believe them to be? Do they really imagine that the fall in agricultural values is not yet proved, and that the mere idea of such a thing was first suggested to Mr. Parnell at the commencement of t[illegible]ecent session of Parliament by the statesman whom, with equal propriety and impartiality, they describe as "the author of the Separation Scheme?"

Let us look a little more closely at this matter. A few short months ago these same gentlemen were never tired of denouncing what they described as "Mr. Chamberlain's intrigues with Captain O'Shea, and his activity in getting up the Kilmainham Treaty." Now, however, all that is changed, and the right honourable gentleman the member for West Birmingham is accordingly complimented on his brilliant debating powers, and finds himself classed with very strange company amongst the men in whom the nation has confidence. What, then, did Mr. Chamberlain say on the subject of the changes in agricultural values in the spring of the present year? Speaking in the debate on the Land Purchase Bill, on April 16, he said: "We are in the midst of a great and remarkable change in the value of agricultural produce. I am told that this value has fallen in Ireland since the Land Act from 20 to 40 per cent." Has any one ever taken the right honourable gentleman the member for West Birmingham to task for giving utterance to these words? Has any one in his senses or out of them ever asserted that the new rent war was practically opened by Mr. Chamberlain on April 16? No; not even the most bitter and unscrupulous opponent of the author of the doctrine of ransom.

But Mr. Parnell's mind, it is suggested, was a perfect blank upon this subject till the beginning of the recent session. What are the actual facts? To go no further back than January last we find Mr. Parnell at that time laying great stress on the fall in the prices of agricultural produce. Speaking on the 21st of that month, he said:—

> The tenants found it impossible to pay the rents fixed under the Land Act, owing to a fall of not less than 50 per cent. in the prices of their produce. That was no discredit to the land legislation of the right honourable gentleman the member for Midlothian—it was the result simply of an economic crisis. In his own county, which had always been remarkably free from crime, Lord Fitzwilliam had given his tenants an abatement of 50 per cent. on the half year voluntarily—tenants who had obtained a reduction under the Land Act, leaseholders and all. He himself was one of the tenants who had received that abatement.

Once more. The *Times* newspaper is, we suppose, still regarded by many persons as an organ of great weight and authority, though it has unfortunately of late years ceased to hold the balance fairly and impartially, and has, in too many cases, given up to party what was meant for mankind. What, then, had the *Times* to say on March 20? On that day it published a striking letter from the eminent agriculturist, Sir James Caird, who came forth to do battle against the projected Purchase Scheme of the late Government. The cue of the *Times* last spring, it will be remembered, was to show the worthlessness of Irish land as an investment for the British taxpayer, and accordingly it fell at once into the trap so unwittingly prepared for it by Sir James Caird. All his extravagant and exaggerated statements were at once accepted as gospel, and the great leader of public opinion straightway proceeded to comment upon them in its most magnificent *ex cathedrâ* style. "From facts unhappily too patent to all the world," said the *Times* in its leading-article,

> we may judge what has been the fall in Irish agricultural values, and can easily conceive that on soil to a great extent 'poor, worn-out, and badly farmed,' not only has rent disappeared, but cultivation threatens to become impossible. It is not too much to say that the rental of 528,000 holdings in Ireland is practically irrecoverable by anybody, whether landlord, English Government or Irish Government. Holdings of an average value of £6 offer no margin to meet such a fall in values as has already occurred, and as is very likely to be yet more seriously felt. . . . . We have reason to believe that the full effect even of the existing shrinkage of values has not yet been experienced, and we have no certainty whatever that values will not fall lower still. In that case all the weaker men among the comparatively strong will go down, and their rental will have to be written off as a bad debt. Thus one-third of the total rental of Ireland is worthless *ab initio,* and the other two-thirds are obviously liable, apart from all political difficulties, to indefinite depreciation.

Such was the deliberate opinion of the *Times*, based, it assured us, on "facts patent to all the world," on March 20 last; yet this very same organ is now day by day preaching precisely the opposite doctrine; it would have us believe that no case whatever has been made out for any such temporary measure of relief as Mr. Parnell's Bill contemplated; it would, therefore, have the law strictly and vigorously enforced, and would even encourage the landlords to exact the uttermost farthing from their hard-pressed and suffering tenantry. One more quotation with respect to the fall in agricultural values, and we will then proceed to deal with another portion of our subject. This quotation is taken from an authority which Conservatives themselves will respect, for it is none other than the present Chief Secretary for Ireland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach himself. In his speech on the second reading of the Tenants' Relief (Ireland) Bill, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach made certain admissions which are beyond question of the greatest importance. "It is admitted," he said, "that, for one reason or another, there is a certain amount of non-payment of rents in Ireland. . . . It is also admitted that there has been of late years, especially in the last year or eighteen months, a considerable fall in the price of produce. These are facts which are notorious." So notorious, indeed, were they that the present Government actually determined to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire "to what extent, if any, and in what parts of Ireland the operation of the Land Act of 1881 was affected, either by combination to resist the enforcement of legal obligations or *by an exceptional fall in the price of produce.*" The determination to appoint this commission was, be it observed, arrived at before "the new rent war was practically opened by the author of the Separation Scheme," the terms of reference to the commissioners having been read by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer to the House of Commons "on the first night of the recent session, August 19."

The causes which led to the introduction of the Tenants' Relief Bill being so largely misrepresented or misunderstood, it is not surprising that we should constantly find serious misapprehensions prevailing with regard to the nature of the measure itself. Mr. Parnell, it is dinned into our ears from day to day, actually went the length of introducing into the House of Commons a Bill "reducing" or "cutting down" or "confiscating" the judicial rent by one-half. Any one who has taken the trouble to read the Bill, or has even glanced at its contents, must be well aware that it cannot be fairly or accurately described in these terms. The preamble of the Bill sets forth that—

> Having regard to the great depreciation in the prices of agricultural produce since the greater number of the judicial rents of tenancies in Ireland subject to statutory conditions were fixed, it is expedient to make temporary provision for the relief in certain cases of the tenants of such holdings;

And the enacting portion of the measure lays down that in cases where it is proved—

> (*a*) That half the rent ordinarily payable in the year one thousand eight hundred and eighty-six in respect of such holding and half of any antecedent arrears have been paid; and (*b*) that the tenant is unable to discharge the remainder of such rent or arrears without loss of his holding or deprivation of the means necessary for the cultivation and stocking thereof: the Court may make an order for *such an abatement of the rent of such holding as may seem to them just and expedient.*

And this is the Bill, the object and purport of which, we are coolly told, was to confiscate 50 per cent. of the landlords' rents!

The causes which rendered the Bill necessary, and the nature of the Bill itself, being sometimes thoroughly and entirely misunderstood, at other times wilfully and maliciously misrepresented, it is hardly matter for wonder or surprise that the same fate has befallen the arguments used in its behalf. The position taken up by Mr. Gladstone is a cause of offence and of stumbling to many. He changed his mind on the rent question, we are told, for no better reason than that the Government had appointed a Commission to inquire into the working of the Land Act of 1881, and then, with an air of triumph, we are given to understand that "the whole College of Jesuits could not have surpassed the memorable argument after the pilgrimage to Bavaria." And yet how perfectly simple and conclusive was the argument Mr. Gladstone employed! The Government had, he reminded the House, appointed a Commission to inquire whether the capacity of the tenants to pay the judicial rents had been affected by an exceptional fall in the price of produce. By that very act they practically admitted that a *primâ facie* case had been made out, and that in certain instances, at any rate, the tenants would be unable to pay the full judicial rents. Indeed, Lord Salisbury himself, continued Mr. Gladstone, had practically confessed as much in the speech which he delivered on the opening night of the Session. At this point a singular incident occurred. Mr. Gladstone was challenged to quote the words, but this he declined to do, as the passage was, he asserted, notorious enough. And, indeed, it should be observed that he was hardly in a position there and then to accept the challenge thrown out to him, as he did not happen at the moment to have Lord Salisbury's speech in his possession. He contented himself, therefore, with giving what he conceived to be the sense and substance of what Lord Salisbury had actually said. Nor can it for a moment be contended that his recollection was very greatly at fault. For what were the *ipsissima verba* of the Prime Minister? They were these :—

> It is loudly said that the cause of non-payment of rent, at all events in some parts of Ireland, is that the tenants cannot pay, because the price of produce has fallen so low that the payment of rent has become impossible. I have great doubts [continued his lordship] whether that is true *to a great extent.*

What is the obvious inference from this most carefully guarded and limited statement? Lord Salisbury expressed his doubts whether it was true to a great extent that the tenants would be unable to pay the full judicial rents. Did he not, therefore, to all intents and purposes, admit that it was true to some extent and in some cases? And, indeed, this view of his language is abundantly borne out by what follows, for he went on to make the astounding declaration that—

> If it should come out that the Courts have made blunders, and that there is that impossibility in any case of paying rent, it was not the landlords who should bear the loss. This would be one of the cases for the application of the principle of purchase by the State, and the State, and not the landlords, must suffer for the errors that had been made.

The inference drawn by Mr. Gladstone from the appointment of the Royal Commission, and from the declarations of the head of the Government on the subject of the fall in prices —viz., that the tenants would, in some cases, be unable to pay the full judicial rents—seems to a plain man of ordinary intelligence to be a moderate and reasonable inference. The argument is, in short, perfectly clear and convincing, and such as to require no Jesuitical skill or sophistry to construct or comprehend. But then it is Mr. Gladstone's argument, and that of itself is sufficient to condemn it in the opinion of no inconsiderable section of the community.

That Lord Hartington should receive his full meed of praise from those who are unable to see the force and cogency of Mr. Gladstone's contentions is only what we should naturally expect. In the last twelve months many things have happened, and with no small portion of the Conservative party Lord Hartington is now the hero of the hour. He is lauded to the skies as the type of a sagacious statesman, and on the occasion of the second reading of "Mr. Parnell's Confiscation Bill" he made, we are told, "one of those high-minded speeches which we hear too rarely in these days." He "stripped away all the false pretences from the new crusade against the landlords, and showed that the Government had neither the right nor the power to prevent the landlord seeking redress for the denial of his claim." "Individuals," he said, "of all classes, whether they be landlords or whether they be others, have their rights and have a right to appeal to law, and it is not in the power of this Government or of any Government to raise itself as a dispensing power superior to law." Here again our friends the critics are at fault. They pick out the weak points in Lord Hartington's speech and bestow special praise upon them. On the other hand, they altogether fail to take notice of certain important admissions made with his accustomed candour by Lord Hartington, for the all-sufficient reason that these very admissions would practically knock the bottom out of everything for which they have from first to last been contending. The answer to Lord Hartington is plain and obvious enough, and it is this. Nobody was arguing in favour of the exercise by the Government of a dispensing power superior to law; the whole point at issue was whether a case had or had not been made out for an amendment of the law by which a temporary relief would in certain cases be given to tenants who, in consequence of the heavy fall in the price of produce, were unable to pay the full judicial rents. The House of Commons, however, was determined that, so far as its influence and authority went, no relief whatsoever should be given, and, therefore, following the advice of the responsible Government of the day and of the leader of the

Liberal Unionists, after a brief and perfunctory discussion, in which few of its members took part, it rejected Mr. Parnell's Bill on September 21 by a majority of ninety-five. The consequences of this action may be seen to-day in the disorder and confusion that unhappily prevail in the South and the West of Ireland. Just as six years ago the rejection by the House of Lords of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill was the fruitful cause of suffering on the one hand and agitation on the other, so have the like results followed from the rejection by the House of Commons of the Tenants' Relief Bill. For a time, indeed, there was a semblance of quiet and of peace. It seemed as if "the truce of God," of which Mr. Chamberlain spoke last April, had at length arrived. Many of the landlords made substantial concessions to their tenants, and the influence of the Government was exerted to induce the bad landlords to follow the example of the good. In some cases that influence, though it may justly be regarded with jealousy, as bearing too close a resemblance to that dispensing power which Lord Hartington very properly condemned as contrary to the spirit of the Constitution—in some cases, we say, the influence of the Government was exerted with the very best results. "The advent of the Hon. Captain Plunkett," writes Father Lucy, "to Clonakilty has practically settled in this district of the county of Cork the rent question for this year. Miss Hungerford, of the Island, has given to her tenants in the townland of Reneen, near Clonakilty, 30 per cent; Captain Beatam, of Dublin, 25 per cent. to the tenants of South Ring, whose rents were already moderate; Mr. Norwood, J.P. Dunmanway, agent has given 20 per cent. to the tenants of Cruary, whose rents had already been reduced some 20 and 25 per cent.; Mr. F. J. Beamish, J.P. of Lettercolm, has given 15 per cent. to the tenants in the townland of Gullane, close by Clonakilty, which was all they asked for, as the rents were, in a great many instances, under Griffith's valuation. Of the twenty-two landlords who hold property in this extensive parish, nineteen have settled amicably with their tenants." This is, it will be admitted, a most remarkable result. By a single visit of a divisional magistrate, nineteen out of twenty-two landlords were induced to make substantial reductions in their rents; and the mere fact of the Government exerting itself in this way is the strongest possible proof of the necessity for such reductions, if the tenants are to live, and the country is to be free from outrage and disturbance. But there are other districts where the influence of the Government has not been exerted, or, if it has been exerted, has failed of its effect. In these districts, the tenants, acting on the advice of Mr. Dillon and other leaders of the Nationalist party, have adopted what is known as "the plan of campaign," and are now at open war with their landlords. The plan of campaign has on the one hand received the blessing of His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, and has on the other been proclaimed as an illegal conspiracy by the Irish executive. What, then, are we to say with regard to it? Simply this, that, whether it be legal or illegal, it undoubtedly has for its object to compel the more grasping and exacting landlords to make those just and reasonable concessions which the heavy fall in agricultural values has rendered necessary, and which, without the compulsion either of law or of coercion, have already been made by a large proportion of the English and the Irish landlords. The tenants of Ireland, it should never be forgotten, are now by law part owners of the Irish soil, and they are therefore at least entitled to be heard on the all-important and vital question as to the amount of rent which, in the peculiar circumstances of the time, it is in their power to pay, and which it is right and proper that they should pay. The plan of campaign is, it must be confessed, an extremely rough method of seeking justice, and is open to the gravest objections. It is not right that the tenants should settle their own rents any more than it is right that the landlords should settle their rents for them. What is wanted is that there should be established in the present emergency some impartial judicial tribunal, which should arbitrate and do justice between the two contending parties. Such a tribunal the Tenants' Relief Bill would have called into operation, and, if it had passed into law, we might have been spared much of the tumult and agitation through which it would appear we are destined once again to pass. For the hundredth time in the history of the United Kingdom, Great Britain has turned a deaf ear to the voice of an overwhelming majority of the representatives of the Irish people, and all the signs of the times go to show that we shall yet have reason to repent us of our folly. Is it to be wondered at that Irishmen have ceased to look for justice at the hands of the Imperial Parliament? or is it difficult to discover the true answer to that old question of the Parliament of Kilkenny, "How comes it to pass that the King has never been the richer for Ireland?"

INDEPENDENT SECTION.

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

I.—LONDON GOVERNMENT.

1. *The London Government Bill,* 1884. Speech of Sir WILLIAM V. HARCOURT on the Introduction of the Bill, April 8, 1884. Speech of JOSEPH F. B. FIRTH, M.P., President of the London Municipal Reform League, on the Second Reading of the London Government Bill, 1884.
2. *Some Reasons for a Single Government of London.* By the Right Hon. Sir ARTHUR HOBHOUSE, K.C.S.I.
3. *London Government, and how to Reform it.* By J. F. B. FIRTH, M.P. London. 1882.
4. *London Government Reform.* Reprinted from the *Times* of October 3, 1882, February 9, 1883, and March 24, 1883.
5. *Speech* of the Right Hon. HENRY MATTHEWS, Secretary of State for the Home Department to the Deputation of Vestries, *Times,* December 3, 1886.

IN the winter of 1829 Carlyle wrote in his diary at Craigenputtock, "Political Philosophy ? Political philosophy should be a scientific revelation of the whole secret mechanism whereby men cohere together in society; should tell us what is meant by 'country' (*patria*), by what causes men are happy, moral, religious or the contrary," and surely the matter which he then raised is worthy of some consideration. Is it not, in fact, forcing itself upon governments and legislators at the present time with painful pertinacity? We see from the trembling of the Bourses of Europe that the question of continued German unity depends upon the possibility or impossibility of France waging a successful war against Germany for the recovery of Alsace and Lorraine. We know that nearer home there is an obstreperous question of nationality, and the right which such a nation as the Irish has to govern itself. We know that within that question there is another nice ethnological consideration, and that is, as to the right that three Celtic provinces have to govern a fourth—Saxon one. But nearer home still there is a most important question as to the government of this great London of ours, and as a preliminary consideration it might be well, as Carlyle suggested, that there should be a scientific revelation of the secret of mechanism whereby men cohere together, and that we should have authentic information as to what is meant by "town." Is this great congeries of something like half a million houses, covering 75,490 acres, and containing very nearly 4,000,000 human beings—is it a town; and is the government which is applicable to other and ordinary towns applicable to this great human Maelstrom? Or, on the other hand, is London half a dozen or more towns separate in every sense except that of contiguity in space, and must we apply as many individual local governments to these separate parts of the metropolis? These are questions which lie at the very root of this matter.

But one thing is very certain, and that is, that in whichever aspect we are to look at this swarming metropolis, its present form of government is not only anomalous, but unsatisfactory to almost all that are concerned—except, perhaps, the persons who govern. One thing is strange, notwithstanding the acknowledged necessity for reform, a necessity which has been openly acknowledged since 1835, and was palpable enough to ordinary shrewdness before that date, yet nothing has been done to apply a remedy. Of course there have been inquiries, commissions, Bills; but the net practical result is that we are not much further forward than we were when corporations throughout the kingdom were reformed in the year mentioned, and when Lord John Russell stated that reform was not intended to stop short at Temple Bar. Temple Bar itself has been swept away, but the reform has not passed its site. The history of the attempts to reform the Municipal Government of London is in itself a serious criticism upon the slow, almost obstructive methods of our present democratic system of legislation. It may be worth while to point out one or two of the "wrecks" to which Sir William Harcourt referred—of measures which were launched fairly enough with firing of oratorical guns and what not, and which none the less came to grief. The very measure in introducing which Sir William Harcourt referred to the wrecks and the shores "whitened with the bones of previous adventurers," is, according to the present Home Secretary, "dead, absolutely dead," and was by him subjected to a by no means flattering *post-mortem* examination.

In 1835, as we have said, the Municipal Corporations Act was passed, and in 1837, the Commissioners, upon whose Report that Act was founded, further inquired into the subject of the

Corporation of London, and they reported that "they did not find any argument on which the course pursued with regard to other towns could be justified which would not apply with the same force to London." The Report further stated:

> We hardly anticipate that it will be suggested . . . . that the other quarters of the town should be formed into independent and isolated communities, if indeed the multifarious relations to which their proximity compels them would permit them to be isolated and independent. This plan, as it seems to us, in getting rid of anomaly would tend to multiply and perpetuate an evil.

So far, then, there seems to be no doubt but there are other statements in the Report which open out very dubious issues. Thus, the Commissioners state: "These matters"—they were referring to various matters of local management—"have never been so well and economically managed as when superintended by an undivided authority, and the real point for consideration is how far these duties for the whole metropolis can be placed in the hands of a metropolitan municipality, or how far they should be entrusted to the officers of your Majesty's Government." There was another Commission in 1854. The great art of action —wise action—is to inquire enough, and not too much. There are consciences in men which want to be so certain of right that they paralyse the hands. If after decision you still inquire, the chances are ten to one that you reverse your own decision. So it is with these larger inquiries which are to make public reason and satisfy public conscience. If you inquire enough from reports you will be able to find a justification for almost any course of action. The Commissioners of 1837 were in favour of one government for London; the Commissioners of 1854 were in favour of seven. The former thought that all the arguments which applied to other towns applied with equal force to London; the latter point out that if London was dealt with on the same principle with other great towns, the effect would be, in the then state of affairs, to convert an area of 723 acres into one of 78,029 acres; a population of 129,128 into one of 2,362,236, and an assessment on £953,110 into one on £9,964,348.* And they go on to say

> A change of this magnitude would not only alter the whole character of the City Corporation, but would, it seems to us, defeat the main purpose of Municipal institutions. London . . . . is a "province covered with houses;" its diameter from north to south, and from east to west is so great, that persons living at its furthest extremities

---

* Of course these changes would be now much greater. The population of the City is 50,276. Of the area covered by the Metropolitan Local Management Act 1855, 3,832,441. The rateable value of the City is £3,500,968; of the Metropolitan area £27,540,029.

> have few interests in common; its area is so large, each inhabitant is in general acquainted only with his own quarter, and has no minute knowledge of other parts of the town. Hence the two first conditions for Municipal Government—minute local knowledge and community of interests—would be wanting if the whole of London were, by an extension of the present boundaries of the City, placed under a single Municipal Corporation. The enormous numbers of the population and the vast magnitude of the interests which would be under the care of the Municipal body, would likewise render its administration a work of great difficulty.

The Commissioners also mention the bisection of London by the Thames as an additional reason against unity of government. They, in effect, recommended that there should be seven corporations to represent practically the seven parliamentary boroughs, and that there should be a single system of police and drainage. Here, then, we see that our preliminary question requires some answer. One set of Commissioners regards London as a "town," and therefore entitled to a single government, although it is somewhat inconsistently doubtful whether that town should be governed by a municipal authority of its own or by Her Majesty's Government. Another set of Commissioners regard London as a province, consisting of some seven towns, and says that each of these ought to have its own municipal authority. Now, both of these views find supporters. There have been Committees and Committees, Bills and Bills. For instance, in 1870, there was a Bill to create separate municipalities; in 1878, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth moved five resolutions, which were adopted by the House of Commons. These resolutions pointed at "one administrative authority representing the ratepayers." In 1880 there was a bill upon the lines of these resolutions. In 1884 the Government introduced a Bill to constitute a Municipal Parliament for all London; and in 1886 the Home Secretary pronounces that Bill the least successful attempt which has been made to settle the question of the government of London; and speaking a few days after the Home Secretary, and after Mr. Firth, who is the advocate for a single government for London, had placed a construction upon Mr. Matthews' words, the Prime Minister said:

> The fact that I am speaking to a City of London audience reminds me that a very eminent gentleman, Mr. Bottomley Firth, has recently claimed Her Majesty's Government as allies (laughter). I was very pleased to see it, though I should be very sorry to be thought to entertain views with which he has become associated in the public mind. But though we have been strongly opposed to anything that could diminish the lustre of the ancient Corporation of the City of London, though we have always been strongly opposed to the erection

of a vast municipality, which we do not believe represents any community of interests, or satisfies any real want, we have not been blind to the defects of the local government of the Metropolis outside the City, and we have never expressed the slightest unwillingness to extend to them in such fashion as might please them best, those advantages of municipal government, which are so largely enjoyed by urban communities throughout this country (cheers).*

Apparently, then, the question is still the one stated by Lord Derby at Liverpool, when he said, "Are you to have one gigantic local Parliament? or are you to break up the four million inhabitants into eight or ten distinct incorporated boroughs? or are you to create, as in the case of the London School Board, separate bodies, each charged with one separate duty?" Apparently, too, the current of public opinion has been running from time to time in opposite directions. At one time it seems to have been in favour of uniting all London under one Municipal Government, at another of separating the Government of London for municipal purposes. If we read the signs of the times, the latter is at present the dominant view. Those who read the works mentioned at the head of this article will see what is to be said for the former.

It will be seen that there is no question as to the continuance of the present system. It will not be necessary for us here either to examine or condemn the present curious arrangements for the government of the metropolis. One of the remarkable circumstances about it is the surprising ignorance that exists as to the matter in the public mind. Most people know that there is a Corporation and a Lord Mayor. The latter has a European reputation. They know, too, that there is a body called the Board of Works, too often confounded in their minds with the Office of Works; and they are aware—sometimes painfully aware—of the existence of Vestries and District Boards, with which bodies they are brought into too frequent contact. But what the function of each of these bodies is—why they all exist, and how they are related to one another—is known to very few Londoners. In view of this ignorance, it may be worth while to say a few words about the present system of London government before we examine, as we must do, the principles upon which the government of the future is to be founded. Our description, however, must necessarily be very short. And first, of the Lord Mayor and Corporation. The Corporation is the only municipal government in London. Its head, the chief magistrate, is the Lord Mayor. He is selected annually from City Aldermen who have served the office of Sheriff. The Liverymen of the City Guilds meet and nominate two Aldermen, one of which is afterwards chosen as Lord Mayor by the Aldermen. The Lord Mayor has many important duties and offices. He is a judge, for instance, at the Central Criminal Court, and a member of the Privy Council. His hospitalities are not unimportant features of his high office. The Liverymen no longer represent, as they once did, the trades carried on in the City. Why they should choose the Mayor, and appoint to other important offices under the Corporation, it is difficult to say. The Aldermen, twenty-six in number, represent the wards of the City, and form a Court: this appoints the Recorder and other officers, is the licensing authority, and admits brokers. The Common Council consists of 206 Councillors, elected by the burgesses, and the twenty-six Aldermen. It is *the* legislative body of the City, makes many appointments, and controls the money of the Corporation. There is a very large number of committees of this Council, which have various matters and estates belonging to the Corporation in charge. And banquets seem to be amongst the onerous duties of a Common Councilman. It is quite possible, however, from the figures that are before us, that these gustatory advantages which are enjoyed by members of the Common Council may be a much cheaper method of remuneration than the payment by salary, which may before long be a feature of many parts of our representative system. Then, besides the Irish Society, a limb of the Corporation, there is the body known as the Commissioners of Sewers. The latter body controls the local drainage, paving, cleansing, lighting, and other sanitary matters in the City. It levies rates, and is recognized by various Acts of Parliament. Amongst the other Committees of the Corporation there is one which has to do with the coal, corn, and wine dues. The existence of that committee, and its receipt of something like £487,968 per annum, is well in most people's memory at the present time.* The City, too, exercises market jurisdiction within seven miles of its boundaries, and has, it is said, been obstructive of the fair provision of the necessary market facilities for that outlying district. The City is, too, an educational body, has important schools, which are nearly self-supporting, has founded a successful school of music, and through one of its trusts gives evening lectures on science. The City police, which costs £100,000 per annum, is in a state of admirable efficiency. Of course, the City has an immense income, and the annual account made out by the Chamberlain is a dazzling document. But the City has, in innumerable directions, done good public service. It has purchased open spaces like Epping Forest, Burnham Beeches, and the like. It has made great town improvements. Its hospitalities have given a liberal aspect to Imperial policy, which might have been regarded as penurious. Its Mayor and Corporation may be an anomaly, but it is a very splendid one.

---

* Speech to the City Conservative Club, Dec. 8, 1886.

---

* The greater portion of this sum is expended by the Metropolitan Board of Works, and not by the City.

The Metropolitan Board of Works has no long history to recommend or discredit it. It was constituted in 1855, under the Metropolis Local Management Act of that year. Before that time the government of the inhabited district lying round the City, of, in fact, "greater London," was chaotic. When the Metropolitan Board was established, it consisted of forty-five members and a chairman. Its members are elected for three years, and do not directly represent the ratepayers, but are sent to the Board by the Vestries and District Boards, three members representing the Common Council. It was established principally for the purpose of carrying out the main drainage of the metropolis, and exercises its jurisdiction over twenty-three square miles. It now exercises quite other functions under about 100 Acts of Parliament. Although not, as we have seen, a representative body in the true sense of the word, it has done admirable work. Reformers are never tired of extolling it. It has not only carried out the main drainage system of the metropolis, but it has made the admirable embankments which adorn London. It has freed the bridges. It has taken powers which will prevent the flooding of low-lying districts near the Thames. It has made immense street improvements; has purchased for the benefit of Londoners parks, commons, and open spaces; has provided a most efficient fire brigade. It has jurisdiction under various Building Acts. It names and numbers our streets, licenses premises for the storage of petrolium, inspects dairies, tests our gas, &c., and even opponents of the present system admit that "the Board has discharged its duties in the matters of these minor jurisdictions with credit to itself and with advantage to the community." * Of course, in carrying out these great works, the Metropolitan Board has expended very large sums of money, and the total liabilities of the Board at the end of 1880 was £18,253,536.

We must now say just a word about the Vestries and District Boards. They, too, were the children of the Metropolis Local Management Act, 1855. There are thirty-eight of these authorities, and they are charged with the minor municipal

---

* See "London Government, and How to Reform it," p. 48. Sir William Harcourt, too, speaking of the Board, said:—"I have indicated the character of the work, and the good work as far as it has gone" (p. 12). Mr. Firth, too, after speaking of the London fire brigade as "an admirably efficient body" (p. 44), says of the Board: "Having regard to the conditions of its life, it may be doubted whether a similar instance of municipal patriotism can be found in the world" (p. 51).

duties. Their chief functions are the paving, watching, lighting, cleansing, dusting, and minor drainage of the several districts. The Vestries are directly elected, but the members of the District Boards are elected by the Vestries. Many complaints are made against these bodies, and a comparison of the amounts that have been spent in various districts in connection with watering or paving, would no doubt show curious discrepancies. It is said, too, that in case of snow-storms these bodies have been found incapable of discharging their primary duty of making the streets passable; but against these small indictments let us quote the reluctant words of an opponent of the present system. "The control," says Mr. Firth, "which has been exercised by the Vestries and District Boards over the paving, watering, cleansing, and lighting of London streets, has within twenty-five years completely changed the whole face of the metropolis; and there is at the present time no large American city which in the excellence of its roads can be for one moment compared with London." * And let us add that to our own knowledge many of the Vestries and District Boards have exercised a most salutary supervision over the Gas and Water Companies of the metropolis in the interests of the ratepayers, and have, by opposition in Parliament and elsewhere, extorted from these companies many valuable concessions. It is complained, however, curiously enough by Mr. Firth, that "each of these authorities is practically irresponsible." This is a strange objection. The Vestries are responsible to the ratepayers, and whatever municipal government we ultimately have for London, that is the responsibility which will be relied upon for the securing of good work from the representative body. The Vestries and District Boards, it will be remembered, are the agencies for the collection of the public rates. Not only do they collect the rates which are necessary for local purposes, but the metropolitan consolidated rate, a general rate for the purposes of the School Board, a Vestry sewers rate, and a lighting rate; and, in some cases, the poor-rate, too, is collected by the Vestry. Under these circumstances it is not likely that, however well a Vestry may do its work, it will be a popular body. We cannot here deal with their minor Vestry jurisdictions as to baths and washhouses, tramways, and the like, nor can we refer at length to other bodies which have at any rate a semblance of authority within the limits of our town, such as the Corporation of Westminster and the Constable of the Tower of London. Nor can we give any space to the much more important matters of the county jurisdiction in London, or the administration of the poor

---

* "London Government, and How to Reform it," pp. 55, 6.

law, the metropolitan police, the much discussed question of London cabs, nor to the important but better understood matter of the School Board for London. All these matters do, no doubt, affect the considerations which apply to the question of the Municipal Government. But we must content ourselves with this slight sketch of London as it is governed, and proceed to the more important matter of London as it ought to be governed. But before passing to that subject we must mention one important matter here. The policy of Parliament was for very many years to entrust matters of a semi-public nature, like the supply of water and artificial light, to companies of private persons who were willing to run some risk in providing the means of these supplies for the sake of profit. To us it has always seemed that in one sense the supply of these very necessary things was no more a public duty than the supply of bread, which is as necessary as water to the maintenance of life. But the fact that the payments for these commodities had to be made in rates, that the supply involved the necessity of breaking up the public streets and roads, made these companies the creatures of Parliament, and that being so, Parliament was quite right in taking every means in its power to prevent the practical monopoly which it was conferring upon these companies from acting to the prejudice of the public. With that view, consequently Gas and Water Companies were placed by Parliament under very onerous restrictions. The amount that they could charge was limited. The amount of profit they could divide was limited; precautions were taken that the water they were to deliver was pure, or that the gas they supplied had a sufficient illuminating power. But a time came when it was perceived that these undertakings might well be in the hands of the municipal authorities, and recently the policy of Parliament has been to transfer water undertakings from the hands of companies into the hands of corporations; and in many cases, too, the gas undertakings in towns have also passed into the hands of the municipal authority. It is very often assumed that London is the only town in which that transfer has not taken place; but that is a mistake. There is still a considerable number of our large towns where the water supply is in the hands of companies, and even a larger number of towns where the gas undertaking is not in corporate hands. Indeed, in the case of gas companies, since the introduction of the auction clauses and the sliding scale into Acts of Parliament, there is far less reason for such transfer than existed before. By means of these clauses, the amount of interest-bearing capital is kept at a minimum, and it becomes the interest of the gas company to work as economically as they can, to reduce the price of gas as low as possible, for by so doing they are enabled to divide a higher rate of dividend. But, as we have said, the tendency of the legislation of the last fifteen or twenty years has been to transfer these undertakings throughout the country from private to public hands. Many persons feel that the same transfer ought to take place in London, and it is unquestionable that the question of the municipal government of London is much complicated with the question of a central authority for the management of the transferred undertakings. It will be remembered that Viscount Cross, in his ill-starred Bill for the transfer of the waterworks of London (1880), proposed to constitute a water trust for the purpose; but we gather that there is at the present time a tendency to allow the one central authority for London to deal with these matters of gas and water, as well as with main drainage. That was the ultimate intention of Sir William Harcourt when he introduced his Bill of 1884, and seems to be the intention of the present Home Secretary.

But to come to closer quarters with the matter in hand. How is this London of ours to be governed? We have seen that there are three alternatives before the public:—1. That there should be one municipal authority elected by the ratepayers of London for the whole of London; 2. That there should be seven or more municipal bodies, each having authority over separate districts of London; a town larger than any of the provincial centres of population; and 3. That there should be separate central bodies established like the School Board, each having some specific matter in charge. Now the question as to whether government should or should not be representative has been long ago decided in the affirmative. Half the legislation of the last half-century has been undertaken with the view of changing non-representative institutions into institutions based on representation and the direct responsibility of the elected to the electors. It is true that many non-representative bodies have done admirable work. We have seen that although the government of London is in no sense truly representative, yet that in many ways it has discharged important duties in a way to win golden opinions. It is admitted that the unpaid magistracy throughout the country has not only discharged its judicial functions well and wisely, but that its administrative duties have been discharged carefully and economically. But these facts will not in the latter case prevent the establishment of representative County Boards, any more than they will in the former prevent the alteration of the system of London government. In a country there are certain wants common to all the people, such as peace from foreign foes, personal security from the enemies of society. And to secure the peace the payment of taxes is a necessity. Now these common objects are in the peaceful country—a country not torn by civil war or the social or political agitation which often leads to it—secured by a government representing all those persons who are to be taxed. Hence the creation of our Imperial Parliament upon the broad basis of household suffrage. But if common interest is to be the sole ground for instituting common representative government, then we cannot see why all the municipal corporations throughout the country should not cease to be, or why all such matters as the effectual draining, lighting, policing of towns should not be performed by one central government. But against that proposition there are a variety of weighty considerations. In the first place it is coming to be understood that government by all is not self-government. When you centralize you minimize the effect of the individual will, and that is tyranny, whether the central authority is a committee appointed by the votes of the community or an individual who has inherited a throne. But further, the health and life of representative institutions is derived from the interest which the governed take in their working, and the vigilance with which their doings and the doings of their members are scrutinized by the electorate. When you centralize you reduce the interest which each citizen takes and ought to take in the working of these institutions. One of the worst features of the present time is the fact that these representative institutions which have been established do not attract to them the services of the best men in the State, and that the public at large take too little interest in the doings of the bodies which have been created. In order to ensure some active interest upon the part of citizens in these institutions you must then localize them. These considerations lead then to the conclusion that, although many of the wants of the people might be supplied by the Imperial Government, it is better that they should be supplied by local representative bodies. Then comes the question, How are you to carve out your localities? Well, in many cases there is no difficulty. A whole town requires draining, lighting, and what not, and the requirements of such an urban population are very different from those of the neighbouring rural districts. In such a case it is obvious that there should be a town authority to do these duties. This, then, is the proper foundation of municipal government.* But just as the country was, as we have seen, too large to allow of all the functions of government being performed by the Imperial Government, so it is evident that a town may become so great as to make such a municipal government as is applicable to an ordinary town community inapplicable for the very reasons that we have given why the State should not manage our towns. A town may be so gigantic that a central representative body may have no more local feeling with any particular part of the community than the House of Commons has with any individual county or borough in the United Kingdom. What we want in our local government is intimate knowledge of the place to be governed, sympathy with the wants to be supplied, common interests with the constituents. These are to be attained in small towns by a central authority for the whole borough: but a town may become so great as to make the inhabitant of one part of it as great a stranger to the wants and the interests of the inhabitants of another part as an inhabitant of Wick would be of those of an inhabitant of St. Ives. Nothing could illustrate this better than an instance which is given by Lord Hobhouse, with the view of showing that one central government was the right thing for London:—

---

* The case in the text is a very simple one. Where, however, a river has to be cleansed from sewage like the Clyde or the Thames, then the town authority is not large enough. The whole of the authorities in the watershed ought to combine to carry out the undertaking.

> Take a case [he writes], which happens to have just occurred in our Vestry. A company proposes to carry a line of railway through Paddington, Marylebone, and St. George's so as to connect the northern and southern circumferences of the metropolitan lines. St. George's, and I believe Paddington, approve of the project, but desire some protective clauses, for which they will appear separately (not without expense) in Parliament. Marylebone opposes the project *in toto.* Now, this is a scheme affecting a substantial portion of London, not only the three parishes where the new line runs, but myriads of people who use the metropolitan line. Apart from individuals whose property is touched, and on the question of its benefit to Londoners, there ought to be but one voice heard in Parliament, and that the voice of the Municipality of London.*

Now, taking this case upon his own showing, it shows, we think, how local wishes and wants may be over-ridden and set aside if the municipality represents too wide an area. We take it that Marylebone was affected by the scheme, and further, that it had some valid objections to the scheme, for these seem to have been recognized by Parliament, as it rejected the Bill. But had the question of opposing that Bill been submitted not to the Vestries, but to the Municipality of London, then we agree with Lord Hobhouse in thinking there would have been no opposition. It is possible that the representative for Marylebone in the Parliament of London might have proposed and urged that the Bill be opposed; but all the other representatives whose districts were not directly affected by the construction of the line, and whose inhabitants were among the "myriads who use the metropolitan line," would have been in its favour. The valid objections of the locality that was to suffer would not have prevailed, and the Bill that Parliament disapproved would have passed unopposed, so far as the Municipality of London was concerned. We know nothing of the particular scheme referred to except what Lord Hobhouse has told us in the passage quoted, but we think his statement admirably illustrates the evils incident to a system of local government which has none of the advantages of "localization," or, in other words, of simple municipal government for too large an area, or too numerous a population. When, if ever, a town grows too large to have on the whole common interests, it has grown too great to be governed by one municipal body, and some other expedient must be found for the altered state of circumstances. We cannot help thinking that it was the opinion of the Commissioners of 1837 that that was the condition of things in London, and that, we think, was the reason of their doubt whether the affairs of London should "be placed in the hands of a metropolitan municipality, or how far they should be entrusted to the officers of 'Her Majesty's Government.'" That the latter suggestion was foolish, we think appears on the face of it. To hand over the government of London to Her Majesty's Government would be to aggravate the evils which they foresaw would result from the too central control by a single municipal authority. It is because the Imperial Parliament and Her Majesty's Government have no special local knowledge or sympathy that a separate system of local government has been inaugurated. To propose, when the conditions of a population are such as to make the application of the ordinary forms of local government impossible or inexpedient, to hand over the government to the Queen's Government, is to despair of local government altogether.

---

* "Some Reasons for a Single Government of London," p. 15. Lord Hobhouse adds in a note, "This scheme failed."

This was, too, the view of the Commissioners of 1854, when they recommended seven corporations for London at the same time that they recommended a central system for drainage and police. They pointed out, as we have seen, that London was so huge "that persons living at its farthest extremities have few interests in common . . . . and that each inhabitant is in general acquainted only with his own quarter, and has no minute knowledge of other parts of the town." That the main idea to which we have been referring was present to their minds, is shown by what follows: "Hence the two first conditions for municipal government—minute local knowledge and community of interests—would be wanting if the whole of London were, by an extension of the present boundaries of the City, placed under a single municipal corporation." But, although we concur to some extent with these views, we cannot altogether approve of the recommendations which they founded upon them. That there should be seven separate corporations for London, would, we are convinced, lead to innumerable difficulties, although it would undoubtedly make the government of London more of a real local government than it would be under the government by one central body.* But not only was the idea that London was too large to be governed by a single central authority present to their minds, but it has, more or less fully, forced itself upon every one who has considered the subject, and it was, without question, present to the minds of the Government of 1884, when they introduced their Government of London Bill. They did not propose to treat London exactly in the same way that provincial corporations were treated under the Municipal Corporations Act of 1835, and their reasons for not doing so was that London had become too large for ordinary municipal government. They proposed, besides the central council, to establish district councils in each municipal district.

> These latter bodies [said Sir William Harcourt, in introducing the Bill] will not be like the present vestries, inasmuch as they will have no original or independent authority. If these district councils were to have such independent authority and powers conferred upon them, it would be impossible to control them, or bring them into harmony with each other. These bodies, therefore, will have merely a derivative authority delegated to them by the central council, and that authority and those powers will be defined by district orders emanating from the central council. These district bodies will not be nominated by the central council, they will be elected by their municipal districts, but they will possess no power except that which is conferred upon them by the central council.*

Now there is a great deal to be said against this part of the scheme, but what we are concerned here to point out is that the then Government thought that London ought to have more local municipal life than it would enjoy if the ratepayers were only represented in a central municipal authority, and devised this curious plan of vicarious councils, which were to be elected by the ratepayers, to carry out the orders of a body to whom they were not responsible, with the view of introducing the element which would have been wanting if they had merely given London a Town Council like Edinburgh or Leeds. That the same truth is present to the minds of Lord Salisbury and his colleagues is evident from the words of the Premier to which we have already referred, when he said he was "strongly opposed to the creation of a vast municipality." Thus, then, we see that on all hands, or, at any rate, on all responsible hands, it seems to be admitted that some new method of local government must be invented for London, and this leads us to the consideration of how this difficulty is to be met. How are we to have sufficient local vigilance combined with sufficient central authority? How are we to secure diligent and interested local government for all parts of London without crippling the power of the central authority, to whom matters of general interest and importance ought, in our opinion, to be handed over? And on this latter point, too, that there ought to be some one central authority for all London, seems to be a matter no longer in dispute. The Commissioners of 1837 and 1854 are at one as to that. Home Secretary Harcourt and Home Secretary Matthews do not differ. The Legislature took that view in 1855 when it created the Metropolitan Board of Works, and every one seems to concur in the view that the main drainage of the metropolis should be in the hands of a central representative and responsible body. Here, then, there is no dispute. Most people seem also to think that the supply of water and gas should be in the same hands.

---

* In Melbourne, each of the districts, fifteen in number, has a Mayor, Corporation, and Town Clerk of its own. Each municipality manages its own district only, and there is no central authority corresponding to the Metropolitan Board of Works.

† Speech, p. 23, and Government of London Bill Clauses, 7, 22, 53.

> There are [said the Home Secretary the other day] interests which are plainly metropolitan—main drainage is one of these about which nobody will disagree; it is a metropolitan want and a metropolitan interest, which must be under the control and management of some central body. I think [he continued] it is probable that so great an assemblage of human beings as exists in the metropolis will not long be content with having less control over the supply of two such necessaries of life as water and light than is possessed by all the great towns of the kingdom, and it is obvious that there are or may be other purposes, other objects of joint interest in which joint action is therefore to the common advantage of the whole metropolis, and which ought to be committed to some central authority.*

But let us point out that the ordinary view, that if you have a central authority for one or two definite purposes you must have a central body for all the municipal duties, is entirely erroneous. That has, however, been to some extent the view of the Legislature itself, for having created the Metropolitan Board of Works it has ever since 1855 been conferring quite other powers upon it until, as we have seen, it now exercises functions under nearly a hundred Acts of Parliament. That circumstance has been used by all the advocates of a Central Municipal Council, for they say from time to time Parliament has found some important work to be done, and whenever that has been the case the duty has been given to the principal central body to perform and never to the small local bodies, the Vestries and District Boards. Does not that show that the strong hands are found to be the efficient ones? Does it not show that you cannot trust the feeble local authorities? And does not that point to the expediency of creating a single central body to perform all these duties for the whole of London? This is one of the standby arguments of the one set of municipal reformers. But it might be used in the same way as an argument against entrusting any powers to a representative body—because Parliament has trusted the Metropolitan Board which is not a representative body, and has not trusted the Vestries which are. But, as we said, it is well to bear in mind that it is quite possible to have central bodies for certain well-defined purposes without putting an end to the functions and duties of Local Municipal Institutions. That that is so is proved by the parallel existence of an Imperial Government, in whose hands are the larger matters of our foreign relations, and local town governments, which have to do with the sanitation of the districts under their control. But it is quite possible and very expedient for local authorities to combine for the purposes of main drainage, and "other purposes, other objects of joint interest," and yet remain perfectly distinct municipal authorities for all other purposes. That that is so is shown by the case of the West Kent Main Drainage Board, which was constituted under Act of Parliament for the purpose of creating an arterial system of drainage from Beckenham down to Dartford, and which consists of representatives sent from each of the constituent authorities which drain into the main sewer. Each of the local authorities in that case carries out its own local sewerage, and is in all other respects perfectly separate from, and independent of, its neighbours. The Dareuth Valley Board, too, was constituted under another Act of Parliament for a similar purpose in another valley. These illustrations show that combinations between separate authorities for the purpose of carrying out works in which they have a common interest is possible. By such a system then you have all the advantages of a central authority for those "purposes and objects of joint interest," and at the same time all the intimate and vigilant local government which it is so important to preserve.* Now it remains to be seen whether some such system cannot be devised for London. We have been able to trace so much agreement in the views of most of the political thinkers upon the matter that it ought not to be difficult to secure, at any rate, general adhesion to one or two main principles which will have to found the legislation of the future. First, then, we have seen that there is to be a central body which is to perform the duties of the Metropolitan Board as to main drainage, and to which the other large matters of joint interest, such as the supply of water and gas to the whole metropolis, are also to be relegated. This body must be directly responsible to the ratepayers. So far we have not come upon any point of divergence between the schools of municipal reformers. Sir William Harcourt, Lord Hobhouse, and Mr. Firth would all agree with Mr. Matthews so far that the central body with powers of spending large sums for the purpose of meeting the common demand of the whole of London for main drainage, for water and gas, ought to be directly responsible to the persons who have to find the money. But from this point out, their ways separate. The first are in favour of making the central authority not only perform duties which subserve the obviously joint interests of the whole of the inhabitants of the metropolis, but would devolve upon that authority all the purely local functions which are at present performed by the Vestries and District Boards. We have seen that with a slight and not very wise modification that was the object of Sir William Harcourt. That that is the whole creed of Lord Hobhouse is obvious from the pages of the pamphlet before us. Sometimes, it is true, he uses large and vague words. "What we want," he says in one place, "is unity of authority over people whose interests have grown up in common by natural and spontaneous growth." * This is not by any means perspicuous. We need not criticize at any length his various arguments, but it is worth while, if we can, to lay the ghost of an argument which walks his pages, and the pages of most of the literature of this subject. A few words ought to be enough for its "quietus." One of his objections to the present system is the mode by which

---

* *Times*, Dec. 3, 1886.

---

* There are clauses in the Public Health Act, 1875, by which urban authorities can form joint Boards for the purpose of sewerage, water supply, &c.

> roadways laid down by one authority are taken up by another. It was impressed deeply upon me, because it so happened that I came to my present house just after a new macadamized road had been laid down in the most perfect order. This was picked up once within a week of its completion, twice within a few weeks, and three times within a few months. Expense, dirt, stoppage of traffic, and great deterioration of the roadway, are the consequences of such operations. *Of course they cannot be prevented as long as we have underground works.* But it is certain that if the making of the road itself, the

---

* But sprawling expressions are used on both sides. What does Mr. Matthews mean when he says that the question of London government "must be dealt with in a large and liberal spirit.?"

drains, and control over arrangements for gas-pipes, water-pipes, telegraphs, and so forth, were in a single hand, the occasion for such expensive annoyances would be much diminished.*

Now the sentence we have ventured to put in italics shows how futile the ghost of an argument is, and the statement contained in the concluding sentence of our quotation "cannot be substantiated in fact." How on earth we were going to say, but it is really under the earth, how could it make any difference in the number of times it might be necessary to take up the road to prevent a waste of water, a leakage of gas, or for the repair of a sewer, if all these matters were in the hands of a central authority? Unless gas and water companies take up the streets for amusement, we cannot see how the number of times the necessity for doing so would be diminished by aggregating the various functions of these various bodies into one hand. But, apart from this matter, it is evident, as we have said, that Lord Hobhouse would fill the hands of the central authority with all the minor administrative matters which are at present in the minor administrative bodies; † and as we understand it that is a position which the present Government is not prepared to take up. There is, it seems in their view, room for central administration in some matters, and for peripheral administration in others. Now, this is a principle which, as we have seen, has been recognized more than once by those who were most competent to form an opinion on the matter. It is true that Sir William Harcourt made a sort of bogus local authority, which was to be elected by the ratepayers, but which was to be at the beck and call of the central authority. Now, in many ways any such sham local authority would fail to meet the case, and there is more to be hoped from the creation of real representative and responsible local authorities, upon somewhat the same, but possibly on a larger basis than the existing Vestries, and with a different name and increased powers to carry out all these matters in which the wants and interests of one well-marked locality may differ from another. It is quite possible that it may be well to reduce the number of such local authorities in London, and at the same time that the area of each new authority is increased, that its powers should also be enhanced. As we understand Mr. Matthews, although he is far from explicit, this, or something like this, is the way his scheme shapes itself; for he said that it was desirable not to destroy the minor local authorities, and that the local authorities should be responsible bodies—*i.e.*, responsible to the persons whose money they spend, and that their area should be a natural area, an area in which there are common interests and common wants, and which would be best met therefore by a single authority. Now, there are two objections to any such scheme. The one is stated by Lord Hobhouse when he points out in effect that the common wants of Londoners overlap all limits, and, as we understand him, that there are no such "natural areas" as are pointed out. "If," he says, "on passing from the Griffin's tail to his head we found ourselves among a different system of houses, among people requiring separate drainage, lighting, ventilation, traffic arrangements, and so forth, there would be good reason why one government should end, and another begin with that interesting beast." Well, at the particular place where Temple Bar used to stand, there may be nothing to indicate different requirements or government on the part of those persons who reside in Fleet Street or in the Strand, but in the first place the same may be said for the people in Manchester and Salford, or, for that matter, for the people in all the towns of England. Light, water, drainage, are equally necessary to the inhabitants of Glasgow and Bristol, but that is not a reason why these places should have a common municipal government, and further, we are content for this matter to rest on the finding of the Commissioners of 1854, on a matter which is besides common knowledge that there are no common interests in the inhabitants which live in the furthest extremities of this great town, and that unless there is community of interest and intimate local knowledge, local government might as well cease to be. The second objection to this view is that which is advanced by Sir William Harcourt, when he says that if the District Councils had independent authority and powers conferred upon them, "it would be impossible to control them or to bring them into harmony with each other." Well, it is an odd thing to hear a Liberal Minister talking about "controlling" a body which has been freely elected by the ratepayers. It is for the electors to control their representatives, and not for any central body or other extraneous authority. As for the harmony which he desires, it may be a good or a bad thing. If the places have similar wants, it is probable that they will be dealt with by the local authorities in the same way; but if the wants are not the same any such harmony as he desiderates would be hurtful to one of the districts in question. What harmony is there between the local government of Leeds and Bradford, and what harmony is necessary? That the powers of the two corporate bodies which administer the affairs of these towns are in harmony it is for the Imperial Parliament to see; but that the two towns should be paved throughout with the same material if the requirements of the traffic in each require a different road material, is a "harmony" which would only result in inconvenience. But while we admit that if such "natural areas" can be found and marked out in the metropolis, it is well that they should govern themselves, we admit that the difficulties of the Boundary Commission which is to draw the limits of each, would be very great. Whether they would be so great as to make the scheme impracticable, we do not say. There is one more matter which, we think, ought to form a prominent feature of any such scheme of reform, and that is that each of the authorities, whether central or local, ought to levy its own rates. No doubt the inconvenience to the ratepayers of having two collections is considerable, but against that we would place the importance that every ratepayer should know what he is paying, and how the money he pays is spent by his representatives. We cannot say whether the scheme which we have sketched is anything like that which will be introduced at no distant date by the Government. We have no authority for our surmises but the published utterances to which we have referred. If we have rightly interpreted the Home Secretary s words, then we understand Lord Salisbury's repudiation of the views of Mr. Firth, and at the same time his willingness to " extend to the districts outside the City, in such fashion as might please them best, those advantages of municipal government which are so largely enjoyed by certain communities throughout this country."

---

* "Some Reasons," &c., p. 8.

† We are not certain that his convictions are as strong as some of the expressions in which he states them. Thus, after stating certain obvious facts, he says:—"Such considerations as these appear to me to incline the balance in favour of Unity, notwithstanding that as regards drainage, water, light, traffic (except the bridges), police, and cleansing, there is no necessity for such Unity."—*Some Reasons*, p. 7.

But while the reform of the Municipal Government of London may not be upon the lines which Mr. Firth and the Municipal Reform League have intended it should run—may, indeed, be upon lines which depart a good way from their main idea in favour of unity—we cannot but acknowledge that it is to their exertions that the ultimate reform will, to a large extent, be due. They have done much to expose the evils—and they are, as we have said, grave and many—of the present system; and when once these were thoroughly appreciated, it was evident that the necessary reform could not "be long postponed." He who lets light into an error is almost as great a benefactor as he who ultimately does the right thing. Whether the present Government will, in this matter of the municipal reform of London, do the right thing or not, it is difficult in our present twilight to say; but that the Municipal Reform League has furthered the good, the excellent work of reform, we unhesitatingly assert.

II.—GOVERNMENT AND COMMERCE.

1. *First Report of the Royal Commission on Loss of Life at Sea.* London. 1886.
2. *Third Report of the Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade and Industry.* London. 1886.
3. *A Review of the History of the Load-Line Question.* By B. MARTELL, Esq. London. 1886.

IT may be safely laid down as a very general rule that the less a Government interferes with trade the better. A Government, through its consular agents, can lend immense assistance to commerce by collecting from different parts of the world the latest information as to the movements of markets, and the peculiarities of taste and custom in foreign countries. Until quite recently our consuls did remarkably little in this direction. English consular reports were models of pretty nearly everything that a consular report should not be, and to make them still more useless they were seldom published until six, nine or even twelve months after they were written. Thanks to Lord Rosebery and Mr. Bryce there has been a decided change for the better since 1885. In particular, British consuls are beginning to send home specimens of the wares for which there is a demand in foreign markets. By-and-by, when this most wholesome practice has become more general, the Foreign Office will perhaps find a place in London where such objects as these can be conveniently collected and exhibited. Possibly the Imperial Institute which is to be located in Westminster might be utilized for this purpose. The organization of a first-rate Intelligence Department is probably the only way in which a Government can actively assist commerce. It can of course supply help and protection to British traders abroad—a thing which is not always done in England; but this is a primary duty incumbent upon all Governments, and which is expected not only by traders, but by every subject of the Crown who goes beyond the Queen's dominions. I will take a case which recently came under my notice as an illustration, to show that British traders abroad are *not* protected by the Government. Some questions were asked in the House of Commons last July with reference to the grievances of a British trader—a Mr. John Godden—against the Dutch Government. It appears that this gentleman was the freeholder of a tract of land, and held the lease of another part of an estate in the island of Curacao, one of the Dutch West India Islands off the northern coast of Venezuela, and he has a concession from the Government of another estate—called Serro Colorado—in the Dutch island of Aruba, sixty or seventy miles from Curacao. From a portion of the Aruba estate he obtains rock phosphate, which he exports and sends to Europe. A few years ago he left the island, and since then, on the showing of all those acquainted officially or unofficially with the facts, he has been subjected to a series of gross acts of oppression by the Local Government. Among other things he is very enormously overtaxed on an assessment which positively has been settled by a Commission composed of his trade rivals and of Government employés, although the Dutch law of Curacao specifies that an independent tribunal shall be appointed. The object no doubt is to crush out English enterprise in a Dutch possession. The victim constructed in 1875—and at his own expense, although partly no doubt for his own purposes—a harbour, at an expense of £25,000, and he has since maintained it at an annual cost of £1,000, but in this very harbour the poor man has to pay dues to the Government for all the ships chartered by him to enter it. In every possible way his trade has been crippled, harassed, and injured, but Lord Rosebery would do nothing more for him—that resolute, strong Minister, whose praises are unceasingly sung in every Liberal organ in England—than to represent his wrongs "unofficially" to the Government of the Hague. It was a futile and foolish proceeding, which could do no possible good. It remains to be seen whether Lord Salisbury will do better in this particular case—which is a striking addendum to the *Nisero* business—a proof that although Englishmen are energetic enough in foreign markets, they sorely need a few statesmen to help them in Downing Street. As it is, England is governed by permanent officials—in other words, by clerks. Every now and again the clerks run the coach of state into a rut, and then our General Gordons and Sir Frederick Robertses have to be sent out in hot haste to get the coach out of the rut. Beyond this most vital duty of protecting British traders abroad—a duty it is certainly not discharging now—the Foreign Office cannot do much more for trade except perhaps to organize a really good Consular Intelligence Department. When this has been accomplished it will have done pretty nearly all that it can do for commerce, except that highest of all services, to leave it alone. It has been suggested that commercial museums could with great advantage be established by the State. Commercial museums when properly conducted have undoubtedly their uses, but it is an open question whether far too much is not expected of them. The London Chamber of Commerce, like most institutions of its kind, is not a very practical body; but it recently took the very wise step of despatching its Secretary, Mr. Murray, to the Continent, to examine some of these commercial museums on the spot. His opinion is that as yet they have "hardly passed from the theoretical to the practical;" nevertheless he is in favour of establishing one or more of them in this country. He considers that if specimens of the various kinds, patterns and colours of articles manufactured here every year could be brought together they would form a valuable historical collection. The question is whether historical collections of this kind would have the slightest effect upon trade. "The great value, however, of a trade museum," he observes, "especially if organized with branches in the industrial centres, would be a medium of technical education to the industrial population;" for they would show working men that they are not the only clever producers in the world. The difficulty is that it is not primarly the working man who needs to be educated. It is his employer. It is notorious that the greatest obstacle to British trade abroad is the deep-rooted conservatism of British manufacturers. It would be easy enough to compile, as the *Times* did the other day, a small army of extracts from consular reports to show that our hold upon many markets has been lost simply for the want of flexibility and adaptability on the part of British houses. When the manufacturer has found out what kind of an article he must make, there need be no difficulty about making it. The Secretary of the London Chamber of Commerce has only an exceedingly vague idea what sort of a commercial museum he would set up. His most powerful contention in their favour is this very pretty little remark: "The great argument in favour of ourselves testing the utility of commercial museums is that they cannot do harm, while they may possibly do a wonderful amount of good." He is not quite certain in the meantime that they are of such practical benefit abroad as many people have supposed. The largest of them and the best organized is the one in Brussels, formed to "promote and extend the export trade of the kingdom, and to collect such samples of raw materials as are or might be utilized by native industry." The samples are collected by Belgian ambassadors and consuls abroad, and great care is taken to obtain the manufacturers' prices at the place of production. This is really a highly laudable scheme provided it be carried out well; but it seems that "in some quarters the very existence of the museum was unknown to Belgian merchants, and that others were sceptical or indifferent to its objects." At Hamburg and Berlin it is found that the large merchants prefer to keep whatever information they can get to themselves. In most cases continental commercial museums are simply export agencies, where sales of goods are effected on commission. This, of course, is a plan which would never answer in this country. A first-rate commercial museum on the Brussels lines would be a very useful institution to a certain extent—and only to a certain extent—if British consuls were in all cases men of practical business knowledge. They are not so now, and the result is that although an expert in a given trade could find out in a few minutes the peculiarities of a particular market, consuls, who are not usually experts in any one trade—still less in all of them—are quite unable to supply that highly technical information which the British manufacturer requires. There is another consideration, too, which ought to be borne in mind. When a man discovers what he imagines to be a new product or a new market, he naturally seeks to make something out of the discovery for himself. He is not in the least likely to communicate his discovery to a consul, who in his turn would proceed to proclaim it on the housetops. Before, then, a commercial museum can be of permanent value, British consuls of the future must be trained to understand the wares sold in the markets where they are to be sent. Even then, when a commercial museum has been established, it could only be kept up to the mark by a very energetic and far-sighted commercial department of the State, and that is precisely what we do not possess in this country.

Few nations in the world are so unbusinesslike in their methods of government as the English. Take for instance that remarkable institution known as the "Board of Trade." I have said that Government cannot do very much directly to promote trade, but it can do much to hinder it, and the "Board of Trade" is a case in point. Its history and its constitution are alike curious. To begin with, there is no "Board" in existence. Early in the fourteenth century it was found necessary to have a consultative Board to assist Parliament in its deliberations with respect to trade. It was little more than a body of what we should call assessors. Oliver Cromwell was the first to conceive the idea of creating a permanent Board of Trade. In 1655 he appointed his son Richard, with many heads of the Council, judges, and other gentlemen, and about twenty merchants of London, York, Newcastle, Yarmouth, Dover, and other places, to meet and consider by what means the traffic and navigation of the Republic could be promoted and regulated. The Dutch were very much afraid lest this committee might injure their trade, but it does not appear to have taken any serious action. In Adolphus' "State of the British Empire" it is stated that "a Committee of Trade was some time since erected in England, which we then feared would have proved very prejudicial to our trade, but we are glad to see that it is only nominal, so that we hope in time those in London will forget that ever they were merchants." We have not quite done that, but it certainly has not been due to the exertions of the Board of Trade. On the 7th November, 1660, Charles the Second instituted by patent a Council of Trade for the purpose of obtaining information as to the imports and exports of the country and improving trade. On the 1st of the following December he created a Council of Foreign Plantations, which was the germ of the Colonial Office. On the 16th September, 1672, the King by patent constituted a standing council to take charge of the welfare of the colonies and plantations, and of the trade and navigation of the King's dominions, domestic and foreign, and of the colonies. Lord Shaftesbury was the president and Lord Culpepper the vice-president of this council. In December, 1675, however, their commission was revoked, and their duties were taken over by the Privy Council. William the Third revived this trade council in 1695, under the title of the Board of Trade and Plantations, the object being "the promotion of the trade of the kingdom generally and the inspecting of the plantations in America and elsewhere." John Locke was one of the lords commissioners appointed by the original patent, but he resigned long before his death.

We hear very little more of a Board of Trade until 1768, when a Secretary for the Colonies was appointed and the control of the colonies was taken away from the Board of Trade and Plantations. In 1779 Edward Gibbon, M.P. for Liskeard, was appointed one of the lords commissioners, a post he held for three years. The department was as little respected then as it is now. Speaking in 1780, Edmund Burke described it as "a sort of gently ripening hothouse where eight members of Parliament receive salaries of a thousand a year in order to mature at the proper season a claim for two thousand." He considered that the Board "made one among those showy and specious impositions which one of the experiment-making administrations of Charles II. held out to delude the people, and to be substituted in the place of the real service which they might expect from a Parliament annually sitting. It was intended also to corrupt that body whenever it should be permitted to exist. It was projected in the year 1668, and it continued in a tottering and ricketty condition for about three or four years, for it died in the year 1673 (there is a confusion of dates here), a babe of as little hopes as ever swelled the bills of mortality in the articles of convulsed or overlaid children who have hardly stepped over the threshold of life. It was buried with little ceremony, and never more thought of until the reign of King William." His motion for the abolition of the Board of Trade was carried, and in 1782, by the statute 22 George III., c. 82, its powers were given to such committees as His Majesty might appoint. When the American colonies revolted, that year, the House of Commons apparently came to the conclusion that England's colonial empire was lost for ever. . The secretaryship of the colonies was accordingly abolished, and its duties were transferred to the Home Office. This arrangement continued until 1801, when the colonial business was handed over to the War Office, which was styled the "Department for War and the Colonies." In 1780 an Order in Council was issued which for the first time regulated the constitution of what we now call the Board of Trade. That Order was issued on the 23rd August, and it appointed a new committee of the Privy Council in the room of one nominated two years before. It was to consist of the following members:—The Archbishop of Canterbury, the First Lord of the Treasury, the First Lord of the Admiralty, His Majesty's principal Secretaries of State, the Chancellor and Under-Treasurer of the Exchequer, the Speaker of the House of Commons, such Privy Councillors as should hold the offices of Chancellor of the Duchy, Paymaster-General, Treasurer of the Navy, the Master of the Mint, the Speaker of the Irish House of Commons (who is still a member, I presume, of the present "Board"), Lord Frederick Campbell, the Bishop of London, Lord Grantley, Sir Lloyd Kenyon (Master of the Rolls), and, some others. Lord Hawkesbury, Chancellor of the Duchy, was the first president, his deputy being the Right Hon. William Wyndham Grenville. This Order still regulates the composition of the "Board," of which the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, and the Speaker of the Irish House of Commons remain members. In practice a new president of the non-existent "Board" is appointed by a minute of the Privy Council. Thus in 1878, when Lord Sandon received this office, the following memorandum of the transaction was made:—

> At the Court at Windsor, the 4th day of April, 1878.
> Present,
> The Queen's Most Excellent Majesty in Council.
>
> Her Majesty in Council was this day pleased to appoint the Right Honourable Dudley Francis Stuart Ryder, commonly called Viscount Sandon, President of the Committee of Council for Trade.

Four days later another memorandum was made:

> Privy Council Office, 8th April, 1878.
>
> This day the oath of President of the Board of Trade was taken by the Right Honourable Francis Stuart Ryder, commonly called Viscount Sandon. C. L. PEEL.

The creation of the offices of President and Vice-President was never specially authorized by an Act of Parliament, but the payment of their salaries, which were not to exceed £2,000 per annum, payable out of the Fee Fund of the Council Office, was sanctioned by the 57 George III. c. 32, and the 57 George III. c. 66. In 1867 the Vice-Presidency was abolished, and in his place was substituted a Parliamentary Secretary having a seat in the House of Commons.

Let us see how this curious institution works. The "Board" of Trade is another name for a mere system of patronage, worked by a President assisted by a number of more or less able clerks, like Mr. Calcraft, Mr. Gray, and Mr. Trevor. Since the days of George the Fourth, new duties have accumulated at a most alarming rate. Bankruptcy, electric lighting, steamboats, railways and gas are only a few of the subjects with which the Board of Trade has to deal. With regard to shipping, the Marine Department has practically handed over the whole of its functions—beyond its purely red tape administrative duties—to Lloyd's Register. There was a time, not long ago either, when Sir Digby Murray, as representing the Board of Trade, tried to grapple with the load-line question; but the task quickly proved to be far too serious for the official mind to grapple with. In his famous Memorandum, heralding the advent of the Merchant Shipping Bill, Mr. Chamberlain adverted to the almost insuperable difficulties in the way of dealing successfully with the load-line question. Mr. Martell and Lloyd's Register, of which organization he is the trusted Chief Surveyor, have grappled with the problem successfully, and the Board of Trade is quite content to have it so. This transference to a voluntary organization of one of the functions of the State is a significant proof that the Board of Trade officials are at last learning the true Platonic wisdom—the knowledge that in all practical business matters they are terribly ignorant. The recent history of the question is interesting. Shortly before the issue of Lloyd's Register Tables of Freeboard, the Board of Trade issued approximate rules for freeboard, which had been drawn up by Sir Digby Murray some few years previously, for the purpose of forming points of departure for the Board's officers in determining whether vessels coming under their notice were overladen. As at first published, Sir Digby Murray's rules were based, like many previous rules, on so many inches of freeboard per foot depth of hold, the number of inches varying for steamers with the length, and for sailing vessels with the tonnage under deck. The latter were subsequently altered so as to conform in principle with the rule for steamers; and later on the moulded depth was substituted for the depth of hold, the inches per foot being correspondingly modified. According to those rules vessels of the "well"-decked type were held by the owners of such vessels to be very harshly treated, a trifling deduction only being made from the freeboard for substantial superstructure covering the principal part of the main deck. It was, in fact, the attempt to put Sir Digby Murray's rule for the freeboard of "well-" decked vessels into force which led to the appointment of the Load-line Committee. These rules were stated to be very unequal in their application, and gave rise to much dissatisfaction and protest from the owners of this style of vessel. The Board of Trade were requested by the Chamber of Shipping to recognise Lloyd's tables, and not detain a vessel which had their line marked on her sides and was not loaded beyond this. Mr. Chamberlain refused to give any such undertaking, which was the more to be deplored, seeing that no officer of the Board appeared to feel himself justified in detaining a vessel being so marked, or was instructed not to do so. The result of this friction between the Board of Trade and the shipowning community was the appointment of the Load-line Committee. In December 1883 was issued a circular by the Board, containing the following questions for the proposed Committee's consideration:—1. Whether it is now practicable to frame any general rules concerning freeboard which will prevent dangerous overloading without unduly interfering with trade. 2. If so, whether any, and which of the existing tables, with any and what alterations, or any other and what tables should be adopted. 3. How far any such tables can be adopted as fixed rules, and what amount of discretion must be left to the officers who have to see that they are complied with. They met for the first time on January 29, 1884, when it was decided to visit, in the first place, the chief ports in the country, for the purpose of hearing the views of shipowners, ship captains, and officers, as well as seamen, regarding the loading of the classes of vessels with which they were severally conversant. On the return of the Committee to London, the evidence of a large number of persons was received, after which the members of the Committee devoted themselves to the preparation of the rules and tables which have since been made public. With tables of freeboard arranged for first-class flush-decked vessels, which first occupied their attention, and also for awning-decked vessels, it became a comparatively easy task to determine the amount of deduction from the freeboard to be made in respect of erections upon deck. When those erections are of a substantial character, the amount of additional immersion for any vessel is made to depend upon that allowed for a complete awning deck on a vessel of the same size, and also upon the ratio borne by the combined length of the erections to the length of the vessel. In spar-decked vessels, which in external appearance are similar to flush-decked and awning-decked types, the structural strength ranges between these two classes of vessels. The load draught of such vessels should obviously be regulated with reference to the structural strength alone, because, when loaded to the draught at which they are strained to the same extent as three-decked vessels, the percentage of reserve buoyancy must be greater than that necessary for the latter description of vessel. Exhaustive calculations were made at Lloyd's Register respecting the strength of spar-decked vessels for the purpose of determining the suitable load draught on the above basis, and the tables of freeboard issued by that body were framed in accordance with the results of those calculations. It is satisfactory to know that independent investigations, subsequently undertaken at the instance of the Board of Trade, fully corroborated their correctness, and they were accepted by the Load-line Committee. The report and tables of that Committee having been presented to the President of the Board of Trade, it only remained to see how they would be administered. That the tables would be accepted by the Board was never doubted, but the means to be employed to put them in operation was a matter of conjecture. The problem was soon resolved. The Board of Trade wisely decided to hand over the whole duty of administering the rules and tables to Lloyd's Register Committee, a body which, from its representative character, as well as from the knowledge which it alone possesses of the construction and condition of the vast majority of British-owned vessels, is eminently qualified to undertake the arduous and responsible duties thus conferred upon it. When the load-line question had been comfortably handed over to Mr. Martell, Mr. Thomas Gray and the Marine Department of the Board of Trade thought it necessary to get up a new crusade. Mr. Chamberlain had made a number of very grave charges against shipowners in his four hours' speech on the motion for the second reading of the Merchant Shipping Bill. He was compelled to abandon that Bill, but, to save his *amour propre,* a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire whether loss of life at sea is increasing, and whether it is to any extent due to preventible causes. Mr. Thomas Gray became the prosecuting counsel in this investigation. He had a regularly prepared brief before him, from which he enlarged upon the evil doings of shipowners; but unfortunately neither he nor his ally, Mr. Rothery, the Wreck Commissioner, had one single clear glimmering of light as to how the imaginary mischiefs they deplored could be dealt with. The truth is that shipowners are very much like other people. There are black sheep in every profession, but the number of these sombre-hued animals is not greater among shipowners than among any other class. Mr. Gray, who is undoubtedly far and away the ablest man in the Department, showed an excess of loyalty to his late chief, Mr. Chamberlain, and to his present coadjutor, so to speak, the Wreck Commissioner. Mr. Chamberlain has passed away for ever from the Board of Trade; Mr. Rothery, it is said, is about to retire, in order that the singular tribunal over which he presides may be reorganized. Mr. Gray is capable of infinitely better work than to hunt up points to prop up falling politicians and doomed institutions. What a power for good he might be if he were freely and frankly to recognize the need of reform, and were to come over to the camp of the reformers.

One of the best known names connected with the Board of Trade is that of Mr. Giffen, the statistician. He has nothing to do with the so-called Board of Trade returns, which as a matter of fact are prepared by the Custom House, but he moralizes at large about statistics, and his methods are peculiar enough to repay a little study. They are thoroughly characteristic of what happens when a clever official absolutely ignorant of trade matters takes up commerce. In October 1884, for instance, he published an elaborate report on the sugar trade of the world, and this is what he had to say:—

> 1. The production and consumption of sugar have increased enormously in the last thirty years. According to Messrs. Rueb and Ledeboer, who omit certain outlying countries, such as India and China, the increase in production in the countries they enumerate is from 1,423,000 tons in 1853–55 to 3,564,000 tons in 1880–82, and to over 4,000,000 tons at the present time. The increase in each decade over the previous one is 30 per cent., and the amount of the increase has consequently also increased.
>
> 2. The increase is in all classes of sugar, cane as well as beet. British cane sugar has increased from 261,000 tons in 1853–55 to 419,000 tons in 1880–82, and foreign cane sugar from 972,000 to 1,499,000 tons.
>
> 3. The proportion of beet sugar in the production has increased from about 14 per cent. of the total dealt with by Messrs. Rueb and Ledeboer in 1853–55 to 46 per cent. in 1880–82, while the proportion of British cane sugar has declined from 18 to 12 per cent., and that of foreign cane sugar from 68 to 42 per cent. Since 1868, however, there has been no decline in the proportion of British cane sugar, which has remained about 12 per cent., the gain in the proportion of beet since that date having been entirely at the expense of foreign cane sugar. It will be understood that these figures only relate to proportions. In amounts, as stated in paragraph 2, all kinds of sugar have increased, while since 1868 British cane sugar has kept its ground both in proportion and amount.
>
> 4. The increase in British cane sugar is very conspicuous as

regards the West Indies and British Guiana. Since 1877–79, when the former complaints of impending ruin were made, and became the subject of investigation by the Select Committee which sat in 1879–80, the increase, according to Messrs. Rueb and Ledeboer's figures, has been from about 210,000 to 230,000 tons, or 10 per cent.

5. According to a special table prepared independently as to production in British possessions, and which includes some possessions, particularly in the West Indies, omitted by Messrs. Rueb and Ledeboer, the annual production in the whole of the British West Indies and British Guiana in 1877–79 was 5,200,000 cwt.; in 1880–82 it was 5,546,000 cwt.; and in 1883, 5,892,000 cwt., equal to 260,000 277,000, and 295,000 tons.

6. In recent years the beet-producing country which has advanced most is Germany, the increase being from 569,000 tons in 1880–81 to 840,000 tons in 1883–84. Austria-Hungary, which formerly was most complained of in the matter of bounties, has declined in the same period from 498,000 to 415,000 tons. In France, which is not alleged to have given bounties on production in the interval, there is an increase from 333,000 to 425,000 tons.

7. The proportion of the imports of cane sugar into the United Kingdom, and especially of the imports of British cane sugar, has declined since 1853–55, as compared with the imports of beet sugar; but the amount of cane sugar, exclusively of foreign cane sugar, has increased enormously—viz., raw cane sugar from 7,779,000 cwt., or 389,000 tons; in 1853–55 to 12,933,000 cwt., or 647,000 tons in 1880–82, and refined cane sugar from 52,000 to 136,000 cwt. The amount of raw cane sugar imported from British possessions has, however, somewhat declined. The increased production of cane sugar, both in British possessions and abroad, has been mainly disposed of by a largely increased export to the United States and Canada, and by a largely increased consumption in Australia. Since 1849–52 the United States alone has increased its imports from Brazil from 5,000 to 92,000 tons; from Cuba from 102,000 to 492,000 tons; and from British Guiana and the West Indies from a merely nominal figure to 78,000 tons, the share of the West Indies proper being now 43,000 tons, and of British Guiana 35,000 tons. The increase in the imports into the United States has been very rapid in the last few years.

8. The consumption of sugar in the United Kingdom has now reached the enormous total of 1,083,000 tons, equal to 68 pounds per head of the population. This represents an annual expenditure by the people of the United Kingdom on the article amounting to £30,000,000, or about half the amount spent on bread when the wholesale price of wheat is under forty shillings per quarter. The consumption has increased from 15 pounds per head in 1840, and the article from being one of luxury has become a material part of the food of the people, its magnitude being appreciable even when compared with wheat.

9. The interest of the United Kingdom is very much greater than

that of the interests which specially complain. The value of sugar produced in the West Indies at the place of production is probably about £4,500,000, as compared with a value of £30,000,000 consumed by the people of the United Kingdom, while the fixed capital in refining in the United Kingdom is probably about £2,750,000 only. There are also various manufactures in the United Kingdom dependent on cheap sugar.

10. According to the calculations of the anti-bounty agitators before the Select Committee, the excess reduction of price due to the bounties was a farthing per pound, which is equal to 2¾ millions sterling on the consumption of sugar in the United Kingdom. According to a more recent estimate by the West India Committee, the excess reduction at the present time is about £5 per ton, which is a gain of over £5,000,000 annually to the people of the United Kingdom, or more than the entire annual value of the sugar produced in the West Indies, and twice the fixed capital sunk in sugar-refining in the United Kingdom.

11. Sugar gives large and increasing employment to labour in the United Kingdom. According to the Census, sugar refiners have increased in number from 2,820 in 1851 to 4,484 in 1881. Between 1880 and the present time the quantity of sugar refined annually has increased from 700,000 to 800,000 tons, the increase being principally in London. It is ascertained that in the manufacture of jams and confectionery throughout the country over 100,000 tons of refined sugar are used and about 12,000 people employed, while there is additional employment for labour connected with the use of sugar as raw material in biscuit-making, manufacture of mineral waters, brewing, &c.

12. In some of these manufactures the raw material used in preference is a certain quality of foreign refined sugar.

13. As to refining in particular, the above statements as to an increase of the business in recent years are confirmed by figures as to the quantity of raw material available for refining, which show an increase of 320,000 tons in 1854–56 to 400,000 in 1862–64, 650,000 in 1877–79, and over 800,000 tons at the present time.

14. The refining of hard sugar, which is alleged to give more proportionate employment to labour than the refining of other sorts, has rather increased in recent years, from about 55,000 tons in London four years ago to 60,000 tons at the present time.

15. The imports of refined sugar into the United Kingdom have not increased since 1877, though they were larger in 1883 than in intermediate years. There has been some increase in 1884 compared with 1883, particularly from the United States; but up to 1883 there had been nothing in these imports to excite alarm as to the growth of refining in the United Kingdom, and it would be premature yet to discuss the figures of 1884, which is an incomplete year. Further inquiries are being made as to the exports from the United States.

16. The exports of refined sugar, the produce of the United Kingdom, have been maintained, as compared with 1877, and as compared with intermediate years, show an increase—viz., from 45,000 tons in 1879 to 58,000 tons in 1883.

17. Neither France nor Holland, the principal countries of whose bounties on the export of refining complaints have been made in recent years, have increased their exports as compared with what they were ten years ago, though there is a slight increase in the case of Holland, as compared with 1881—viz., from 62,000 tons in 1881 to 72,000 in 1883. This, however, is a small increase compared with the increase of refining in the United Kingdom in the last four years, which is more than the whole exports of refined sugar from Holland at the present time.

18. Sugar has not fallen in price more than other articles. Taking 1882 for comparison with 1861, it is found that tea has fallen more, wheat and cotton about as much, and wool, timber, and rice much more. The great fall in the present year in sugar is quite paralleled by the fall in wheat.

19. It is a fallacy to represent all beet sugar as bounty-fed, and to ascribe the increase in beet production exclusively to bounties. The bounty being on the export only, the maximum quantity of beet sugar receiving bounties cannot be more than the exports from the bounty-giving countries, Austria, Germany, and Belgium, amounting to 700,000 tons, or about 16 per cent. out of a total production, according to Messrs. Rueb and Ledeboer, of 4,200,000 tons, and about 11½ per cent. of the absolute total production of 6,000,000 tons. It is argued that all beet is more or less stimulated by the bounty, then a bounty of £3 per ton, calculated on 700,000 tons, would amount to £1 per ton only on 2,000,000 tons, the total beet production, and would be too insignficant to have the effects alleged. There is no pretence for saying that if the incubus of bounties were removed, natural sources would not at once be developed to supply any void caused by the diminution of bounty-fed production.

20. Similarly the maximum amount of sugar receiving a bounty on refining is about 270,000 tons only, as compared with an annual total of about 3,000,000 tons refined. The amount is too small to affect the predominance of the natural manufacture.

21. The increase in the production and refining of sugar in recent years has not been exclusively in the bounty-fed article. On the contrary, making a comparison for thirty years, it is found that out of a total increase of 2,000,000 tons in the production of sugar, only 700,000 tons have received bounties, while the increase, even in the latter case, may be due to other causes. There is, besides, an increase of 756,000 tons in the production of beet sugar, which must be due to other causes than bounties, while there is an increase of 685,000 tons in cane sugar, of which 158,000 tons is British cane sugar. As regards refining, again, while the total refining with a bounty is still under 300,000 tons, it appears that in the United Kingdom alone the increase from 1862–4 to the present time has been from 400,000 to 820,000 tons, or 420,000 tons—*i.e.*, more than the total quantity of refined sugar which is now alleged to receive a bounty. The increase in the United States also has been as large. The natural trade thus predominates largely over the artificial trade, and there is no fear of

monopoly prices in consequence of the natural trade being killed and the bounty-fed trade taking its place."

Now, this is a very lengthy document to reproduce here; but it is necessary to do so if we are to estimate the practical worth of Mr. Giffen's statistical moralizings. To the average Briton, these fanciful essays on an exaggeration of free trade principles are a profound mystery to be carefully eschewed. The ordinary newspaper reader avoids these portentous and dreary variations on the same everlasting theme that the good of the whole is more than the good of the several parts. The ordinary newspaper reader loses but little, for Mr. Giffen never seems to realize that the welfare of the whole is dependent on the welfare of the parts. Wading through the mass of figures he gives us in the paper I have quoted, what does the whole thing amount to? At the time it was written Java sugar had fallen from 23*s*. 6*d*. per cent. in 1883 to 15*s*. in 1884. Havana No. 12 had dropped from 22*s*. 6*d*. to 13*s*. 6*d*.; French raw beet from 21*s*. to 13*s*.; and German beet from 20*s*. to 10*s*. 9*d*. Imagine how immense must have been the loss and even the ruin entailed on sugar producers in the West Indies, in India, in Germany, in France, and more than all in Russia. In those countries where the industry is fed by bounties, the statesmen who give the bounties are heartily sick of the system, and would probably gladly get rid of it if the vested interests involved were not too powerful. It is a trade in which millions of money have been lost during the past few years, and nowhere has the pinch been more keenly felt than in our West Indian colonies. Foreign bounties have destroyed their prosperity, probably, for all time to come. What has Mr. Giffen to say to this? He commences by pointing out that the production in the West Indies is about four and a half millions, as compared with a total value of thirty millions consumed by the people in the United Kingdom. He forgets that our fellow-countrymen in the West Indies take in return for their sugar our manufactured goods, which they can no longer pay for in the same quantity as before. The Germans will take nothing from us if they can help it. It seems to be a fixed idea in Mr. Giffen's mind—and it is the source of most of his fallacies—that international obligations must necessarily be discharged by an interchange of commodities. He can disabuse himself of that idea by looking at the figures of our export and import trade with Germany. It is true that the balance is covered by securities—Russian and otherwise—which are being freely sold just now in Berlin; but the export of securities is not the same thing as the export of manufactured goods. The former has little or no effect in encouraging our home trade, and the more you starve English industries the smaller will be the production of English securities. It is not clear how Mr. Giffen arrives at his total value of thirty millions. If he multiplies the number of tons given in the Custom House returns by the average market price, and adds to that total the retail dealer's profits, he might get a decent approximation; but how is the thing to be done? On this point and another connected with it I may be permitted to quote the observations of an expert in the sugar trade, writing in a well-known and ably conducted weekly organ of the shipping trade:

> Taking in round numbers the consumption of sugar at 1,000,000 tons, we have no hesitation in saying that the prime cost in this country, if we are to reckon by present prices, has not exceeded £13,000,000; and as foreign bounties are likely to prevent any sensible and sustained rise, we may take it that that is the figure with which we have to deal. Allow £3 per ton for refining or conversion, and there will still be £14,000,000 to be accounted for. Either this is so, or the amount paid by consumers for sugar is not what Mr. Giffen asserts it to be. Now it will be evident to every one that the comparison between four and half millions and thirteen millions would point to a very different conclusion from that presented by the contrast of the smaller sum with thirty millions; and this difference is in the direction of enhancing the relative importance of our West Indian colonies as sugar producers. But the question does not end here. There is our colony of Mauritius—a colony possessing vital importance as a coaling station for the Navy in time of war. The Mauritius produces considerably over 100,000 tons per annum of the very best refined sugar. This production is the basis of a large and active trade. The port is always crowded with shipping engaged in carrying stores of all kinds for the supply of the inhabitants; for the island is one large sugar estate, and, in a commercial sense, nothing else. Grain has to be imported for the mules, and rice, food and clothing for the coolies. Everything, in fact, has to be imported. Unless the bounty system is put an end to, the Mauritius must follow in the wake of the West Indies. Its industry is doomed. It may, owing to its vicinity to the Bombay and Australian markets, hold out a little longer; but in the face of an elastic bounty regulated so as just to beat cane, the ruin of the colony can only be a question of time. The same fate will overtake the rising sugar industries of Fiji and Queensland. This is a heavy sacrifice to make in pursuit of cheap sugar, which, as we have shown, is often in reality, and thanks to low beet, nothing but shoddy sugar. Are we sure that Mr. Giffen's hypothetical gain of £5,000,000, which his brother and superior scribe, Sir Thomas Farrar, recently put at £8,000,000 is really all gain? May there not be another page in the national ledger in which the losses appear? Loss in freights, which are 5*s.* on beet against 40*s.* on cane, loss in value of shipping property consequent on that, loss by the cessation of orders for sugar mills and machinery, loss generally of the great reciprocal trade between England

and her sugar-growing colonies, may figure, and figure too for a large amount. We think there is such a page. . . . Wheat has fallen from 46*s.* to 36*s.*, a decline of about twenty per cent., sugar has fallen from 20*s.* per cwt. to 10*s.*, a decline of 50 per cent. Another fall of 10*s.* would wipe out sugar, but would still leave wheat at 26*s.*; yet Mr. Giffen can see no difference as regards the recent fall between sugar and wheat.*

There is only one thing more to be said about this statistical homily, and that is to observe that its faults are inherent vices in the Board of Trade manner of looking at things. Sir Thomas Farrar was an extreme free-trader. Mr. Giffen caught his inspiration from that gentleman. Whenever he hits upon an idea which is calculated to soothe the poor unfortunates who regret the decay of our West Indian and *entrepôt* trade, it is thrown into a series of numbered paragraphs published in an official form, and duly commented on by a *Times* leader writer who invariably takes refuge in a safe paraphrase of a production he does not understand. In statistics, as in shipping, this department is long behind the age.

Perhaps the greatest of all the recent failures of the Board of Trade is the Bankruptcy Act. Like the Merchant Shipping Bill, this measure was intended to reform commercial morals. It has done nothing of the kind. Every man of business, every practising barrister, knows that there are undischarged bankrupts in shoals trading to-day in the City of London not one penny the worse for their visits to Portugal Street. The evils Mr. Chamberlain's Bill—drawn for him, of course, by Board of Trade officials—had to grapple with may be conveniently illustrated by a story which came out in some bankruptcy proceedings in Glasgow in 1884. Messrs Girdwood and Forrest are, or were, wool-brokers in Glasgow and Bradford. With them Mr. H. E. Sykes, retired wool-stapler in Bradford, and Messrs. Hird and Barnett, wool-spinners, Glasgow, contrived somehow to get hopelessly mixed up. The gross liabilities were said to be: Girdwood and Forrest, £61,342; H. E. Sykes, £14,815; Hird and Barnett, £13,814; but as some of their "assets" included claims by one or other of the three firms on the other two, we are not surprised to be told that their value was doubtful. It appears that in 1879 Mr. Thomas Forrest inherited a good firm name and a moderate business connection as a wool-stapler in Glasgow. In that year he commenced business with a capital of £1,500, but £1,000 of this sum was certainly borrowed, and it was not clear where the other £500 came from. The rest of the story I will quote from a trade journal of January, 1885:

> He exerted himself to such purpose during that year that he lost

---

* "Fairplay."

£308. In 1880 he thinks he made £919, but in 1881 he lost £216. As the wool-broking business was clearly not very profitable, he turned his attention to grain-store keeping, with the result that in 1879–81 he lost £1,000. Adding up the total profits and losses of the three years, Mr. Forrest was £677 worse off in April, 1881, than when he was Girdwood and Forrest in 1879; but at this very period he calculates his capital to have been £371 1*s.* 5*d.* It may have been an admiration of Mr. Forrest's system of book-keeping, which was searching enough to include even the odd coppers, that induced Mr. W. W. Sykes, son of Mr. H. E. Sykes, of Bradford, to join him as a partner. Mr. Forrest contributed his capital of £376 1*s.* 5*d.*, without deducting from it the £1,000 he still owed; and Mr. Sykes, being worth £495 0*s.* 1*d.*, undertook to find £10,000. As a contribution to this sum, he includes £750 in house property, which, unfortunately, his father now claims, and Mr. Sykes, sen., also makes out that his son was indebted to him for several thousands, in the shape of cash advanced or guaranteed to the bank. Mr. Sykes, sen., retired from business in 1872, and, since then, has contented himself with backing his son. He left £12,000 in the business, and the worthy couple, in addition to this, appear to have done a good deal of clever financing. He also amused his leisure moments in speculations in real property and on the Stock Exchange, and his operations were so extensive that in April, 1881, his account was considerably overdrawn. By the end of 1883 Mr. W. W. Sykes owed the Glasgow firm £14,000, and, as Mr. Sykes, sen., at one time owed the Bradford Bank £13,000, it is not surprising to find unkind people suggesting that the one loss had a good deal to do with the other. Early in 1884 Mr. Sykes, jun., feeling it necessary to do something, decided upon liquidating this debt by making Mr. Forrest a partner in the Bradford firm. In other words, he was to become a debtor to himself, a fact he forgot to mention to his bankers; nor did he tell them that he and Mr. Sykes were the sole partners of certain other concerns in Broxtowe and Scarborough, on which he drew bills and discounted them. Hird and Barnett continued to buy wool from Girdwood and Forrest, which was paid for by bills that were continually renewed. At last the time came when Hird and Barnett wanted to stop, but Mr. Sykes, sen., would not hear of it. He undertook to be security for their debt to Messrs. Girdwood and Forrest, providing they would sign bills to the tune of £5,000—purely as a matter of form, of course. We can quite understand that when these pieces of paper were duly drawn up Mr. Sykes "showed anxiety to get away," and, when the crash ultimately came, there were £20,000 worth of bills to rank against Hird and Barnett's estate.*

I have cited this case at length—knowing something perhaps about the above articles—because it shows that the canker the Board of Trade had to deal with when it framed the Bankruptcy Act was loose, reckless speculation. Speculation of that kind is more rampant in the City of London to-day than it ever was, and the gentlemen who indulge in it are not over minute in their inquiries as to the financial antecedents of their co-speculators. The Board of Trade may reply that you cannot stop this kind of thing by Act of Parliament. You cannot. I quite agree with the view that honesty in business must be left to the individual conscience and to the individual vigilance; but if that is so, why pass new Bankruptcy Acts with immense flourishes of trumpets, as if a sovereign remedy had been found at last for all the ills from which the City is smarting?

---

* *British Trade Journal*, January, 1885.

I have left myself no space to deal with the action of the Board of Trade respecting railway rates. That is a question which is to come before the House of Commons next session, and therefore I may have another opportunity of dealing with a deeply important and very intricate question. For the present it is enough to point out that, in every respect where it has come into contact with the practical business life of the nation, the Board of Trade has broken down. It is supposed that the Royal Commission on Loss of Life at Sea intends to make proposals for a complete reconstruction of the Marine Department. A project has often been mooted for the establishment of a shipping council of practical men to advise the President, and possibly this scheme may be revived. I hope, if ever such a council is created, it will consist of tried representatives of every trade in the country; for if that were done, they would simply make it their business to keep the Board of Trade quiet. The highest wisdom as regards Government interference with trade is not to interfere at all. By all means let us have a genuine, living Board of Trade; for, whenever that institution comes into existence, it will see, for instance, that shipowners are no longer harassed by ridiculous legislation, and that the hundred and one Acts of Parliament relating to them are boiled down to a reasonable and workable compass. This is a question of far greater importance than the establishment of any imperial institute or commercial museum. Unless a commercial museum is under first-rate management, it quickly becomes a mere lumber room. There are plenty of sharp people all over the world who are on the look-out for new products, or for a new use of an old product; but when a discovery of this kind is made, the finder does not send it to a commercial museum. Merchants and manufactures must find out for themselves what is in use in other countries, and this can only be done by sending out men who can detect at a glance the difference between the article they make and the article required by the foreigner. A commercial museum, with full control of the consular service in the hands of a competent man familiar with foreign trade, could be made into a great success. At present it is *in nubibus*, and the best thing that could be done with the Imperial Institute, as the only concrete form of the idea before the public mind, would be to drop it. But the Board of Trade and its endless blundering is ever with us, and it is time that blundering were toned down somewhat by the kindly advice and influence of a genuine "Board" of business men. Much has been heard of the official *Journal* it has recently issued, and undoubtedly that publication is a step—certainly a very small one—in the right direction. It will be interesting, I imagine, to newspaper proprietors, to know what objects the department has in trying to make this print into a trade journal, competing with private enterprise, although it is subsidized, and, in fact, entirely supported by the Government. The other day I saw a circular, of which I append a copy:—

Private and Confidential.

Royal Arms.

"THE BOARD OF TRADE JOURNAL."

The Official Organ of the Board of Trade.

HER Majesty's Government, acknowledging the long-felt want of English Merchants, Shippers, and those interested in the commerce of the Empire for authentic information and statistics respecting the Trade of the World and the requirements of foreign countries, as well as our colonies, have instructed the British Consuls and representatives abroad to report on these subjects fully and regularly.

The information thus received, "for which the *Gazette* is hardly a suitable form of publication," and "which is not included in the Trade and Navigation Returns," has formed the basis for a Journal entitled "THE BOARD OF TRADE JOURNAL."

The immense importance of this Journal will at once be seen. Through its publication the export trade of this country will speedily develop, and Manufacturers and Shippers will no longer risk sending out their goods to places for which they are not suited, and for which there is no sale, but from month to month will know the exact requirements of the various trade centres, together with other information that will enable them to ship goods to the best advantage and with a minimum of risk.

The Board of Trade has decided, in order to make the purpose for which "THE BOARD OF TRADE JOURNAL" is intended more perfect, *to allow a limited number of approved advertisements to appear in its pages.* These advertisements will bring the various Manufacturers directly before the notice of Shippers and the Agents abroad who require the goods.

The advertisement pages being limited, applications will be entertained in the order received; and when the allotted space is filled, the names of applicants who have been unsuccessful will be registered in the order received, and inserted in the Journal as other advertisers fall out.

All advertisements should be sent direct to the Sole Agents, Messrs. JUDD AND Co., LIMITED, as no discounts can be allowed to Advertising Agents or others.

Besides the large general sale which this Journal commands in the Commercial World, the Board of Trade sends a copy of each issue to—

- Official List:
  - Board of Trade.
  - Admiralty.
  - War Office.
  - Home Office.
  - Treasury.
  - Trinity House and other Government Offices.
- Chambers of Commerce.
- Foreign Government Bureaux of Statistics, &c.
- Colonial Governments.
- Colonial Statistical Authorities.
- Trades Union Congress.
- Consular and Diplomatic Service.
  - Ambassadors.
  - Ministers.
  - Chargés d'Affaires.
  - Consuls-General.
  - Consuls, &c. &c.

Messrs. Sole Agents for Advertisements,
London, E.C.

What have newspaper and magazine proprietors to say to this? They will resent, I fancy, the attempt to create a big salary for somebody by unfair competition with private persons.

ROBERT J. GRIFFITHS.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

THEOLOGY.

THE author of "Philochristus" still preserves a transparent veil of anonymity; his new book, "The Kernel and the Husk,"[1] contains a full exposition of his doctrine of "Spiritual Christianity"—that is, Christianity without any miraculous element. It is written in the form of letters, from "one who has for many years found peace and salvation in the worship of a non-miraculous Christ," to an imaginary young man, whose objections are more or less admirably answered. The volume was, it appears, undertaken at the request of a dying Agnostic clergyman, who besought the writer to "give young men a religion that would wear." It falls into two parts, one destructive, the other constructive. The first deals with the miracles, from the Immaculate Conception to the Resurrection, a subject to which the author of "Philochristus" has given much study, and he is able to marshal his arguments against them with much force and "sweet reasonableness." It is when we turn to the constructive portion that the reasonableness ceases to be quite obvious. We are told that "imagination is a factor in all knowledge; my imagination asserts the Fatherhood of God." But how if some one else's imagination refuses to assert the Fatherhood of God? The Fatherhood of God cannot accommodate itself to both imaginations. Imagination undoubtedly opens a door, but the disadvantage of it surely is that it opens such a very large door; it certainly will not keep the miracles out. Another favourite and dangerous abstraction of our author's is Illusion; he finds that illusions "work;" the belief in Satan is illogical, he thinks, but he accepts it because he finds that it works; illusions fall away, "but men are on the whole the better for them." This game of illusion, however, is one at which two can play, and if one throws away the husk another may find that the kernel is formed of very similar tissue. There is, too, the initial question as to which is husk and which kernel. The author of "Philochristus," after he has demolished the physical Resurrection of Christ, finds in his hands a curious spiritual resurrection, which to some eyes may look very much like husk. "As God reveals the laws of astronomy through imaginative Reason, so He has revealed the Resurrection of Christ through imaginative Faith." A series of Definitions is appended to the volume—and for this we are grateful, for few writers realize the necessity of defining their fundamental conceptions—but very little light is thrown on this large statement. A curious conception of "spirit" may be found in the book; it is defined as "the Cause of Force in the human individual;" every one, we are told, has a "spirit" that may possibly be outside him—"say, at a point six feet, or six miles, above me; or away in Jupiter, or Saturn, or down at the earth's centre; or it may be incapable of occupying space." "I myself firmly believe that there was a spiritual act of Jesus simultaneous with the conveyance of the manifestation to the brain of the Apostle," at his conversion which is admitted to be subjective. But powerful manifestations have been conveyed to the brain of some persons from other potent personalities at a distance, as, to mention a living man, Whitman. Are we to believe that the surely substantial "spirit" of the sage of Camden, New Jersey, performed at the moment some mysterious act which was the cause of that mental impression? This is, however, an able, eloquent, and earnest book; it deserves attention because it represents a phase of religious feeling which will probably occupy a considerable place in the future history of Christianity. In some respects it answers to the attempts of the Neo-Platonists to give new life to the expiring classic gods, to amalgamate something of the old spirit with something of the new, and it may possibly grow to the same importance: just as the Neo-Platonists sought to take truth by storm through ecstasy, so their modern successors make use of imagination and the sense of mystery. That such an attempt, useful as it may be in a period of transition, will be widely successful, may well be doubted. In the last letter of the volume, on "The Religion of the Masses," the author of "Philochristus" seems vaguely to realize the mighty movements that are beginning to stir the masses; he thinks that when they realize what sort of person Jesus was they will turn to him; but, as a matter of fact, the intelligent among the "masses" do realize the character of the Nazarene carpenter's son of tradition; but they realize also that that is at best a matter of ancient history. The style of this book has what we may call a sanguine and impulsive temperament, which is attractive, but occasionally grows over-hasty. Were it not for St. Paul's vision (*i.e.*, for Christianity), "the world might be a chaos of barbarism," we are told. It is easy to reply that the world might possibly have been much better off, but this saying, if it means anything at all, testifies to a peculiar philosophy of history. The author is unable to recall the name of the zoetrope when using it as an illustration: this is pardonable, but we supposed that every one nowadays knew that the spectroscope is a very different instrument. Again, who is the typical Agnostic (elsewhere spoken of with deep respect) who would "reject the Scriptures *in toto*, because it would be so very inconvenient to weigh evidence and discriminate the true from the false?"

---

[1] "The Kernel and the Husk. Letters on Spiritual Christianity." By the Author of "Philochristus." London: Macmillan. 1886.

Carthago delenda est! That is the sentence pronounced by Professor Pierson and S. A. Naber[2] on the current belief that the beginnings of the Gospel are set forth in the New Testament. Christian antiquity is a far more ancient thing than is dreamt of in our theology. The New Testament furnishes ground for archæological research; it is a kind of Mycenæ; we shall not find Agamemnon, but we shall come across much that is ancient and of interest; we shall not find the Apostle Paul, but we shall find a Bishop Paul, who will explain much to us; we shall not find Christ, but we shall find the forms in which he was afterwards clothed—a number of Christs (six are enumerated) pieced together in a mosaic of which we may to some extent trace the outlines. Not that the dates of the New Testament books should be placed later than they now are by the best critics; let it be granted that the Epistle to the Romans was written about A.D. 60; nevertheless, the antique fragments which the Epistles and Gospels present to us are not conspicuous for their freshness; they are worn with long use and removed from their original sites. This is the burden of the message delivered by Dr. Pierson and his colleague, uniting their theological and philological powers in "Verisimilia," written—according to the tradition still to some extent retained by Dutch scholars—in Latin, in a style that is fresh and vigorous. They submit to an acute and detailed analysis the Epistles to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans; all these are considered to be of a composite character, and largely formed of fragments of devout Jewish writings founded on a faith in the *parousia* of the Son of Man, predicted by Daniel, and representing the beliefs of such Jews as Cornelius the Centurion, and perhaps still better, though he is not named, of Simeon. These fragments, Jewish in spirit and closely moulded on the Book of Daniel, were, they consider, edited by a Christian, whom they call Bishop Paul, much in the same way as the "Pilgrim's Progress" has been edited for the use of Roman Catholics; Bishop Paul may have written some of them himself before he became a Christian, and then adapted them to Christian use. The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, regarded as specially corrupt, they consider to contain no Jewish fragments; it was compiled at a late date from various fragments of episcopal letters, some being by Bishop Paul. An interesting section of the work deals with the alleged influence of the worship of Dionysus on the fourth Gospel, with its peculiar insistance on the symbolism of wine and the grape. Parallel passages from the "Bacchæ" of Euripides, and from Pausanius, Plutarch, &c., are brought forward, tending to show that the purest elements in the worship of Bacchus were transferred to the Christian religion, the bond of connection being the title *Logos*, which appears to have been applied to the *person* of a god, even in the case of Mercury. An interesting attempt is also made to sketch the outlines of the six images of Christ which these writers trace in the New Testament.

---

[2] "Verisimilia. Laceram Conditionem Novi Testamenti Exemplis illustrarunt et ab origine repetierunt." A. Pierson et S. A. Naber. Amstelodami: Apud P. U. Van Kampen & Fil. 1886.

Many years ago F. W. Newman advocated the doctrine of the immortality of the soul; it was, however, he tells us, "to me only a religious theory, not a personal, pressing question; hence, after saying my say, I was quickly absorbed in other ample lines of thought and inquiry. Misgivings as to the fundamental Christian assumption are with me of very old date." In this pamphlet,[3] written in brief sections, vigorous and incisive, he finally breaks with the old doctrine. He starts from the maxim of the Stoic Panætius, "Whatever is born perishes," which he now accepts, and he also recognizes the futility of the supposed "moral argument," since the same argument would involve the necessity of constant miracles—miracles, which, it is obvious, would work very badly. He points out the fatal part which the creed of Protestantism has played in paralyzing effort after a better present, and sums up his moral aim in the words of a Scotch preacher: "To leave the world *better and bonnier* by reason of our having been born in it." A large field is swiftly passed over in this pamphlet; the arguments, in the concluding words, "assert that the doctrine of Heaven and Hell has its source, not in Christianity, much less in Judaism, but in a shallow and monstrous Oriental theosophy. They plead that this doctrine is not only unproved but unprovable; that the idea of Hell or fiery Purgatory is wholly pernicious, and that of Heaven (variously and on the whole) far from harmless." Perhaps Plato is treated with a little too much contempt: it may be remarked that his doctrine of reminiscence, however absurd in its crude form, has a basis of scientific truth, and the child is really remembering what his ancestors have learned. Newman's theism seems to remain unaltered, as a "Universal Mind," which appears to be personal and providential; there are, however, some indications that he faintly realizes something awkwardly incongruous and ghost-like about this conception.

The weaver of Mayilâpûr, known as Tiruvalluvar, is scarcely even a name to most people. He was, nevertheless, one of the great moral lawgivers of the race, and is still revered by the ten million inhabitants of Southern India who speak Tamil. It is curious that both his name and his work are without name; the name he is known by simply means "the sacred devotee." We only know that he was a pariah and a weaver, who lived probably in the ninth century, at what is now a suburb of Madras, Mayilâpûr ("the town of peacocks") or St. Thomé—at which there was a Christian community founded, according to a late tradition, by St. Thomas—and that he had an intimate friend who was a sea-captain. His "Kurral"[4] (which simply means *couplet*) is written throughout in short stanzas, and deals with the whole range of life into which morals or religion can enter; there are also some books on love, which are purely poetic and passionate. Tiruvalluvar has been claimed by many sects, but does not fit into any; he has most affinity with the Jains. What is most remarkable about his morality seems to be its peculiar breadth, its harmonious reconciliation of distinct ideals. On the one hand, it is to a slight extent mystical, having Buddhistic tendencies, and he teaches that it is not right to kill even in self-defence; on the other hand, he dwells constantly on the active and practical virtues, and on the ordinary duties of daily life. Taken as a whole, the "Kurral" is very attractive—though it is generally without the vivid flashes which make the "Naladi" of an even less-known Tamil writer so charming—and seems to deserve more study than it has yet received. Dr. Pope is an enthusiastic admirer of Tiruvalluvar, and has devoted a very large amount of labour to this volume. The result is not entirely satisfactory. He describes the original as a series of mosaics like Propertius or Theocritus; he has translated them into couplets, which, in the course of the volume, exhibit every fault which a couplet can possess. Sometimes the charm of the original clearly pierces through, as—

---

[3] "Life after Death: Palinodia." By F. W. Newman. London: Trubner & Co. 1886.

[4] "The Sacred Kurral of Tiru-valluva-Nâyanâr." By the Rev. G. U. Pope, M.A., D.D. London: W. H. Allen. 1886.

> Than gods' ambrosia, sweeter far the food before men laid,
> In which the little hands of children of their own have played.

But when we come across even a couplet like the following, which is still among the best—

> His foot, "Whom want affects not, likes not grief," who gain
> Shall not through every time of any woes complain—

it is necessary to turn to a literal translation to discover the fine utterance, half Buddhistic, half Christian, that underlies it: "Sorrow never assails those who have drawn nigh to the foot of Him who is free from desire and aversion." Dr. Pope would have conferred a greater benefit, both on the student of religion and the student of language, if, instead of using a medium which he is unable to handle, he had chosen to give a clear and simple prose translation. With this reservation, the book may still be recommended to both students; the translation of each couplet accompanies the original, and the book is well supplied with introductions, notes, grammar, lexicon, and concordance.

The indefatigible Dr. Legge has produced a new and careful translation of the interesting travels of the Chinese monk Fâ-hien, in the fifth century, to India and Ceylon, in search of the Buddhist Book of Discipline.[5] A map is supplied, and numerous and excellent notes, which include simple explanations of the elements of Buddhistic faith and ritual. The well-reproduced illustrations by Chinese artists of episodes in the life of Buddha are of considerable interest, and the book appeals more than such works usually do to the general reader. In the introduction Dr. Legge criticises some of the received estimates of the present number of adherents of Buddhism. According to Mr. Rhys Davids, for instance, it is about 500 millions. Dr. Legge concludes: "My own opinion is that its adherents are not so many as those even of Mohammedanism, and that instead of being the most numerous of the religions (so called) of the world, it is only entitled to occupy the fifth place, ranking below Christianity, Confucianism, Brahminism, and Mohammedanism, and followed, some distance off, by Tâoism."

---

[5] "A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms." Translated and Annotated, with a Corean Recension of the Chinese Text, by John Legge, LL.D. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1886.

There are many ways in which St. Augustine may be approached. An attempt may be made to reveal his fascinating and intense personality, and the curious forms into which it was moulded by Christian influences; or we may have a discussion of his philosophical or theological views, or a history of his influence on the Christian Church, or he may be utilized for purposes of edification. Mr. Cunningham[6] has adopted something of all these methods, except the first and most central, and mixed them up in a confused and incomplete manner which is far from satisfactory. We had never realized before that it was possible to write a book so dull and dead about a person so intensely vital as the passionate African bishop. Mr. Cunningham has an absolute faith in his hero. What a pathetic trust in the saint's abstract reason these words, *à propos* of the Resurrection, betray: "From his high regard for empirical knowledge we might have supposed that, like Hume, he would have regarded any human testimony, however good, as insufficient to outweigh the conclusions of our organized experience;" the supposition that Augustine might be expected to think like Hume is very charming. Mr. Cunningham appears to regard the treatment St. Austin (as, following the old English custom, he prefers to call him) dealt out to his opponents as entirely right—not merely right, as it certainly was, from the standpoint of ecclesiastical policy. "He above all others may be our guide, philosopher, and friend." Mr. Cunningham has a persistent and incurable tendency to make use of bald platitudes—it comes out even in the enthusiastic utterance, which represents him at white heat, just quoted—and there is not a single memorable saying throughout this volume: in this respect he is a curious contrast to his brilliant Presbyterian namesake. At the same time, Mr. Cunningham possesses considerable familiarity with his author; the *excursus* forms the most readable portion of the book.

Professor Momerie is at once a clergyman and a student of science, and we turn with interest to his little book on "Belief in God,"[7] to learn what he has to say on the matter. In his first chapter, called "The Desire for God," he lays before the reader a series of considerations, not one of which amounts to an argument. Savages, he tells us, believe in gods; philosophers, like Plato, Aristotle, Kant, and Hegel, all had beliefs, which may probably be described as some sort of Theism or Pantheism; many philosophers and men of science (and in a list here quoted Sir W. Hamilton does duty as two philosophers) have believed, and men of science who have taken the opposite view have been wanting in metaphysical ability (here termed "knowledge of metaphysics"); even those who have abandoned the belief in God have admitted that it was a very comfortable theory, and the chapter concludes with the assertion that, though religions perish, Religion will never die. None of these considerations amount to a serious argument, while there are plenty of mis-statements and fallacies, some of them sufficiently obvious. The constant implication that truth goes by majorities is one which Professor Momerie would undoubtedly reject in any other inquiry. Men of science, like Clifford and Huxley, have shown as keen a faculty for metaphysical speculation as any of the men ranked against them; if Mill, Clifford, and others have admitted the consolations of the old faith, this surely adds to, rather than detracts from, the weight of their opinions, while the conclusion that while religions die religion will never perish involves the assumption that religion is bound up with belief in God, an altogether unwarranted assumption, for the conclusion will be accepted by many who do not accept even the Pantheistic god. In the second chapter, on "Materialism," we must of course accept Professor Momerie's own statement of the doctrine he is refuting. They are sufficiently absurd; it is held, he tells us, that the brain secretes thought just as the liver secretes bile, and that to explain sight nothing is necessary but to describe the structure of the eye. The reader is here disposed to admire the courage with which his author has penetrated into unknown intellectual slums. Professor Momerie cannot be ignorant of the fact that, while the expression "secretion of thought" was bandied about a century ago, a man of science would no more speak of brain secreting thought than he would speak of a piece of iron secreting magnetism. Professor Momerie plunges into psychology, and solves the mysteries of the human mind with marvellous celerity and sleight of hand. In a succeeding chapter, on "Supernatural Purpose," he confuses the popular with the more restricted scientific sense of the word "purpose." The concluding portions of the last chapter, on the "Infinite Personality," is, perhaps, the vaguest and most unsatisfactory of all; no attempt is made to face the difficulties of such a contradiction in terms, or to distinguish between Theism and Pantheism. We turned to this book with some interest, because Mr. Momerie is at once a D.Sc. and a Professor of Logic and Metaphysics, and therefore, we supposed, peculiarly well equipped for the defence of the cause he has taken up. It cannot, however, be said that his advocacy gives a very impressive sense of its strength. We are reminded of the saying of Joubert, that God is much easier to know than to define or prove.

---

[6] "S. Austin and his Place in the History of Christian Thought." By W. Cunningham, B.D. Cambridge: University Press. 1886.

[7] "Belief in God." By Rev. A. W. Momerie, M.A., D.Sc. Edinburgh and London: Blackwoods. 1886.

It is pleasant to turn to Professor Momerie's "Sermons."[8] There is a certain *modernité* about them which is agreeable. It is clear that he has devoted much study to the art of preaching; he avoids studiously the least appearance of rhetoric; he always preserves an elegant conversational tone, and is especially careful not to step out of it towards the conclusion of a sermon. Once he criticizes himself in an almost Heinesque manner: "I may tell you" (speaking of the last Sunday's sermon) "I took a great deal of pains with it. Several sentences cost me half an hour apiece. I shall never, as long as I live, be able to give a clearer exposition of the Gospel than I did in that discourse." He constantly quotes with approval non-Christian writers like Mill, Buckle, and Swinburne: almost the only Christian writer he quotes is Mansel, and, as he admits, if Mansel had been logical he would not have been a Christian.

---

[8] **"Preaching and Hearing, and other Sermons." By the Rev. A. W. Momerie, M.A., D.Sc. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood. 1886.**

Mr. William Marvin, who lives at Skaneateles, N.Y., is an ex-judge of the district court of the United States for the southern district of Florida; he is also the author of "A Treatise on the Law of Wreck and Salvage." In the summer of 1881, while staying for the benefit of his health at the Pigeon Cove Hotel, situated on Cape Ann, Massachusetts, he became acquainted with an old gentleman. This old gentleman ("aged about seventy years"), who resided in Buffalo, asked him if he had read the Gospel of Marcion. Mr. Marvin was as ignorant of the Gospel of Marcion as the Christians of Ephesus were of the Holy Ghost; he knew not even whether there was a Gospel of Marcion; and this apparently innocent question acted upon him like the *Tolle lege* of the child's song on St. Augustine. From that moment he resolved to write a "little treatise" on the wreck and salvage of Christian evidence. On his way home he bought the "Ante-Nicene Christian Library" (24 vols.), Strauss's "Life of Jesus," and a quantity of other books, and the result is contained in the little volume before us.[9] Mr. Marvin's method of dealing with Christian evidence involves an amount of simplicity, directness, and 'cuteness which is refreshing. There are, however, weak points in it. It is quite clear at the outset that his attitude is not judicial, and it becomes increasingly plain towards the end that the ex-judge is really an advocate. The book may be useful to a reader not familiar with the subject, who wishes to have the chief passages from early writers concerning the Gospels laid before him with simple explanatory observations, sometimes in a style which reminds us of an ancient school-book called "Mangnall's Questions," as when we are told that Jerome "flourished about the year 380"—certainly rather a cruel remark, applied to a writer who lived for nearly a century. The reader must be willing to judge the value of the evidence for himself. Mr. Marvin undertakes at the outset to give *verbatim* extracts from writers of the first and second centuries. This he is, of course, unable to do; his earliest writers belong to the second century, and mostly to the third. That the Gospels existed in some condition at the middle of the second century is unquestionable. Mr. Marvin observes that the Gospel quotations given by the apostolical fathers do not correspond with our Gospels, and that they make no reference to miracles; the interesting question is not, Did the Gospels exist then? but, In what form did they exist? and, How did they grow? How was it the old gentleman from Buffalo did not explain this to the ex-judge?

---

[9] "Authorship of the Four Gospels. From a Lawyer's Point of View." By William Marvin. London: Nisbet. 1886.

Dr. Romundt, who has previously written a book on Kant as an ethical teacher, "Die Vollendung des Socrates," has now followed up his task with a work dealing with Kant's doctrine of religion.[10] He considers that Kant has himself most concisely set forth the true doctrine of religion, and left a priceless testament to humanity in the words, "We must proceed, not from grace to virtue, but from virtue to grace." Dr. Romundt evidently regards Kant with boundless veneration; quite as evidently, his sentiments towards all later thinkers are of an exactly opposite character. In reading German speculative works, we frequently realize how recently Germany has emerged from barbarism. In France and England it is beginning to be pretty widely recognized, even among theologians, that every one has a certain amount of right to his own speculative opinions, and that a metaphysical conception does not amount to a crime. In Germany, however, there are still but a small number of persons who have risen to this point of view. Dr. Romundt considers that nothing so absurd as Fichte's philosophy ever existed outside a lunatic asylum; Hartmann's is a *Somnambulentheologie;* Hegel's religion is "the perfect religion for swine;" if the Fichte-Hegel philosophy really had the slightest basis in Kant's "Kritik," we should have to regard that "Kritik" as a pestilence more dangerous even than cholera. Several pages are devoted to H. W. Beecher, who, he tells us, has long been known to believe in the Darwinian theory of the bestial origin of man—"lately he has openly gone over to the apes altogether." And so with regard to Pfleiderer, Hase, J. H. Fichte, Fechner, &c. Let us trust that Dr. Romundt will never have to choose between Hegelianism and cholera.

Canon Travers Smith's lectures[11] form an elaborate and carefully written argument, which, starting from the general mystery of things, seeks to prove that belief in a God is rational. In obtaining this knowledge of Divine things we must use our feelings, instincts, sentiments, as we do in obtaining natural knowledge. This argument resembles that of the author of "The Kernel and the Husk." Canon Smith is, however, willing to admit that a sense of the mystery of personality is itself religion. In drawing a rigid distinction, as he does, between mystery and physical science as non-mysterious, he seems to miss a strong point in favour of his argument. Science and matter are very far from eliminating mystery: they are constantly landing us in mystery. The argument is worked out with much care and skill, and the book may be read with considerable sympathy and satisfaction, even by those whose attitude is quite different from Canon Smith's.

The late Gustave d'Eichthal was in his youth a disciple of St. Simon, and preserved the faith of his master that the organization of modern society is only possible through the development and renovation of Judaism and Christianity. This volume,[12] which has in part been published before, is a study of Old Testament documents, chiefly of Deuteronomy. D'Eichthal's introduction to the attempted restitution of the text is incomplete, but he considers that the book was composed in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, in the interests of the reform which they accomplished.

---

[10] "Ein neuer Paulus. Kant's Grundlegung zu einer sicheren Lehre von der Religion." Von Dr. H. Romundt. Berlin: Stricker. 1886.

[11] "Man's Knowledge of Man and of God." Donellan Lecture, 1884–5. By Rev. R. T. Smith, D.D. London: Macmillan. 1886.

In Dr. Westcott's new volume of sermons[13] there is a certain chastened sweetness, a certain sadness and weariness, in face of "the trials of a new age." There is little else to note concerning them, save that he rejects the common theory by which the Incarnation is based on the Fall, and bases it on the Creation; and that he accepts the Positivistic doctrine of the family as the social unit.

"The Bible and the Age"[14] is an attempt to produce a "reasonable mystical exegesis." Among other things Mr. Collingwood demonstrates that on *à priori* grounds there must have been four Gospels, neither more nor less, chiefly, it appears, because there are four quarters in the heavens. Reasonableness is a relative quality; this is Mr. Collingwood's reasonableness.

The author of "Trinitas Trinitatum"[15] also endeavours to reconcile revelation and science. He has not put his name to his book, because it is, he tells us, in no sense his own—"not even my own piecing together"—but has been "sent." In order to live up to this supernatural origin it has been found necessary to expend a ruinously large number of capital letters. The argument thus mysteriously transmitted begins with the fall of man, and lands us at last at "the Human Trinityhood itself—at the Creation, weak with the essential potentiality of a fall, doubly weak in its own essential anhomogeneity of Immortal Spirit consubstantiate with mortal soul, and doubly mortal body—now freed from its weakness by consubstantiation with the Divine Perfection, and purged of its mortality by Hypostatic Union with the Immortal." To all who are attracted by this climax the book may be most heartily commended.

Mr. Page Roberts's sermons[16] are of the best Broad Church type, vigorous and healthy in spirit.

"Still Hours"[17] is a volume of Rothe's fragmentary reflections, somewhat in the manner of Novalis, and forms the first of a series of translations called the Foreign Biblical Library, which is to consist of "prompt and accurate translations, at a moderate price, of the best and newest contributions of orthodox foreign scholarship to Biblical study and research." The volume is well got up, but the "sententious utterances" are mostly feeble and commonplace.

---

[12] "Mélanges de Critique Biblique." Par Gustave d'Eichthal. Paris: Hachette. 1886.

[13] "Christus Consummator: Some Aspects of the Work and Person of Christ in Relation to Modern Thought." By B. F. Westcott, D.D., D.C.L. London: Macmillan. 1886.

[14] "The Bible and the Age." By C. Collingwood, M.A., B.M. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1886.

[15] "Trinitas Trinitatum." London: Elliot Stock. 1886.

[16] "Liberalism in Religion." By the Rev. W. Page Roberts. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1886.

[17] "Still Hours." By Richard Rothe. Translated by Jane T. Stoddart. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1886.

Mr. Row's little book [18] is the first of another series from the same publishers, called the "Theological Educator," edited by the editor of the "Expositor," and which is to be "wholly unsectarian," written by men who are recognized authorities on their subjects, and published in half-crown monthly volumes. This first volume is weak and rhetorical; it is interesting, however, to note that Mr. Row puts into the forefront, and devotes most attention to, the "moral evidence" concerning Jesus—that his influence still continues, that he "energised" history, and so on—and allows the "miraculous attestation" to fall into the background.

Dr. Payne Smith's papers on "Daniel" [19] do not lay claim to great originality or research; "they were written rather with a view to edification."

Mr. Evans appears to have set himself to show that the New Testament was written by St. Paul. He has already, as we have before had to inform our readers, "irrefragably demonstrated" that that apostle wrote the Third Gospel and the Acts; in the latest instalment of his work [20] (in which, besides his usual laborious energy, Mr. Evans shows much improvement as regards controversial tone) he proceeds to claim for his favourite apostle the last twelve verses of Mark's Gospel. He is more convinced than ever that "an apparent discrepancy between two documents does not by any means necessarily involve a diversity of authorship—*especially when the author concerned is St. Paul.*"

Mr. Exell has begun to edit a miscellaneous collection of "Anecdotes, Similes, Emblems, Illustrations, Expository, Scientific, Geographical, Historical, and Homiletic," [21] which may be found useful by preachers; but, as in most similar compilations, there is an amount of trivial homiletics which must, one would think, be irritating to an intelligent preacher; but Mr. Exell probably knows his public; perhaps intelligent preachers are a negligeable quantity.

Last on our list comes a little volume of religious rhapsodies [22] by a prolific writer, the Rev. G. Everard.

---

[18] "A Manual of Christian Evidences." By the Rev. C. A. Row, M.A. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1887.

[19] "Daniel: an Exposition." By the Very Rev. R. Payne Smith, D.D. London: Nisbet. 1886.

[20] "St. Paul the Author of the last Twelve Verses of the Second Gospel." By Rev. H. H. Evans, B.A. London: Nisbet. 1886.

[21] "The Biblical Illustrator. St. Matthew. Part I." By Rev. G. S. Exell. London: Nisbet. Nov. 1886.

[22] "Links of Loving Kindness." By Rev. G. Everard, M.A. London: Nisbet. 1886.

PHILOSOPHY.

MR. SALTUS'S book[1] is "intended to convey a tableau of anti-theism from Kapila to Leconte de Lisle. The anti-theistic tendencies of England and America have been treated by other writers; in the present volume, therefore, that branch of the subject is not discussed." "To avoid misconception," the author proceeds, "it may be added that no attempt has been made to prove anything." It is an article of the author's philosophy, we may add, that nothing can be proved. For, indeed, "there is no criterion of truth." The doctrine of Pyrrho has never been refuted, and Pyrrho "had but one true successor—Montaigne." After summarizing Pyrrho's philosophy, the author proceeds:—

> And happiness? some one may ask. But that is happiness. Where there is indifference and apathy, there too is ataraxia, the perfect and unruffled serenity of the mind. If in act, word, and thought, an entire suspension of judgment be maintained—if men, and women too, and events, and results, and causes, concerning all of which we may have our fancies and our theories, but whose reality escapes us, are treated with complete indifference—then do we possess an independent freedom, an unmoutable calm. Once freed from beliefs and prejudices, an exterior influence is without effect; perfect impassibility is obtained; and with it comes the passionless serenity, the ataraxia, which is the goal of the sage (pp. 45–6).

Mr. Saltus, however, is not quite a true Pyrrhonist. He may rather be described as a pessimistic Agnostic who aspires to be "blown out," or to attain Nirvana. This kind of Agnosticism is not uninteresting. Strenuous optimistic Agnosticism is no doubt a healthier sort of creed, but if it is to become dominant it will need a devil, like theology, before it, and pessimism seems exactly adapted for that office. Mr. Saltus writes pleasantly, and his selection of Leconte de Lisle as the poetic representative of the kind of theory of the universe with which he is in sympathy shows that his powers of literary appreciation are good.

Herr Nietzsche, like Mr. Saltus, keeps clear of commonplace. His new book, "Beyond Good and Evil," also called "A Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future,"[2] expounds in numbered paragraphs, written more in the manner of the "seers" than of those philosophers who try to proceed by the method of demonstration, a mystical doctrine which makes the last stage of morality the disappearance of the contrast of good and evil—a sort of "marriage of heaven and hell," as Blake called it. Comparison with Blake is suggested by the last lines of a short poem at the end of the book:—

Nun lacht die Welt, der grause Vorhang riss,
Die Hochzeit kam für Licht und Finsterniss.

Herr Nietzsche's attitude towards Christianity is as decided as that of Mr. Saltus, and it is always refreshing, among modern "men of historical sense" (in Herr Nietzsche's phrase), to come across a writer who does not go about to prove that Christianity is somehow "the highest synthesis" of everything. His book ought to be read for its mixture of eccentricity and insight. One of his favourite ideas is that the "men of historical sense," to acquire the power of appreciating writers of all ages and nations, have had to become semi-barbarous again themselves. Periods like the French Classical period, when all literature that does not attain a certain limited perfection called "correctness" is misjudged, are really the culminating periods of civilization. An age like our own can appreciate everything—except what belongs to these highly "polished" ages. This exception proves that it is itself nearer the lower level of what used to be called the "rude" ages—the sixteenth century, the Middle Ages, the age that found its expression in Homer. We may not agree with Herr Nietzsche's particular judgments; but the point of view is interesting. Besides, we must not take him too literally. He admits that he has the tastes of his own age, that he also is a "man of historical sense." His great fear for the future of the human race is that socialism and "altruism" will make of man a "tame domestic animal." He has therefore a good word for egoism as tending to prevent this consummation. In the course of his criticisms of modern life he says some true as well as interesting things. His remarks on the distinctions of national types are always worth reading.

---

[1] "The Anatomy of Negation." By Edgar Saltus. London: Williams & Norgate. 1886.

[2] "Jenseits von Gut und Böse. Vorspiel einer Philosophie der Zukunft." Von Friedrich Nietzsche. Leipzig: C. G. Naumann. 1886.

Dr. Leonhard Freund has written a little book[3] (38 pp.) to show from German popular proverbs, &c., that a regard for truth has always been characteristic of the Teutonic "race-spirit." This recalls one of Herr Nietzsche's paragraphs, where he talks about the "simplicity," &c., of the Germans, and then goes on to say that it is not at all a disadvantage to the German people to have a reputation for simplicity. We are quite ready to concede to Dr. Freund, without reading his proverbs, that truthfulness is a Teutonic virtue. Is it not written that Prince Bismarck gained some of his greatest diplomatic successes by his frankness? Besides, proverbs, like statistics, will prove anything.

For those who are interested, as so many now are, in Russian literature, and who read German, it will be sufficient merely to mention the appearance of a German translation (from a Russian manuscript) of a work by Count Leo Tolstoi.[4]

Pietro Ceretti was an Italian Hegelian who died recently, leaving a large number of unpublished manuscripts. Some of them have since been published. Professor Pasquale d' Ercole, having become interested in Ceretti, has written an elaborate Introduction of 410 pages to the small work now published, entitled "My Celebrity"[5] (in which title there is an ironical intention). Professor d'Ercole admits that he himself—and he is, we believe, a Hegelian—often finds Ceretti's thought difficult. He admits also that Ceretti was constantly repeating himself. The general formlessness of his writing is obvious enough. We have not read very much of the volume; but we are afraid the matter it contains was not quite worth the trouble that has been taken with it. The best thing we have met with is a rather lively piece of verse entitled "I Positivi," extending over pp. 52–55 of Professor d'Ercole's Introduction, in which Ceretti ironically salutes Positivism as the final philosophy.

---

[3] "Treue und Untreue in deutschen Sprüchen und Sprichwortern." Von Dr. Leonhard Freund. Leipzig: Karl Fr. Pfau. 1886.

[4] "Bekenntnisse. Was sollen wir denn thun?" Von Graf Leo Tolstoi. Aus dem russischen Manuscript ubersetzt von H. von Samson-Himmelstjerna. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. 1886.

[5] "Notizia degli Scritti e del Pensiere Filosofico di Pietro Ceretti, accompagnata da un Cenno autobiografico del medesimo intitolato 'La Mia Celebrità.'" Per Pasquale d' Ercole, Prof. ord. di Filosofia nell' Università di Torino. Torino: Unione Tipografico-Editrice. 1886.

Professor Knight's "Hume"[6] is divided into two sections not differing much in length, the first dealing with "Hume's Career," the second with "Hume's Philosophy." The reason of this division is explained by the author. "The aim of the book," he says, "is to give . . . . a full and unbiassed picture of the man, and an equally impartial account of his Philosophy—of its sources, its characteristics, and its issues." "As Hume was not much involved in metaphysical controversy during his lifetime, and as the significance of his system was mainly posthumous, it is easier in his case than in that of any other modern philosopher of note to separate the biographical sketch from any but the most cursory account of his system, and to take up the latter by itself." Both parts of the book, the biographical and the philosophical, are well written and appreciative. The first perhaps is the most appreciative, for the author is not in agreement with the philosophical principles of Hume or of his successors; and some space is devoted to criticism of his positions from the point of view of the Scotch school. There is, however, one advantage in the presence of this criticism rather than of a development of Hume's positions in the sense of modern doctrines, such as formed the corresponding part of Professor Huxley's "Hume." It is not Professor Knight's aim to accentuate Hume's resemblance to a modern Agnostic and to minimize his resemblance to an ancient Pyrrhonist. On the contrary, he brings out as much as possible the points in which Hume "was more like the leaders of the late Academy in Rome than any of the moderns;" while Professor Huxley sees under the mask of one of Hume's Greek or Roman personages the visage of John Knox. The quotation of a passage may show best how Professor Knight supplies some of the features that were left in shade by Professor Huxley:—

> When we pass to the "Dialogues concerning Natural Religion," we have some fresh light as to the attitude of Hume's mind toward this ultimate problem. It is a clear, cold, passionless discussion of the question; and while the form of the Dialogue may have been adopted to avoid the more precise statement necessary in a treatise, the views of the several interlocutors are clearly expressed; and Hume has told us (in a letter to Gilbert Eliot, March, 1751) with which of them his own sympathies lay. Three characters are introduced—Demea, Cleanthes, and Philo. Demea is the orthodox *a priori*

---

[6] "Hume." By William Knight, LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy, University of St. Andrews. ("Blackwood's Philosophical Classics.") Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1886.

> theologian; Cleanthes the liberal-minded theist, who adopts the teleological argument from design, and combats the narrower theology of Demea; while Philo is the sceptic, who mediates between both. Hume tells us it was not Philo, but Cleanthes, whom he meant to make the hero of his dialogue. It must not be forgotten, however, that he had a certain amount of sympathy with all the characters; and that each of them (Demea included) alternately mirrored his own ever-changing mood. This kaleidoscopic character of Hume's mind has not been sufficiently recognized, and it is quite consistent with his prevailing tendency towards Agnosticism (Pp. 209–10.)

On the whole, Professor Knight's volume of the "Philosophical Classics" may be regarded as the complement of Professor Huxley's contribution to the "English Men of Letters" series. While one expositor is a philosophical opponent and the other a successor of Hume, both are equally sympathetic in writing of him as a man. Professor Knight's book is of the two the fuller in the biographical part.

The last Presidential Address delivered before the Aristotelian Society by Mr. Shadworth Hodgson[7] is, like its predecessor (mentioned in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW for July, 1886), full of interest. We quote a passage on the "Theory of Knowledge" of the Germans:—

> Now I am not going to advise you to plough through that acre or acre and a half, be the same more or less, of German paper covered with German prose, on which the tangled thicket of *Erkenntnisstheorie* flourishes. . . . . These speculations are for the most part—so far at least as my painful experience goes—signal examples of how philosophy ought *not* to be written, and I am going to advise you how *not* to read them. The world does not want, and never did want, *Erkenntnisstheorie*. It never was in Kant's hands, and never will be in anybody's, a valid answer to those sceptical doubts and questionings which found their chief and most powerful exponent in Hume. The world, I repeat, does not want *Erkenntnisstheorie*. It wants now, as it has always wanted, *Philosophy*;—it wants a Rationale of the Universe, so far as it is attainable by human powers. It wants a combined treatment of those two questions which can never be sundered, the questions of Being and of Knowing,—of Being as well as of Knowing,—and not a treatment of the question of the validity of knowledge, on the original supposition that the knower is either (1) separate from, or (2) identical with, the object known. You cannot say what *knowing* is, without also in the same words saying what *being* is. And therefore, if *Erkenntnisstheorie* were (*per impossible*) to solve its own problem, it would not be *Erkenntnisstheorie*, but Metaphysic (pp. 5–6).

The argument of the "Address" is so condensed that it is difficult to summarize; and, as it is not very long (60 pp.), we prefer to advise all who are interested in the line of thought suggested by the passage quoted to read the whole for themselves.

"This translation of the 'Rhetoric' of Aristotle,"[8] Mr. Welldon says, "is a companion volume to my translation of the 'Politics.' But it differs from it in the greater fulness of the notes; for, as I have no thought of publishing an edition of the 'Rhetoric,' it seems to me necessary to explain as well as I can my interpretations of some difficult passages and my reasons for them." The reason for undertaking the translation is thus explained :—

---

[7] "The Re-organization of Philosophy." An Address delivered before the Aristotelian Society, November 8, 1886 (being the Annual Presidential Address for the Eighth Session of the Society), by Shadworth H. Hodgson, Hon. LL.D. Edin., Hon. Fellow of C.C.C. Oxford, President. London: Williams & Norgate. 1886.

[8] "The Rhetoric of Aristotle." Translated, with an Analysis and Critical Notes, by J. E. C. Welldon, M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and Headmaster of Harrow School. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

> The study of Rhetoric as an educational instrument, although it formed a part of Roman as well as of later Greek culture, although in the Middle Ages it was one of the subjects of the *Trivium*, although from the era of the Revival of Learning it entered into the curriculum of the Universities, has at least in England been practically neglected since the beginning of the eighteenth century. There are several reasons for this neglect, and they are valid; but it is not a gain without a loss. It is possible that the time will come again when the world will recognize that "it is not enough to know what to say, but it is necessary also to know how to say it." Then the "Rhetoric" of Aristotle will, I think, be widely read, as being perhaps a solitary instance of a book which not only begins a science, but completes it. It is one of my hopes in publishing this translation that I may bring the "Rhetoric" within the reach, if I may so express it, of the modern world. The office of a translator, even if he is also in some sense an interpreter, may not unfairly be regarded as a humble one. But as knowledge broadens, and the mass of men have less leisure for studying Greek thought in the language of the Greeks, it would seem to become more and more desirable that the links which unite the new civilization with the old should be strengthened and multiplied; and of these links translation is the chief.

The wish expressed here with regard to the "general reader" is no doubt a pious one; but probably the class of readers who benefit most by translations from the ancient classics (with the moderns it is different) will always be those who can read them to some extent in the original, but prefer to have the aid of an accurate interpreter. By such students the present translation will be welcomed. It is preceded by a really useful analysis (pp. ix.–xlvii.).

The American translation of Lotze's "Outlines" is still proceeding. The new volume[9] does not strike us as being among the most interesting. We are disposed to agree with the translator that "the reader will find in the theoretical discussions of the 'Outlines of Æsthetics' a certain vagueness and apparent unwillingness to enter upon the task of attempting clear definitions." Professor Ladd thinks, however, that they have qualities to compensate for their defects.

> If those who are wise in the principles and maxims of the different art differ from Lotze upon various points considered in this volume, it will not be at all strange. Even the wisest in such matters differ among themselves; perhaps, not infrequently, the wiser they are the more they differ. And yet they agree in holding that the truths which underlie the representation of the beautiful in art are by nature universal and eternal. All such will find a manifest feeling of sympathy and a courtesy of manner, which are in themselves both ethical and æsthetic, pervading these brief chapters from the mind and heart of a genial philosopher.

---

[9] "Outlines of Æsthetics." Dictated Portions of the Lectures of Hermann Lotze. Translated and Edited by George T. Ladd, Professor of Philosophy in Yale College. Boston: Ginn & Company. 1886.

POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES, AND TRAVELS.

MR. RALEIGH'S modest little shilling volume of 160 pp.—"Elementary Politics"[1]—is in every way admirable, and contains more political philosophy than any work of double its size that we are acquainted with. Its philosophy is not obtrusive, but it is pervaded with the philosophic spirit, and exhibits throughout a true insight into the principles of human nature, as these manifest themselves in political affairs. It is thoroughly practical and popular in scope—most of it well within the comprehension of any London crossing-sweeper; and yet Mr. Chamberlain or Lord Randolph Churchill might learn something from it. The author's object is to stimulate inquiry, not to satisfy it. With a clearness and thoroughness, surprising when we consider its brevity, the little book analyzes the great problems of the art of government, and describes the framework of the institutions by which, in various countries and at various times, especially in our own country at the present time, the functions of government have been and are performed. More valuable even than these descriptions are the explanations and definitions of terms and phrases so glibly and so vaguely used in political discussions. These terms, as Mr. Raleigh reminds us, are derived from history, morals, economic science, and law; and some elementary knowledge of these sciences is as necessary to the practical politician as an elementary knowledge of physical science is to the mariner. All is done without apparent effort on the part of the author, and the reader is scarcely conscious of effort in following. Nor is it easy to guess to what school of politics the author belongs. Probably to none; for he shows intelligent sympathy with all, while impartially indicating the defects of each. Amid the afflicting mass of pretentious, crude, ill-written, partisan treatises on political questions belched out by the press of the day, it is no small pleasure to come across such a little volume as this. Mr. Raleigh begins at the beginning—the origin of society. In a few pages he indicates the strength and weakness of Egyptian, Greek, and Roman civilization. He touches "superficially, but not carelessly, some critical points in the process by which primitive tribal communities have been developed into modern political communities," and, coming to modern society, sketches lightly the great successive movements of Protestantism, the secularization of government, humanitarianism, the emancipation of industry, and the advance of democracy. The following illustration appears to us very happy:—

> The movement of human progress is hard to follow; often we seem to lose sight of it altogether. It is not like the march of a regiment along the highway; it is like the advance of a crowd, making for some point which only a few know how to find. Look at them from a height, and you see that each individual in the crowd has a path of his own. One keeps straight on; another is following a circle which will bring him back to his starting-point in due time; another has turned into the wrong road, and is calling the rest to

---

[1] "Elementary Politics." By Thomas Raleigh, Fellow of All Souls, Oxford. London: Henry Frowde. 1886.

> follow him. Even those who hold the steadiest course are often turned back or aside by unexpected obstacles. . . . . We find the right path only by making a series of blunders, whether we plod along the track of our fathers, or dash into new ways of our own.

The modern State in its various forms is then described, and an account given of the three chief principles which, by the proportions in which they enter into a constitution, determine its character—viz., Monarchy, Aristocracy, and Democracy. The English constitution is then examined—not exhaustively, indeed, but so as to give a fair notion of its framework and the functions of its various organs. Elections, political ideals, parties, and party government are treated at considerable length. Then come a series of excellent chapters on the elementary economic principles which enter largely into the science of government—principles relating to wealth, its production, exchange, and distribution; competition; monopoly; rent. Then a few chapters on social inequalities, the functions of the State, and finally, social reform and what the State can do for it. With reference to this last subject Mr. Raleigh suggests some services the State might legitimately be expected to perform for Society, with a view to mitigating those evils that arise from *ignorance*, those that arise from *selfishness* being, in his opinion, for the most part outside the sphere of the State. We said it is not easy to discover to what school of politics Mr. Raleigh belongs. It is certain, however, from his modest suggestions that he is not a Socialist, but an economist of tolerably orthodox views.

Mr. Escott's new volume, "Politics and Letters,"[2] contains a number of articles on men, eminent in literary or political circles in London, some living, some recently dead; also a few essays on miscellaneous subjects. Some, if not all, of these have already appeared in magazines. They are good specimens of Mr. Escott's pleasant easy manner and kindly appreciation of the good qualities of his heroes. Sandwiched in between John Bright and Lord Houghton we come upon a less familiar theme—a parallel between London in 1875 and Rome in 408, founded on the picture of Roman society left by Ammianus Marcellinus. The likeness between "Society" as it was in Rome and as it is in London is in many points curiously striking.

Under the title of "The Bankruptcy of India,"[3] Mr. H. M. Hyndman republishes three papers on the financial and social condition of India that appeared six or seven years ago in the *Nineteenth Century*, to which he has now added three new chapters, including one on the Silver Question. Mr. Hyndman has no personal acquaintance with India; he has never been there. Not that this fact at all disqualifies him from forming and expressing an opinion on the facts reported in Blue Books, and the statements and opinions of writers who have spoken from personal experience. But the fact ought to be borne in mind. Conclusions concerning the very complicated problems suggested by the social and economic phenomena of any country—and *à fortiori* of such a country as India—are really worth very little unless and until they have been verified by reference to the facts. And these can never be comprehended in some of their most important bearings without personal experience of the people to whom they relate. Mr. Hyndman adopts the view of those who attribute most of India's financial troubles to the costliness of our administration. But he makes no attempt to show how, consistently with the security of our rule and the efficiency of our administration, it can be rapidly or materially cheapened. Even he holds that we must, in fairness to the people of India, continue to rule them. We must therefore look to our political security, as well as to the immediate benefits we may be able to bestow upon the people. And Mr. Hyndman does not even attempt to disprove the almost unanimous testimony of those who have an intimate acquaintance with India as to the necessity of great caution in relaxing our control or weakening our material strength more rapidly than our moral strength increases. The fall in the gold value of silver is also a cause, Mr. Hyndman thinks, of the approaching bankruptcy of India. It certainly increases the drain on the Indian Government for its "home charges," but there are many countervailing advantages which Mr. Hyndman ignores or denies. He ignores the saving to India on pensions, and he denies that the stimulus to exportation is beneficial. He calls this stimulus "excessive;" but he entirely omits to indicate in what respect it is so beyond what is implied when he asks—"Is it then beneficial to starving ryots that wheat or rice, which would feed them, should, to the amount of millions of tons, be shipped off to this country, because otherwise they could not make their payments or meet their assessments? Manifestly not." The argument here implied puts the car before the horse. Obviously the wheat and rice are not sent to this country to enable the ryots to meet their assessments; but, the assessments having been made, the wheat and rice are enabled to find a profitable market in England, thanks to the state of the exchange. It would, no doubt, be pleasanter for the ryots if they had no assessments to meet. But the assessments being, unfortunately, a necessity, the state of the exchange enables them to meet these, as well as all other payments, more easily than they could if silver was dearer. On the other hand, of course, it must be admitted that their assessments are likely to be heavier when silver is depreciated; and it is not easy to determine offhand and by abstract argument, whether their heavier assessment is or is not more than balanced by the higher price of their wheat and rice. But Mr. Hyndman apparently does not see that there are these counterbalancing considerations. His treatment of this, as well as of some larger political problems, is one-sided. Nevertheless it is an advantage that attention should be sharply and frequently attracted to the less satisfactory aspects of our rule in India, and that undoubtedly deplorable facts should be known and faced publicly. Mr. Hyndman has contributed something to this end, and has done it on the whole with moderation and good temper.

---

[2] "Politics and Letters." By T. H. S. Escott. London: Chapman & Hall. 1886.

[3] "The Bankruptcy of India. An Inquiry into the Administration of India under the Crown, including a Chapter on the Silver Question." By H. M. Hyndman. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1886.

Mr. Samuel Smith reprints his thoughtful and interesting paper on India[4] from the *Contemporary Review.* It is well worth publishing in some more accessible and less ephemeral shape than that it first appeared in. We trust he will see that it is circulated in India as well as at home; for it appears to us to take not only a very intelligent view of some complicated questions, but also to be remarkably fair and even-handed as between native and European ways of looking at the same set of facts. The paper contains a summary of the conclusions arrived at by Mr. Smith after a careful examination of all the evidence he could collect from observation and conversation with natives and Europeans on the spot, from his long-standing business experiences, and from a wide study of the best literature on the subject. What the educated natives complain of most he finds to be the costliness of government, its tendency to subordinate Indian to British interests, and the exclusion of natives from most of the highest posts. India is terribly poor—the average income per head is probably less than one-tenth of the average per head in England. Her primitive hand industries have been starved out by machinery, while as yet machine manufactures are not established to any large extent in India; but Mr. Smith believes they will be before very long, and then India will reap a rich harvest to make up for the long period of lying fallow while the transition from hand to machine industry has been taking place. Mr. Smith makes a vigorous and not uncalled-for protest against the greatest of dangers to our rule—the narrow pedantry that would apply "cut-and-dried formulas of European thought without mercy to the complex and widely different civilization of the East." This is, indeed, the greatest danger to ourselves, and the greatest curse to those we rule, not in India only, but in Egypt and everywhere else. Statesmen and reformers who live at home, and have no personal acquaintance with the people for whom they legislate and agitate, are too often fatally unable to understand the way these people look at things. Hence innumerable errors; the best-aimed efforts miss their mark, and result only in confusion and despair. Mr. Smith urges the adoption of three political reforms, from which he thinks much good would result—viz., representation of natives by election on the Legislative Councils of India; the return of a few members directly from India to Parliament; and the election of a proportion of the Indian Council in London by the natives of India.

We have two small works on Bulgarian affairs, written respectively from the German and the Russian point of view. The first of these, "Aus bulgarischer Sturmzeit,"[5] gives an eye-witness's account of the revolution of Sofia and the events that followed. The author,

---

[4] "India Revisited: its Social and Political Problems." By Samuel Smith, M.P. London: Wm. Isbister, Limited. 1886.

[5] "Aus bulgarischer Sturmzeit. Eine authentische Darstellung des Handstreichs von Sofia und seiner Folgen." Von A. von Huhn. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. 1886. "Der erste Fürst von Bulgarien. Aufzeichnungen des russischen Generals und vormaligen bulgarischen Ministerpräsidenten." Von L. N. Sobolew. Aus dem Russischen. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. 1886.

A. von Huhn, is the well-known correspondent of the *Cologne Gazette*. We need not say that his views are decided and his language strong. His book is able and interesting, and deserves the attention of those who really want to get at the truth and understand all parties. The other is a German translation of the articles recently published in the *Russkaja Starina*, at St. Petersburg, by M. Sobolew, giving an account of his experiences as Minister-President and Minister of the Interior from July, 1882, to September, 1883. Sobolew is, of course, no admirer of Prince Alexander; and as his account was written for a Russian audience, we must of course expect it to be coloured accordingly.

"Toryism and the Tory Democracy"[6] is a strange book. The author is evidently something of a genius—of the rather wild, impracticable variety. It is not every one who can imitate Thomas Carlyle, and do it well. This, on the whole, we may admit Mr. O'Grady has done. He has caught his master's tone and style, and has avoided caricaturing them. To what extent Carlyle would accept his pupil's views is perhaps doubtful. He could not, at all events, fail to be gratified by Mr. O'Grady's adoption of him as his model, both in political philosophy and in style. But Mr. O'Grady has an individuality of his own too. If he is far behind his model in trenchant vigour, in withering scorn, in pathos, in richness of metaphor, in general power, he is more graceful, smoother, less uncouth. In matter and in form, "Toryism" is a weaker "Past and Present"—an echo which will hardly waken a world that slumbered through the thunder and lightning. The book is dedicated to Lord Randolph Churchill, "the first among our political men honestly to acknowledge the political and social transformation effected by the rapid advance of Democracy in the present age," to whom the author looks "to direct towards noble ends, and along legitimate channels, the fierce revolutionary energies of these times." This from a disciple of Carlyle, it must be owned, is a little startling. Indeed, it is hard to reconcile with the frequent reproofs and warnings Mr. O'Grady is obliged to administer to his patron, and the feeble attempts he makes to palliate that statesman's shiftiness. It is enough for Mr. O'Grady that Lord Randolph has "reconstructed" the Tory party, and recognized that henceforth it must rely on popular support. In fact, it is not for what they have done that our author admires either the party or its leader, but for what, if they absolutely abandon their former course and follow Mr. O'Grady's directions, they may yet do. As for the party, Mr. O'Grady himself admits that, "after much reflection, it is not easy to arrive at a clear idea of the nature of the Tory Democracy;" and again, "Lord Randolph, and the men who think with him, have at all events exiled traditional Conservatism from the region of practical politics. What they are putting in its room is not so clear." After much searching, the "essential principle" of democratic Toryism turns out to be the old Socialistic doctrine that "waste labour has a right to employment—a doctrine which carries this Conservative corollary, that the State has a right to control the labour which it employs." True, the party has never shown the smallest inclination towards this principle; and their leader, as Mr. O'Grady proves, "has not as yet indicated" it. But Mr. O'Grady has detected the drift of their unconscious evolution. He pleads with stirring eloquence on behalf of this principle, but makes very little effort to grapple with its economic difficulties. These he thinks will vanish, once the principle has been resolutely adopted. And it must be adopted, as the only alternative to Radicalism, which is leading to universal confiscation, anarchy, bloodshed, and the wreck of the British Empire. If the State will not employ all waste labour, it must perforce grant to labour a right to the soil. Radicalism is heading straight for the latter alternative. Tory Democracy must aim at the former. This is the "essential principle" of Mr. O'Grady's political philosophy; and he has persuaded himself, against all indications, that it will be the principle of the party, which in another part of his work he seems to say have as yet given promise of nothing better than "a bastard and halting Radicalism," willing "to attack, if necessary, those great interests whose defence was the principal work of historic Conservatism." The book is in three parts. The first, "The Dawning Century," presents a quasi-historical picture of the social and economic condition of Ireland at the epoch of the Union, not flattering to the rulers of the new United Kingdom. It contains at least one astute remark: "Statesmen, like jugglers, must be watched, not in the proceedings to which they attract attention, but in those from which they distract attention." The second part is devoted to developing his ideas about State employment of labour, and the necessity and fitness of the Conservative party adopting his programme. The third part, "Ireland and the Hour," is an impassioned condemnation of the landlords of Ireland for shameful neglect of their duties, and an urgent appeal to them—for, after all, they are "the best class" of Irishmen—to rouse up, and snatch themselves and their country from "the sucking, whirling maelstrom of agrarian and national revolution" to the edge of which they have drifted. Let them, as far as possible, restore the old feudal personal relations with their tenants—live among them, look after their welfare, make friends of them. Mr. O'Grady's contempt for his countrymen is unutterable. "What nation with the spirit of a rabbit would bear for ever such an aristocracy as yours, devouring its substance, and sneering into the bargain? And now, at the first brunt of the fight, it is discovered that even the strength of that little rodent is not yours." Rather inconsistent this with his appeal to landlords as "the best class." And yet, till the life is out of a man's body, there is hope; and so, in some dim, confused way, Mr. O'Grady sees light ahead, and persuades himself that Lord Randolph Churchill sees it too, and is steering thitherward.

---

[6] "Toryism and the Tory Democracy." By Standish O'Grady, Ex-Scholar, Trinity College, Dublin. London: Chapman & Hall. 1886.

We are rather at a loss to know how to describe Mr. Partridge's contribution to the Irish question.[7] It is mainly historical, but also largely controversial and prophetic. It is never very easy to get a clear conception of the author's meaning. This difficulty commences with the title-page. Reading it, we should conclude that the making of the Irish nation had been accomplished by the "makers and martyrs of Ireland" to whose "memories" the volume is "consecrated." But on opening the book, we find that so far from Ireland being already "made," we have not yet made England or the Empire. "We can't make England or Ireland or the Empire without making Ireland, and if we don't begin soon it may be too late." Again, this passage is hard to reconcile with his contention that Ireland has been and is a nation. In a preface of considerable length, Mr. Partridge argues on general grounds in favour of Ireland's abstract right to independence; though he appears to consider that she is bound to exercise that independence so as to bring about a federation of the British Empire in which she must take her place. What would he say if Ireland declined to enter into such a federation? We fancy his ardour for Irish parliamentary independence would considerably cool if it were found to stand in the way of his favourite dream of Imperial federation. For it is not difficult to read between the lines that our author is an Imperial Federationist first, and a Home Ruler afterwards. The grand merit of Home Rule in his eyes is, not so much that it will benefit Ireland, as that it will be the first fruits of the principle of Federation. There is scarcely any attempt in this book to show how Irish independence is likely to affect Ireland herself. His attitude towards the question appears to be that Ireland asks for independence; she has an abstract right to it; therefore it must be given her. This is what we gather to be the drift of the author's rather confused and confusing declamation which occupies the preface and what he calls "The Argument." Then comes the historical review, in which Mr. Partridge has thrown together with sad lack of arrangement a considerable mass of opinions and comments by contemporary and other writers and speakers on the Union, the events which led up to it, and the disasters that followed it, down to the present time. Of course Mr. Partridge is a vehement advocate, openly fighting for the cause which now claims for its leaders Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell. We find no fault therefore with his book on the ground of its controversial character. But when he tells us that his pages contain "everything really necessary to a fair understanding of the essential Irish question, past and present, and of its dawning national and federal future," and that he hopes it may become "a handbook for the people," we are bound to say that, in our opinion, the work cannot sustain that claim. There is no attempt whatever to place both sides of the question before his readers. There is no mention of the difficulties and embarrassments and consequent weakness and danger which weighed so heavily in favour of Union. There is, in fact, no history, properly so-called, from which readers can form their own opinions. There is little beyond copious excerpts from the speeches and writings of statesmen and historians on one side; not a voice or a sound is allowed to reach us from the other side. It is obvious that such a partial picture cannot contain everything really necessary to a fair understanding of "the essential Irish question." This collection of excerpts proves simply that a great many distinguished politicians and writers bitterly opposed the Union, and denounced its authors and their methods. We know from other sources that they were in great measure, if not altogether, justified in so doing, but it does not therefore follow that a wise statesman would now upset that arrangement. What Mr. Partridge endeavours to show is "How Ireland became a nation and got Home Rule. How that worked. How it was taken away. What followed Pitt's Union, and has got to follow." This is an interesting programme. We regret that Mr. Partridge has not brought a more open mind, greater care in arrangement, and a more severely simple style to the carrying it out.

---

[7] "The Making of the Irish Nation, and the First Fruits of Federation." By J. A. Partridge. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1886.

Mr. Edwin Guthrie[8] proposes to solve the Irish question, the question of Imperial Federation, and the question of the House of Lords, in one. England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales are each to have a National Parliament, with an Imperial Parliament in place of the present House of Lords, consisting of elective representatives of the whole Empire. This he calls a simplification of the separate questions. Mr. Guthrie hardly seems to realize what a tremendous question this threefold one would be. That we may arrive in time at some such arrangement as he proposes is not impossible. The one great objection to it as a proposal for the solution of our present troubles is that while the Irish question is urgent and will not wait, the others are not nearly ripe. Circumstances might at any time bring up the question of reform or abolition of the House of Lords, and some solution of it might become necessary and possible. But it is quite certain that the idea of Imperial Federation will take a very long time to ripen, and that premature action on it would be perilous to the last degree. It must be approached gradually and tentatively. To couple the Irish question with it is simply to postpone the solution of that question to an indefinitely distant period.

From the bickerings, the confusion, the petty details and personalities of contemporary Irish history[9] it is an unspeakable relief to turn back to a period so far removed from the present that we can contemplate and discuss it without passion or prejudice—a period of which little is clearly known or understood outside the small circle of Celtic antiquarians and scholars, concerning which, nevertheless, much that is of extreme interest has been ascertained, and more is being learned every day; and, finally, a period which, remote as it is, throws light on the history and character of a people whose history and character we are compelled to study to-day under heavy social and political penalties. The materials for reconstructing ancient Irish history are by no means so scanty, nor is that history so unimportant a branch of the history of Western civilization as we might fairly suppose, if we judged by the neglect with which it has always been treated. It is only quite recently that writers of commanding popularity and extensive erudition, like Sir Henry Maine, have recognized the wealth that lay hidden in ancient Irish manuscripts, antiquities and traditions. General interest in these matters is gradually awakening; and any one who can make the dry bones of ancient Irish history live again, may feel sure of finding an audience sympathetic, intelligent and ever-growing. Dr. Stokes has this faculty in a high degree. His lectures on "Ireland and the Celtic Church," are as attractive in style as they are careful and judicious in matter. Although himself "no profound Irish or Celtic scholar, qualified to deal with the recondite mysteries of ancient dialects or well-nigh illegible manuscripts," he proves in every page that he is "a diligent student of the results skilled inquirers have attained," which he has endeavoured, not in vain, "to weave into a connected and interesting narrative." The work is the substance of lectures which, as Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin, the author was bound to deliver, but which, as he remarks, no one was bound to attend. There was, we should hope, little fear that such capital lectures on such a subject would fail to attract an audience in a literary centre like Dublin; and, in fact, they did not fail. Though dealing nominally with ecclesiastical history, Professor Stokes is well aware that the history of the early Christian Church of any country is so entwined in the history of the State that it cannot be understood or followed without studying the political and social history of the same period; and Dr. Stokes has applied this principle with a generosity to the State which leaves us nothing to complain of. The history of the Celtic Church is, in his hands, as a string on which to hang a number of excellent pictures of the art, literature, social conditions, and chief political events of the period. We venture to think that amongst the impressions a perusal of this book will leave behind two very general ones will be prominent: first, that so much of what we have been accustomed to laugh at as mythical is indisputable historic fact; and, secondly, that Ireland in those far-off times was by no means so isolated from the rest of the world as is generally assumed. Dr. Stokes gives several instances in which Oriental ideas and institutions found their way with singular rapidity into Ireland. This book will be a boon to that large and growing number of persons who desire to have a trustworthy account of the beginning of Irish history, and cannot study it for themselves in the great but often dull works of original investigators. It collects the scattered and often apparently insignificant results of original workers in this field, interprets them for us, and brings them into relation with the broader and better known facts of European history.

---

[8] "The Political Problem: Proposed Solution." By Edwin Guthrie. Manchester: John Heywood. 1886.

[9] "Ireland and the Celtic Church. A History of Ireland from St. Patrick to the English Conquest in 1172." By George T. Stokes, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Trinity College, Dublin. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1886.

The "Liberty and Property Defence League"[10] publishes a report of the address delivered before their Association by M. Léon Say last June, and the speeches made on the occasion. M. Say is the head of a similar association in France, the object of both being to restrain Government action within what they consider its proper limits. But how are these limits to be determined? M. Say laid down a rule which at least is easy to understand, although its application may not be always so easy:—"Les gouvernement trouvent donc leur limite dans la nécessité de respecter deux raisons fondamentale de l'existence de l'humanité . . . . ce sont l'energie individuelle et la responsabilité personelle." But it does not follow that the limit so determined will be identical in different communities. Action, which in one community might crush one or other of these principles, in another community where they have greater power of resistance might be harmless. Hence another rule:—"La limite de l'action du gouvernement est relative à la force de resistance des deux principes qu'il s'agit de sauvegarder." Both France and England have transgressed these principles in M. Say's opinion:—"L'Angleterre et la France se laissent en ce moment entraîner dans une voie d'intervention qui est certainement excessive; et nous sommes les uns et les autres, malade du Socialisme local et du Socialisme d'Etat." M. Say's voice is still a power in the world of economic thinkers; but to the rising generation of social reformers it is already as the voice of one crying in the wilderness.

To what extent, if at all, the reforms of the late Lord Shaftesbury and his followers are included in M. Say's condemnation of England's advance towards Socialism we do not know; but it would be interesting to hear. So far as any direct effect in diminishing individual energy and responsibility is concerned, even the rigid French economist would probably acquit the English philanthropist, looking to actual results. But it is open to M. Say, even so to argue that the tendency of these measures was mischievous, and that their full effects are not yet apparent, though they can be forecast by science. Amongst those who have carried on and extended the work of the late Earl of Shaftesbury, Lord Brabazon[11] holds a distinguished place. His name is perhaps best known in connection with certain associations whose function is to procure the means of healthy recreation for the poor people of the most densely crowded parts of London and other towns. But these are not his only schemes for the social improvement of his fellow-countrymen and women. As Chairman of the National Association for Promoting State-directed Colonization, he presides over a movement of the first importance—one which as yet is hardly under weigh, but which bids fair to become a potent and far-reaching factor in promoting the welfare of the people of these isles, and of the whole British Empire. In support of these and other efforts to do good in his day and generation, Lord Brabazon has written many articles and delivered many addresses. A selection of these is now published as a separate volume under the title "Social Arrows." Many of these articles are well worth careful consideration; they not only present us with a true and temperately coloured sketch from life of a very bad state of things, but offer us, at the same time, means carefully devised for remedying, or at least minimizing, the evils they portray. We know very well that the best intentions of social reformers have again and again aggravated the very evils they were directed against, or produced new ones, especially where the State has been induced to lend its powerful but clumsy aid. For this reason it behoves us to scan closely and with some scepticism such schemes as that of Lord Brabazon's Association for Promoting State-directed Colonization. We note the distinction—and it is vital—between "State-directed" and "State-assisted;" also between "colonization" and "emigration." Lord Brabazon expresses the distinction clearly. "'State-aided emigration' is popularly understood to imply that money should be furnished from the public exchequer to assist needy people to proceed from the United Kingdom to other countries to work for wages. 'State-directed colonization' steps far beyond this. We interpret it to mean the planting of our industrious surplus and unemployed population—not our 'ne'er-do-wells'—upon the lands of the British colonies, under the direction of an officially constituted joint Home and Colonial authority." Further, the Home Government is asked to raise a loan from which to advance the cost of the operation, and this advance is to become a first charge on the farms of the emigrants, and to be repaid by instalments extending over several years. So long ago as 1880 the Government of Canada despatched a memorandum to Lord Kimberley, in which they laid down what Lord Brabazon considers the true conditions of success of any such scheme, and declared themselves ready and willing to do their part. "By very simple pre-arrangement," the memorandum states, "any required number of farm lots could be prepared for occupation in the season preceding the arrival of the immigrants, a small dwelling erected, a certain extent of the prairie land broken up and prepared for seed, and, in the case of late arrival, actually sown, so as to ensure a crop the same season that the immigrants were placed in possession." This, be it remembered, is the serious proposal of the responsible and practical statesmen of Canada, by which they were willing to abide. Unfortunately, the Home authorities, while adopting the scheme, did not see to the strict fulfilment of its essential conditions, and the plan broke down, as Lord Brabazon and his fellow-workers foresaw. The long paper on this subject, and some papers on other means of relieving the fearful pressure of population in England, are the most important portion of "Social Arrows." But there are also some admirable papers on "Open Spaces," and "Public Playgrounds," which show that here, at all events, the author and his friends have achieved something very tangible and visible, and something which, while it cannot possibly offend any one, has added, and will add, let us hope for ever, to the daily health, happiness, and morality of thousands of poor workers and their children.

---

[10] "Municipal and State Socialism. An Address to the Liberty and Property Defence League." By M. Léon Say. London: Central Offices. 1886.

[11] "Social Arrows." By Lord Brabazon. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1886.

Dr. Anton Menger, Professor of Law at the University of Vienna, is perhaps as good a type as we could find in Austria of that group of economists with strong Socialist leanings known as "Socialists of the Chair." In the work now before us, "Das Recht auf den Vollen Arbeitsertrag in geschichtlicher Darstellung,"[12] he aims at working out the fundamental idea of Socialism from the jurists' standpoint. It is a fragment of a larger work in which the author seeks to exhibit Socialism as a "Rechtssystem." This he considers the most important undertaking that the philosophy of law can be applied to in our time. As introductory to the historical part of his work, he commences with an examination of (1) the right to the full profits of labour (*Arbeitsertrag*); (2) the right to existence; (3) the right to work. Passing lightly over German philosophy of law, he traces the origin of all modern scientific Socialism to our countryman, William Godwin, in whose writings may be found the germs of all later Socialist and Anarchist theories. Professor Menger appears to have made a far more minute search for these germs in English writers than any English Socialist has thought it worth while to attempt, and he certainly assigns to our countrymen a larger share of the initiative in this field of thought than has hitherto been claimed for them. The great German Socialist writers, he maintains, have simply borrowed from the earlier speculations of English and French—amongst whom Dr. Menger selects Charles Hall and William Thompson as the English pioneers, next in succession to Godwin, giving a chapter to each of the three. He then traces the development of Socialism through Saint-Simon, Proudhon, Rodbertus, Marx, Louis Blanc, and Ferdinand Lassalle. He gives a chapter to Conservative Socialism in Germany, and another to the Nationalization of Land in England, and ends with an examination of various forms of property. The author's own views are those of an advanced social reformer, who, however, recognizes the necessity of advancing gradually step by step. He emphasizes very strongly the great difference there is in this respect between political and social changes. The former may be successfully established by a *coup d'état*; the latter never can.

Mr. Williams' pamphlet on "Trade Depression and the Appreciation of Gold"[13] is a remarkably able and lucid inquiry into the relations between these two phenomena. It appears to have been suggested by, and to be partly an answer to, Mr. Goschen's address three years ago to the Bankers' Institute on the Appreciation of Gold; and Mr. Williams tells us it was written some time ago as introductory to an essay on some problems of Political Economy, and is now published without waiting for the essay, because the question with which it deals is urgent. Mr. Goschen asks, To what is the fall in prices due? Is it attributable in part at least to a rise in the value of gold? that is to say, is the lower price due to changes connected with commodities, and acting in the first instance on them, or to changes connected with gold and acting directly on it? Mr. Williams thinks that both kinds of change have contributed to present low prices. But in the pamphlet before us he desires to deal only with changes which have acted exclusively on gold. It is in estimating these conditions that he considers Mr. Goschen has missed his mark. As to the facts they are agreed, but in their interpretation of them Mr. Williams differs with Mr. Goschen—at least so Mr. Williams thinks. Mr. Goschen, in fact, appears to assume the orthodox theory that prices depend on the amount of gold in circulation, and that this amount has been, in fact, diminished, and prices have in consequence fallen. Mr. Williams charges Mr. Goschen with here confounding two distinct functions of gold—its function as a measure of value, and its function as a medium of exchange. Low prices are, according to Mr. Williams, the cause not the effect of a diminution in the amount of the circulating medium. It is at least clear that with low prices there is less use for the circulating medium, because a smaller amount of it will serve for a given transaction. And, in fact, bankers know that there is no lack of gold for purposes of circulation at such times, but, on the contrary, it is redundant. On the other hand, Mr. Williams appears to us to look too exclusively to the effect produced by increased cost of production of gold. That this cost has increased is obvious, when we find that, in spite of the greater purchasing power of gold and the consequent greater inducement to produce it, its production has steadily and largely fallen off—fallen to about half what it was thirty years ago. But besides the direct effect on prices which this increased cost of production would have in gold-producing countries on the commodities sent there to be exchanged for the newly produced gold, might not also important effects follow from increased consumption of gold for currency or other purposes and the consequent strain on the stock of gold? The diminished supply of gold, and the enhanced cost of its production are two aspects of one phenomenon. Mr. Williams, however, declines altogether to sanction, though he does not attempt to disprove, the theory that the value of money depends at all on the quantity of it in circulation, and proclaims himself a disciple of Karl Marx, whose "Kapital" "has thrown as much light on economical questions as 'The Origin of Species' has upon natural history." Whether Mr. Williams is right or wrong in his views concerning the accepted theory, he has admirably traced the effect on prices that is produced by enhanced cost of gold production. His reasoning is remarkably clear and convincing in this branch of his inquiry, and forms a most valuable supplement to Mr. Goschen's examination. He shows that effects would follow, corresponding exactly with the phenomena which have been observed in the recent condition of trade and industry. Mr. Williams further inquires how a general fall in prices operates on trade. Low prices, of course, are not in themselves either good or bad for trade. But falling prices are generally bad, and unless accompanied, as they never are, by a proportionate and simultaneous fall in the "fixed charges"—rent, taxes, interest—it is probable that profits almost disappear; going, in fact, to the receivers of those fixed charges, who, through the enhanced purchasing power of gold, get a larger share than before of the produce. Mr. Williams works out very clearly the combined effect of low prices and "fixed charges" on the manufacturer, the landlord, the farmer, and the labourer. The result would be to throw out of gear all our main industries. "And all the while—and here is the misleading part of the business—there would be nothing in the condition of the markets of the world, nothing in the state of trade or agriculture here, to so much as suggest to manufacturers, landlords, farmers, or workmen, that the real cause of this almost universal fall of prices lay, not in the conditions of production at home, but in those of gold-mining enterprise abroad." As to the future Mr. Williams thinks there will be no serious revival of trade until either fresh discoveries of gold shall have reduced the value of the metal to its former level, or else till improved methods of production have so increased the return to labour as to counterbalance the effect of low prices. Mr. Williams appears to overlook the relief which must come, though it comes slowly, from reduction in the "fixed charges." On the other hand, should the value of gold go on increasing as rapidly as it has done the result would be the collapse of our whole industrial system. This, it must be confessed, is cold comfort. But if it is truth it is right that we should know it and face it. Mr. Williams has some excellent remarks on bimetallism which he thinks delusive, although he welcomes discussion on it as likely to throw light on what he considers the real evils of the situation—namely, rents, royalties, and debt. His views on the economic effects of national debts appear to be confused, but his demand that the effect of gold appreciation on such debts should be recognized is not unreasonable. A remedy for the evils caused by fluctuations in the value of gold is to be found, he thinks, in the adoption of sliding scales, which would make rents, royalties, and interest rise and fall in proportion as general prices rose and fell. "Still even these measures are mere palliatives; they will only serve to make the transition from our present social and economic system to a system more rational and more just a little less rough than it threatens to be."

---

[12] "Das Recht auf den Vollen Arbeitsertrag in geschichtlicher Darstellung." Von Dr. Anton Menger, Ord. Professor der Rechte an der Wiener Universität. Stuttgart: Verlag der J. G. Cotta'schen Buchhandlung. 1886.

[13] "Trade Depression and the Appreciation of Gold." By S. D. Williams. Birmingham: Cornish Brothers. 1886.

American writers appear to have a genius for making railroad politics and statistics interesting even to the general reader. Last quarter we noticed this quality in Mr. Hadley's "Railroad Transportation." Mr. Swann's "Investor's Notes"[14] is scarcely less interesting. America is, perhaps, not entitled to claim all the credit of Mr. Swann's attractiveness, for he is an Oxford M.A., as well as a "counsellor at law, and sometime general manager Alabama Great Southern Railroad." His qualifications for dealing ably with his subject are therefore unusual, and his work bears distinct witness to his threefold qualification. Literary culture, legal habit of mind, and practical acquaintance with railroad administration, are combined in his "Investor's Notes." He does not attempt to examine the railroad problem in all its aspects, but merely "that small range of conditions which affect the interests of investors, as such." But these conditions can hardly be examined fully without touching on almost every aspect of the general problem. Indeed, the immediate occasion of his work is the result of his views on the European, and especially the British, political outlook. The "stormy" appearances in Europe, and the distinct foreshadowing of "large changes in the conditions affecting property in the British Empire," lead the author to the conclusion that "large changes in European investments are likely to occur in the course of the next few years, and that a liberal transfer of capital will be made from European to American securities." Immense investments of English money in American railroad securities have at various periods been made; but, strange to say, the investors have given very little attention to the choice or protection of these investments. For the benefit of future investors who have neither time nor inclination to study the subject fully, Mr. Swann has put together these "few practical observations on salient points in the situation." We ought, perhaps, to say that the investor who expects to find here laid down definite rules, or anything like an attempt to appraise the relative merits of specific companies, entirely mistakes the nature of the book. He will find explanations of the causes and the consequences of "control," "pools," "water," "corners," &c.; but when he comes to consider whether a particular railroad is a good one for his investment, he must observe for himself, and interpret at his own peril, with such aid as the above explanations may give him. Thus, after a brief but interesting discussion of the question of Protection, not for the purpose of making out a case for it, but "to indicate in outline the drift and tendency of popular feeling on the subject," he adds: "What bearing the existence and probable permanence of this feeling may have on the investments of foreign capitalists must, of course, be judged of by the parties concerned, according to their several idiosyncrasies and the conclusions of their particular schools of political economy." On the general question of the relative safety of American and English securities, Mr. Swann takes a very desponding view of the latter. He regards England as already "overtaken by the wave of Democracy," doomed to suffer much from "the pest of Socialism," compelled to "ransom" property. True, he admits that America cannot hope to escape the plague; but he argues that the conditions of the problem and the character of the people are less favourable to Socialism in America than in Western Europe. It is in such speculations as these, on the economic as dependent on the political and social future of America and Europe, that we find an unexpected interest in Mr. Swann's "Notes." The investor who would apply them must extend his ken considerably beyond its accustomed range.

---

[14] "An Investor's Notes on American Railroads." By John Swann, M.A. Oxon. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1886.

Much has been said and written about registration of title to land,[15] and many attempts have been made to discover the means of amending our existing machinery which so obstinately refuses to go. The defects of the present system and the objections to most of the proposals hitherto made are easy to point out, and they have been frequently pointed out with great force. But something more than this was achieved by the writer of an article in the July number of this REVIEW. He pointed out one important provision in the Torrens Act which is absent from all existing or proposed English sytems—the guarantee a purchaser has for compensation in case his title should turn out bad. There are also a number of minor defects, many of them naturally flowing from this cardinal one, the remedies for which will be found in most instances in a closer imitation of the system which has stood the test of a pretty long experience in Australia, and given complete satisfaction. Mr. C. F. Brickdale, the author of the article in question, has, we are glad to find, expanded his views, and made them public in a separate volume. He has advisedly addressed himself to the general public, because although legal reforms must be carried out by lawyers, the motive force must be supplied from outside their profession. Space will not permit us to do more than indicate the salient points of the scheme Mr. Brickdale advocates. Any reader, lay or learned, who wishes to understand its full merits will have little difficulty in doing so with Mr. Brickdale's book in his hand. In the Torrens' system "indefeasible" or "absolute" title is not aimed at; but a "guaranteed" title is conferred. This is the grand difference between that system and our own. Under our system the acceptance and registration of a doubtful title involves the possibility of confiscation of dormant claims, the owners of which are not consulted and know nothing of the transaction—confiscation without one penny of compensation. This possibility very properly compels the registrar to be far stricter in his investigation of the title than a purchaser in the ordinary way would be. The result is necessarily much greater delay and expense than the ordinary method involves. And when the title is finally registered, the present system exposes it to new and serious dangers of fraud. In Australia, the injured owner receives full compensation from a fund supplied by a small *ad valorem* tax on all transactions—a mutual insurance fund, in effect. The adoption of this principle would remove some at least of the most formidable defects in the working of Lord Cairns' Act. Other important points insisted on by Mr. Brickdale are, that it must be voluntary in the widest sense; prescription and limitation must remain; trusts must be recognized; and facilities given for effecting bankers' mortgages without publicity.

Vegetarianism[16] is not dead, nor even sleeping, although of late its voice has been almost lost in the din of political and social struggles of a more exciting nature. Mr. H. S. Salt, of the Manchester Vegetarian Society, has just published a little volume of essays in support of the principles of the Society. The essays are written with conspicuous ability and moderation. He proves his case "up to the hilt," if we admit his assertions, and he brings weighty authority to support them. We are aware that there are plenty of authorities on the opposite side of the question, but we must nevertheless frankly admit that the arguments are almost all on the side of the vegetarians. They claim—and they support their claim with arguments not easy to answer—that flesh-eating is at once immoral, unwholesome, and uneconomical. That it is less economical and less wholesome than their own system they claim to have proved from their own personal experiences; and if it has these two characteristics, it is certainly hard to resist the further argument that it is immoral. For if flesh-eating is not beneficial to body, mind, or pocket, how can we justify the appalling amount of suffering inflicted on animals by the practice? We cannot argue the question here; but any one who wishes to see it from the vegetarian's point of view cannot do better than read this little book. The arguments, as we said, are on the side of the vegetarians; but custom and prejudice are against them, and are likely to hold the field for ages to come. If food reformers bear this in mind, it may spare them discouragement at the slowness of their progress.

---

[15] "Registration of Title to Land; and How to Establish it Without Cost or Compulsion." By Charles Fortescue Brickdale. London: Edward Stanford. 1886.

[16] "A Plea for Vegetarianism, and other Essays." By H. S. Salt. Manchester: John Heywood. 1886.

Mr. Hubert Hall, the author of "A History of the Customs Revenue in England," has "once more tendered his mite of industry towards the tardy restoration fund of historical research." His present work, which he calls "Society in the Elizabethan Age,"[17] endeavours to sketch various types of the society of that period—the landlord, the steward, the merchant, the host, the lawyer, the courtier, &c.—some ten in all. The latter half of the book is taken up with two appendices, in which a number of original documents (accounts, inventories, records, letters, &c.) illustrative of the text are reproduced, and all those relating to the Darrell family of Littlecote, are collected together. Of these sketches, the author tells us: "I have attempted to place before the reader some familiar names in new characters, with the aid of a mass of information, desultory I must confess, but perhaps curious, as it is certainly new." The author here hits his own weak point. His information we may admit to be new, and even curious; but it is thrown together without much skill, and narratives which are, as we gather, intended to be complete and continuous, if not exhaustive, have a very maimed and disjointed appearance. The difficulty of picturing to ourselves the characters he endeavours to sketch is increased by the obscurity of meaning of many of his sentences; and, to crown all, the reader must rely chiefly on his own "previous knowledge" to enable him to distinguish between historical fact and the author's "colouring." In his preface he frankly admits, "I have followed my personal inclinations in the historical colouring of my materials." But, notwithstanding these blemishes, Mr. Hall's book is a valuable one, even if it fails to prove the somewhat obscure proposition that "the Romance of Society, as read in the infallible records of the past, possesses attractions greater and more lasting than a many conceptions of impossible humanity." Mr. Hall is not a literary artist. He is, however, a good navvy in the work of historical research, and has tossed up, amid much rubbish, some material which is capable of being worked up into valuable forms. The material is scattered through the sketches as well as condensed into appendices. His plan is to take some historical person, and group around him all the information the author's researches in the public records have yielded. Thus Sir John Popham is taken as the type of the lawyer, and Sir Thomas Gresham as the type of the merchant. "Wild Darrell," of Littlecote, appears in two parts—landlord and courtier. Indeed, "the 'star' of this little historical company is none other than that Lord of Littlecote whose evil fame has descended to us from a barely contemporary gossip, and is now best known through the exquisitely pathetic ballad of 'The Friar of Orders Grey,' in 'Rokeby,' together with Burke's version of the same legend." Mr. Hall evidently thinks, and not without reason, that "the spacious times of great Elizabeth" were not altogether so pleasant to live in, or so full of sweetness and light, as they are popularly supposed to have been. The reader will find an interesting map of London in Elizabeth's time, and some other plates from original sources. There is also an index.

---

[17] "Society in the Elizabethan Age." By Hubert Hall, of H.M. Public Record Office. London: Swan Sonnenschein, Lowrey & Co. 1886.

"The Dogaressa"[18] is disappointing. Professor Melmonti's work fails to interest us, probably because he does not give us time enough to get acquainted with the great number of faces that are outlined on his canvas. They want individuality; they pass before us rapidly as abstractions, devoid of distinctness of form and colour; and when we are told some fact concerning this or that "dogaressa" we take little interest in it because we know nothing else about her and are unable to bring the fact into relation with her life and character. It is, perhaps, not quite fair to the author to judge of his critical remarks on the art and literature of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries from a translation. Nothing is so impossible to translate as the subtle ideas of a profound criticism. The critic himself must be a master of expression as well as of thought, if he is to be successful in conveying his thought to other minds. And his thought when expressed can never be conveyed by the simple process of construing his words into their equivalent in another tongue. The translation is introduced by Mr. G. A. Sala with a few desultory remarks on the charms of modern Venice; but although "asked to say a few words concerning Clare Brune's translation," he carefully avoids doing so.

Without looking too closely into controversial points or pledging ourselves as to the correctness of his views on all of these, we may say generally that Mr. Loftie is eminently qualified to write the municipal history of London by the light of recently discovered evidence. His "London,"[19] just published as one of Messrs. Freeman and Hunt's "Historic Towns" Series, will disappoint readers who hope to find in it a record of the great events of which London has been the scene. To deal with every aspect of London history would require several volumes. Mr. Loftie had "to pick and choose." While proud—to an extravagant degree, as we think—of the decisive influence London has always exerted in great political movements for a thousand years past, he wisely recognizes that no book of this size "could contain a complete account of the influence of London upon England, and at the same time account for that influence;" and he has chosen to attempt only the latter task. He tell us "more about the history of the City in itself than about the history of the City in relation to that of all England." (In passing we invite Mr. Loftie's attention to the construction of the sentence on page 212 from which we have just quoted.) No summary of ours could give the reader so comprehensive an idea of the contents of this little volume as the following, which is the author's own:—

---

[18] "The Dogaressa." By W. G. Melmonti. Translated by Clare Brune. With Preface by G. A. Sala. London: Remington. 1886.

> I have endeavoured, without writing a continuous narrative, to show, first, by the investigation of recently discovered evidences, how London attained its paramount position in the kingdom; secondly, how its municipal institutions, the models on which those of almost every other English city and town have been moulded, grew up from the combination of the English shire system with the foreign commune, and partakes of characteristics derived from both; thirdly, how, in spite of the legal subjection of Middlesex and part of Surrey to the City, the suburbs grew and extended under the control, not of the citizens, but of the ecclesiastical landowners and their successors. And lastly, I have tried in the two concluding chapters to account for the wealth and trade of London, and to show by two examples, taken as far apart, chronologically, as possible, the nature of London's influence on politics.

It will be evident from this that the book is not exactly one for boys and girls. Indeed its audience will be rather strictly limited, we fancy. Important as is the phase of London history which Mr. Loftie has devoted himself to in this work, we cannot but think it somewhat unfortunate that he should have selected it for his contribution to what we suppose is intended to be a popular series. Valuable his work most certainly is; and if only he can get the readers of "Historic Towns" to study his "London," they will have reason to be grateful to him. Students of the subject, at least, will in any case rejoice over this careful and compact volume.

We have no important books of travel this quarter. Times are bad, and people's thoughts are gloomily pre-occupied with grave questions of public interest. Mr. Percy Clarke's "'New Chum' in Australia"[20] has reached a second edition, a success it deserved, no doubt. It belongs, indeed, to the large and commonplace family of globe-trotters' experiences; but it is considerably above the average of its brethren in attractive qualities. It is carefully written; minute and graphic in its descriptions of people, manners, and natural features; fair and kindly; humorous, though its humour is not always in perfect taste; on the whole, an entertaining and truthful picture of what it purports to represent. By far the best chapters are those in which he describes in detail life on a "station." The illustrations are well enough drawn, but rather insignificant. They unconsciously call attention to the remarkable lack of picturesque elements in Australian scenery—so different in that respect from the scenery of New Zealand.

---

[19] "London." By W. J. Loftie. ("Historic Towns" Series. Edited by E. A. Freeman and W. Hunt). London: Longmans. 1886.

[20] "The 'New Chum' in Australia; or, the Scenery, Life, and Manners of Australians, in Town and Country." By Percy Clarke. Illustrated. Second Edition. London: J. S. Virtue & Co. 1886.

Dr. Gordon Stables has already made his mark in the field of fiction as a writer of thrilling adventures by sea and land. In his new volume[21] there is nothing thrilling, there is hardly anything that can be called an adventure, and we are bound to assume there is no fiction. It will not, therefore, be as popular with boys as "The Cruise of the 'Snowbird'" for instance. It speaks rather to the mature mind, the thoughtful, contemplative lover of quiet, rural English scenes and out-of-the way, old-fashioned villages. "The Cruise of the Land-Yacht 'Wanderer'" is an account of a rare, but not quite new, mode of touring for health and pleasure combined. In the author's case the experiment was a brilliant success. But there are not a great many persons to whom a similar experiment is possible, or, if possible, likely to be satisfactory. To begin with, it is decidedly expensive and requires leisure. It is not every one who can leave wife and family and house to take care of themselves for several months, or who, if they got over this difficulty, could enjoy a solitary existence. It is all very well for an author who can employ himself agreeably and profitably writing an account of his thoughts and experiences; but how many of us could fill up our time in that way? No! "Caravanning," delightful and wholesome as we grant it to be, is not for any but a favoured few. Still there are a few for whom it is possible, and if they should suffer from *ennui*, debility of nerves, indigestion, or any other of the forms of ill-health for which Dr. Stables recommends his cure, by all means let them try it. There must be something seriously wrong with mind or body if they do not return from their cruise better men than they were at starting. It was, at all events, a happy inspiration which led Dr. Stables to turn gentleman-gipsy. The Bristol Waggon Company built him a caravan after his own design. It contained at one end a kitchen pantry, with stove, &c.; at the other end a *coupé* to shelter the coachman, or for the owner to lounge on as if on deck; and in the middle was the "saloon," which was dining-room, drawing-room, and library by day and bedroom by night; the whole twenty feet long, and fitted up with every comfort and luxury that space would permit. It was drawn by two horses. The crew consisted of a coachman, a valet who was cook also, a Newfoundland dog, and a parrot. The

---

[21] "The Cruise of the Land-Yacht 'Wanderer;' or, Thirteen Hundred Miles in my Caravan." By Gordon Stables, C.M., M.D., R.N. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1886.

"Wanderer" had also a "tender" in the shape of a tricycle, which the author found most useful. Thus equipped, the crew were independent of both hotels and trains. All they wanted was provisions, which were purchased on the road as required, and any quiet corner to stand in at night. Horses and coachman were, however, housed in the usual way. In this moving house our author travelled slowly from Berkshire to the Highlands, returning to London by train, and caravanning home *viâ* Brighton. As he travelled, he wrote his experiences and impressions. These, we can well believe, were as pleasant as they were novel. There is probably no equally good, and there is certainly no such comfortable, way of seeing the country parts of England and studying the country folk as in a well-appointed caravan. There are a considerable number of illustrations, but they are not particularly interesting in subject or treatment.

Miss Marryat has given us at least an amusing account of her experiences in America.[22] Her style, if flippant at times, is bright and lively; and if her impressions of things and people American are sketched with a flying hand, and neither go, nor pretend to go, below the surface, they have the merit of being lively and amusing. The most entertaining pages of the book are those which comprise the letters written to her by an old travelling companion of her father's. It is like a voice from *outre tombe*, recalling and reminding us of past merry days. American women, though spoken of as a community, and not as individuals, will not feel gratified by reading Miss Marryat's comments on their manners, or rather want of them; their laughter, "shrill and harsh," and their lack of politeness to strangers. Yet the author is not wanting in acknowledgment of the kindness she has met with on various occasions from some among these women, who "all talk together like a flock of parrots," and who speak of a "real elegant lunch," who "room together," and have sometimes a "lovely husband," meaning they find him charming. But indeed these sayings are not exclusively the property of the reigning sex. Miss Marryat was only eight months in the country, and exclusively occupied during that time by her business. Yet she learnt to love America, and hopes to return to it, in spite of the annoyances she sustained at various times from hotel servants, shop-assistants, and from *one* adverse critic; but that, we read, was on British territory, and therefore the great American nation must not be held accountable for him.

A second edition of Mr. Carnegie's "Triumphant Democracy,"[23] which we noticed in our July number, has already appeared. We are not surprised at this proof of its popularity; for, in spite of much that will raise a smile of half-amused dissent on an English reader's face, Mr. Carnegie's descriptions of American affairs are decidedly interesting and truthful. Every such book tends to unite in feeling the two great divisions of the Anglo-Saxon race, and we can only regret that, in his admiration for the country of his adoption, Mr. Carnegie is often unjust to his born countrymen. That the immeasurable superiority of America—granting that it is immeasurably superior—is due to her form of government, or that the assimilation of the government of England to that of the United States would benefit the English people, Mr. Carnegie very wisely makes no attempt to demonstrate. It is a faith with him, and of course proof is superfluous. It never for an instant crosses Mr. Carnegie's enthusiastic mind that the prosperity of America may be due to causes other than her form of government. If Mr. Carnegie had some elementary acquaintance with history he would hardly have fallen into this simple error.

---

[22] "Tom Tiddler's Ground." By Florence Marryat. London: Swan Sonnenschein, Lowrey & Co. 1886.

[23] "Triumphant Democracy; or, Fifty Years' March of the Republic." By Andrew Carnegie. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington. 1886.

The story of the *Alabama*,[24] from the day she left Birkenhead until she was sunk off Cherbourg by the *Kearsage*, is given by one of her crew. It bears internal evidence of tolerable fidelity to fact. Of course her commander's intentions were not fully known to the crew; but what an ordinary sailor was in a position to see and understand, Mr. P. D. Haywood has told us very intelligibly in his own sailor's language. The start, the life on board, the capture of prizes, and the final duel are graphically told. His verdict on the Yankees is, "they fought their ship magnificently, and beat us fairly."

We feel quite lost in admiration at the completeness and the lucidity of arrangement exhibited in the statistics issued by the Italian Ministero di Agricultura, Industria e Commercio. We know not whether to wonder most at the patience or the ingenuity of the compilers. What splendid material the future economic historian and statistician will find ready prepared! We are particularly struck with the beautiful charts showing the movements of the prices of some six or seven of the most important articles of food in an unbroken weekly record from 1862 to 1885. An examination of these statistics suggests many interesting conclusions; but we have not space for them, and indeed they do not concern English readers very nearly. Amongst these official statistics are the following:—"Movimento dei Prezzi di Alcuni generi Alimentari dal 1862 al 1885; e confronto fra essi e il movimento delle Mercedi;" "Atti della Commissione per il Riordinamento della Statistica giudiziaria Civile e Penale;" "Saggio di Una Storia Sommaria della Stampa Periodica;" "Bilanci Comunali per l'anno 1884. Parte I.;" "Statistica della Emigrazione Italiana per gli anni 1884 e 1885."

We have received the following pamphlets, which we have been unable to notice:—"The Irish Question. I. History of an Idea. II. Lessons of the Election." By the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone (London: John Murray. 1886); "The Development of the Athenian Democracy." By F. B. Jevons, M.A., Tutor in the University of Durham (London: C. Griffin & Co.); "The Relations between Church and State and the Tithing System." By Stephen Williamson, M.P. (Liverpool: Gilbert Walmsley). Also the following books:—"An

---

[24] "The Cruise of the 'Alabama.'" By One of the Crew. With Notes from Historical Authorities. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1886.

Australian Orator: Speeches, Political, Social, Literary, and Theological, delivered in the Parliament of New South Wales and on the Public Platform by David Buchanan." Edited by Richmond Thatcher (London: Remington & Co. 1886); "A System of Political Economy." By Arthur M. Smith. Second Edition (London: Williams & Norgate); "Handbook of Jamaica for 1886–87: Comprising Historical, Statistical, and General Information concerning the Island." Published by Authority. By A. C. Sinclair and Laurence R. Fyfe (London: Ed. Stanford. 1886).

SCIENCE.

AN important memoir on the absorption of the sun's heat by the earth's atmosphere, prepared by Professor Langley, of the Alleghany Observatory, has been issued by the War Department of the United States of America.[1] An expedition was sent to Mount Whitney, in Southern California, by the liberality of a citizen of Pittsburg. A station was chosen so that observations could be made on the sun's heat at low and high levels, with the result that the observed heat at the higher level was conspicuously and systematically greater than the heat which theoretically should be found at that height. As higher levels are reached the air becomes more and more capable of transmitting rays, quite independent of its diminishing density, and the transmissibility increases throughout the spectrum as the wave length increases, so that the blue rays pass more readily than the violet, and the green than the blue. The author concludes that the heat received by the earth from the sun annually would be sufficient to melt a shell of ice over the whole surface of the earth 54·45 metres deep, but that something less than two-thirds of this amount reaches the sea level from a vertical sun. The temperature of the earth's surface, however, is not due primarily to this radiation, but to the selective absorption of our atmosphere, without which, the temperature of the soil in the tropics under a vertical sun would probably not rise above −200° C. The memoir appeals rather to the scientific man than to any other class of reader.

The second volume published by the Royal Society of Canada[2] is not inferior in interest to the first. The transactions are divided into five sections, of which the first comprises a number of literary and historical memoirs in French, and includes a number of poems. The second section is a similar series of literary papers in English, dealing with the early history of Canada, its native races and poets. The third section opens with a memoir by Dr. Sterry Hunt, on the origin of crystalline rocks, in which a valuable history of the views held by the earlier writers is set forth, and the growth traced of a new hypothesis in which the author asserts that the ancient crystalline rocks were generated either directly from materials brought to the surface by subterranean springs rising from the primary igneous rock, or in later times by the reactions of these materials with clays and magnesian salts. Various illustrations of this hypothesis, termed the crenitic hypothesis, follow. This interpretation is based upon the hypothesis that the primary igneous rock was similar to basalt, from which the quartz and felspars would be separated by aqueous processes. The author remarks: "Igneous fusion destroys the mineral species of the crystalline stratified rocks, and brings them back as nearly as possible to the primary indifferentiated material. Fire is the great destroyer and disorganizer of mineral as well as of organic matter." Other interesting papers comprise an account of the manganese ores of Nova Scotia, by Mr. Gilpin; a revision of the Canadian Ranunculaceæ, by Professor Lawson; an account of the Trilobites in the St. John's Rocks, by Mr. Matthew; an historical account of the Taconian rocks, by Dr. Sterry Hunt; a history of Canadian ferns, by Macoun and Burgess; besides a few minor memoirs. The deficiency of the volume is in illustration, and we venture to think that a work of this national importance should not, from deficiency in a matter in which almost every scientific publication is better provided, fail to secure a place in every reference library.

---

[1] "United States of America, War Department. Professional Papers of the Signal Service, No. XV. Researches on Solar Heat and its Absorption by the Earth's Atmosphere. A Report of the Mount Whitney Expedition." By S. P. Langley, Director of the Alleghany Observatory, with the approval of the trustees. Washington: Government Printing Office. London: Trubner. 1884.

[2] "Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada for the Year 1884." Volume II. Montreal: Dawson Brothers. London: Trübner & Co. 1885.

Many small books on geology have been written, but with the rapid modern growth of the science they have either become large books, or have not been revised. One of the most excellent of the small treatises in its day was the "Historical Geology" by Professor Ralph Tate; and Mr. Jukes-Browne[3] now offers, under a similar title, a compact volume on a not dissimilar plan, but with fuller illustration and a more ambitious treatment. It is well conceived and well worked out. After an introduction, follows a brief palæontological treatise on the geographical distribution of life, the origin and succession of species, and the correlation of rocks by the evidence from their fossils. The historical geology which follows is devoted to the strata; commencing with the oldest, they are followed through the successive deposits on to the most recent accumulations. Each rock is described in the geographical areas in which it is found, its characteristic fossils are enumerated, its foreign equivalents are given, and the physical geography of the period of time in which each deposit was accumulated is discussed. It is what it professes to be—a handbook for students, and the illustrations contribute greatly to the elucidation of the text. The book concludes with a good index.

---

[3] "The Student's Handbook of Historical Geology." By A. J. Jukes-Browne, B.A., F.G.S. With numerous Diagrams and Illustrations. London: George Bell & Sons. 1886.

"The Prospector's Handbook"[4] is an unsatisfactory little volume, addressed to those who are seeking to discover mineral wealth. It first states the conditions under which metallic ores may be looked for, then gives the most elementary information concerning rocks and lodes, and the principles on which minerals may be recognized. The mineralogical characters of the ores and precious stones are briefly stated, as are methods of assay. A short chapter on surveying concludes the book, to which is added an appendix of some common tables, a glossary of miners' terms, and an index. The information is altogether too brief to be practically useful, though the idea of presenting the minimum of information which the prospector is likely to be able to grasp, may make the work acceptable to those who have had no scientific training, and have no leisure to study the subject in a systematic way; but since the author states that he has traversed the mineral fields of New Zealand, New Caledonia, New Mexico, and Colorado, we may think that he ought to have gained experience enough to have stated the subject in a more systematic and practically useful way.

The use of electricity in the separation, purification, and deposition of metals has grown with the development of electric power, and is likely to grow until it plays no unimportant part in the separation of metals from their ores. Mr. Watt's Treatise on Electro-Deposition[5] is preceded by a short account, chiefly historical, of the scientific principles involved, and then chapters are devoted to the electro-deposition of copper, gold, silver, nickel, tin, iron, zinc, and alloys, in which processes are described from the most simple and familiar up to those which involve elaborate machinery, and form the basis of many important industries. With chapter twenty-nine electro-metallurgy is commenced, which is defined as being the refining and separation of metals from their ores by electrolysis, and this part of the work gives some account of the principal electrolytic copper refineries, and the refining of lead, gold, silver and other metals. Many other matters are treated of, such as the mechanical operations of polishing and burnishing, the recovery of metals from waste solutions, and other subjects of a practical nature. The work concludes with a full index. It cannot fail to be interesting to the large class of artisans and manufacturers, whose interest is rather with practical results of science than in the theoretical principles out of which those results have grown.

It is remarkable that the honey-bee, which is indigenous over the whole of India, and exists in a favourable climate, has received little attention and cultivation compared with the honey-bee of Europe.

---

[4] "The Prospector's Handbook. A Guide for the Prospector and Traveller in Search of Metal-bearing or other Valuable Minerals." By J. W. Anderson, M.A., F.R.G.S. London: Crosby Lockwood & Co. 1886.

[5] "Electro-Deposition. A Practical Treatise on the Electrolysis of Gold, Silver, Copper, Nickel and other Metals and Alloys; with Descriptions of Voltaic Batteries, Magneto- and Dynamo-Electric Machines, Thermopiles, and of the Materials and Processes used in every Department of the Art." By Alexander Watt. With numerous Illustrations. London: Crosby Lockwood & Co. 1886.

Hives are built in Cashmere and the Punjaub, but of the sixty-five specimens of honey sent to the Exhibition at Calcutta, almost all were fermented, thin, and, from the European point of view, unmarketable, so that good pure honey is not to be obtained in Calcutta from indigenous bees. Mr. Douglas,[6] who has given some attention to the subject, describes the habits of the honey-bees of India and his experiments in introducing the honey-bee of North Italy, which is much more productive, easy to manipulate, and obtained cheaply. These bees have been bred and successfully cultivated in Calcutta, so that there is every reason to believe that they may be successfully distributed, in which case bees may become a not inconsiderable source of wealth and food for the native population.

Although the Chinese have long made use of greenhouses, the first structure of this kind in Europe was erected at Heidelberg in 1619. Since then multitudinous details of improvement have been developed, and this information Mr. Fawkes brings together in his volume on horticultural buildings.[7] The subject is discussed with regard to the position of the house, with a view to securing the rays which are necessary for plant life, and with reference to the effect of the angle of the roof on the admission of the sun's rays to the house. Drainage and levelling are also considered. Then the various types of lean-to houses, span-roof houses, curvilinear houses, &c., with wall-tree protectors, conservatories, &c., are described and illustrated by some figures. Garden-frames and pits, with the various sheds and houses which are necessary to a garden, receive notice. Attention is given to the glass, paint, training wires, ventilation, opening gear, staging and lighting. The information extends to the modes of heating, boilers, furnaces, fuel, water supply, and instruments for meteorological observation. The volume is written chiefly from the architect's point of view—the gardener's point of view apparently being regarded as subordinate. Yet, after all, the great object of such a work should be to set forth how the best practical results may be attained with the simplest appliances, and we have long been led to believe that the backward condition of the gardener's art in this country is due to the fact that the architect as a rule is not a practical gardener, while gardening is hardly yet looked upon as a branch of applied science sufficiently important to be followed as a profession.

The lower types of plant life have always had a fascination for young students, and the modern use of the microscope in botany has tended to develop this predilection. Mr. McAlpine has written a small volume[8] of about 300 pages, in which the first chapter, extending to 105 pages, is termed a comparative study of plants and animals, on a physiological basis, which discusses the general, structural, and physiological conditions of organs, not with the clearness which the subject is capable of being presented with, but in a systematic way. The remainder of the book comprises ten more chapters, in which, after describing the living cell in its various forms, chapters are given to the life histories of various plants which show stages of development from the cell through more complex structures, to the seaweeds, lichens, moss, fern, and pillwort. The concluding chapter is on the connection between flowerless and flowering plants. The volume is printed on good paper, with well-selected woodcuts, mostly copied from Sach's "Botany." The criticism which occurs to us is, that the story told of each plant is very short, and that any one who should attempt to follow with the aid of a microscope the life histories here told would acquire a fuller and better knowledge than the book offers.

---

[6] "The Hive Bees and the Introduction of the Italian Bee." By J. C. Douglas. Reprinted from the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. LV. Part II. 1886. Calcutta: J. W. Thomas. London: Trübner & Co. 1886.

[7] "Horticultural Buildings: their Construction, Heating, Interior Fittings, &c., with Remarks on some of the Principles Involved, and their Application." With 123 Illustrations. By F. A. Fawkes. New Edition. London: Swan Sonnenschein, & Co. 1886.

[8] "Life Histories of Plants." By Professor D. McAlpine. With over 100 Woodcuts and 50 Diagrams. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

Dr. J. C. Brown adds to many works on forestry an account of the School of Forest Engineers in Spain.[9] It is interesting as giving a detailed account of the organization, and the studies carried on by the students in the several years of their work; and it further gives some account of the principal publications contained in the library to which the students' attention is directed. A second part of the work is termed Practicable arrangements in accordance with those in the School of Forest Engineers in Spain, suitable for a British National School of Forestry, in which the author formulates a scheme of study, and discusses the conditions under which it might be carried out. It is much to be desired that the author's persevering efforts to diffuse knowledge concerning forestry should bear fruit in the foundation of a school for this country, as well equipped as those of some other European countries.

Mr. Scott Burn[10] writes on farming from practical experience, but addresses himself to the small farmer who is able to carry on such cultivation as is usual on the Continent. In these days it needs some courage to say anything in favour of farming when cultivation has ceased to be profitable in so many industries, and farms are let with difficulty on any terms. But there is no doubt that the small farm worked by the farmer with labour which commences at from two to four o'clock in the morning, and continued as long as it is needed, or can be given, may succeed where farming with our short English hours of working necessarily fails. The present work is an expanded form of a volume formerly published as the "Lessons of my Farm," and the author discusses cropping, fencing, weeds, implements; the rotation of crops, and the cultivation of root crops, leaf crops, corn, beans, with haymaking, manuring, cattle feeding, ensilage, the rearing and management of cattle, making of butter and cheese; poultry, pigs, &c. It is an interesting volume, written in a bright entertaining style, so that even technical matters are made interesting.

---

[9] "School of Forest Engineers in Spain, indicative of a Type for a British National School of Forestry." Compiled by John Crombie Brown, LL.D., Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 1886.

[10] "Systematic Small Farming; or the Lessons of my Farm; being an Introduction to Modern Farm Practice for small Farmers." By Robert Scott Burn. With numerous Illustrations. London: Crosby Lockwood & Co. 1886.

We have received among mathematical books a Treatise on Elementary Statics,[11] by John Greaves, which is designed for students who are not sufficiently advanced to read Professor Minchin's statics.

Part I. of a "Treatise of Spherical Trigonometry,"[12] as far as the end of the solution of triangles, by McClelland and Preston, is written with a view to the wants of University examinations. It includes a number of fully worked-out examples and answers to examination papers.

The second part of this treatise[13] consists largely of spherical geometry. The chapters deal with the circles related to a triangle, areas, the chordal triangle, concurrent arcs and concyclic points, direction angles and direction cosines, theory of an harmonic and harmonic section, the small circle, projection, spherical reciprocity, and concludes with a chapter of miscellaneous propositions.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

THE letters of Cassiodorus,[1] though well known to the professional student of history, are probably not equally familiar to the general public, and a short sketch of his life and works may therefore be acceptable. We gather from the introduction that Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus Senator (the last name, it may be noted, being a family cognomen and not an official title) was the third of a line of Roman officials, noble and highly cultured, who rose successively to the highest offices of the State. He was appointed by his father, who then held the office of Prætorian Perfect under King Theodoric, as an assessor in his own Court. Having attracted the favourable notice of the king, he was (A.D. 505), at the early age of twenty-five, raised to the post of Questor, an office under which was combined part of the duties of a Home and Foreign Minister with those of a private secretary to the Sovereign. He was to all intents and purposes Prime Minister in civil matters, and was a strong supporter of Theodoric's policy, the principal object of which was to preserve harmony between the Gothic and Roman population, leaving to the former the defence of the realm, and to the latter the care of the civil administration under the guiding hand of the king. This policy, however, endured for little more than the life of its founder, owing to the quarrel which arose between the King and the Pope, in consequence of which the Roman population took the first opportunity of transferring their allegiance to the Eastern Emperor. Cassiodorus was raised to the Consulship in A.D. 514, and to the Patriciate in A.D. 515. In 526 the great king died, and was succeeded by his grandson Athalaric, a child eight years old, his mother, Amalesuentha, being regent. Cassiodorus retained his position under the new government, and was in 533 promoted to the highest office in the kingdom—that of Prætorian Prefect. On the death of Athalaric in 534, Amalasuentha associated with her in the government Theodoric's nephew and nearest male heir, Theodahad, who, however, deposed and murdered her in 535. Theodahad, being doubtful of his ability to retain his position, entered into negotiation with the Eastern Emperor, with the view of exchanging his kingdom for a pension. On the invasion of Belisarius in the same year, he was deposed by his countrymen in favour of Witigis, who was finally made prisoner on the fall of Ravenna in 540. Cassiodorus, who under all changing circumstances retained office, seems to have retired from public life, about 538, to Squillace, in Calabria, his native town, and to have devoted the rest of his life to literary pursuits. He died about 575, aged ninety-six. His principal literary works consist first of the "Variæ" (his correspondence from 505 to 538), of which a compendium is given in the present volume; second, "The Chronicon," a history of the world; third, "A History of the Goths"; fourth, the treatises "De Institutione" and "De Orthographia:" together with commentaries on the Psalms and Epistles," transcripts of the Psalter," &c., a history of the Church, and some grammatical works which have not been recovered. In conclusion, we have to call attention to the chapters upon the imperial administration, military, financial, and civil, out of which the feudal government of the Middle Ages took its rise, and to express a hope that Mr. Hodgkin will perform the same kind office for Procopius that he has already done for Cassiodorus.

---

[11] "A Treatise on Elementary Statics." By John Greaves, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

[12] "A Treatise on Spherical Trigonometry." With Numerous Examples. Part I., to the End of the Solution of Triangles. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

[13] "A Treatise on Spherical Trigonometry. With Applications to Spherical Geometry and Numerous Examples." Part II. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

[1] "The Letters of Cassiodorus." By Thomas Hodgkin. London: Hy. Frowde. 1886.

In his preface to "The Law and Custom of the Constitution,"[2] Sir William Anson states very clearly the object which his book is meant to serve, distinguishing his task from that of Professor Dicey by means of a comparison which also serves to convey to the last-named a very pretty and well-deserved compliment. "Nor again," he explains, "have I attempted to delineate the law of our constitution after the manner of Professor Dicey. He has drawn, with an unerring hand, those features which distinguish our constitution from others, and has given us a picture which can hardly fail to impress itself on the mind with a sense of reality. I have tried to map out a portion of its surface and to fill in the details. He has done the work of an artist; I have tried to do the work of a surveyor." The volume now under notice deals only with one-half of the subject—viz.,

---

[2] "The Law and Custom of the Constitution. Part I. Parliament." By Sir William R. Anson, Bart., D.C.L. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1886.

"Parliament." It is essentially a book of contemporary practice, with only so much historical introduction as is necessary to make clear how existing institutions have come to be what they are. It is meant primarily for students, but every variety of person having to take part in the operations of public life will find it useful, since it sets forth formally the steps of procedure, which, however familiar parts of it are, and however often described by the pens of journalists (the portion, for example, stating the proceedings at the opening of Parliament—a standing dish in the newspaper *menu* in February, and described more than once in Lucy's "Diary of Two Parliaments"), it is well to have stated in this precise and accurate manner and in its due place. But most of the erudition is by no means of this familiar character, explaining, as it does, the mysteries of the meeting of Parliament, of the qualifications of elected and electors, the constitution of the House of Peers, and so forth.

It is to be feared that, Miss Strickland and Lord Campbell notwithstanding, and spite of all the faith which generation after generation has placed in the representations of poet and historian, Shakespeare's Prince Henry and his mirth-moving, if disreputable, associates, are creatures of fancy, and not of fact; and that the story in which the independent judge, the law-abiding prince, and the proud king-father play such excellent parts, must also be relegated to the region of fiction, at least so far as the personages generally supposed to have been the actors in it are concerned. Mr. Herbert Croft, in a learned note to the story of Prince Henry's committal by Justice Gascoign for contempt, as given in his edition of Elyot's "Booke of the Governor," states excellent reasons for supposing that a similar transaction, which really took place in the persons of Edward I. and the then Prince of Wales, has been wrongly attributed to those usually credited with it; and now Mr. Solly-Flood, in a most painstaking and convincing argument, enlarges, in his "Story of Prince Henry of Monmouth and Chief Justice Gascoign,"[3] on the same theme. A perusal of this tractate—a reprint from the "Transactions of the Royal Historical Society"—leads to the conclusion that, contrary to the belief so long generally held, the Prince was in reality a model of "propriety, modesty, and perseverance"—indeed, an abnormally sedate youth, with never so old a head on quite boyish shoulders. For the indisputable evidence of authentic records, ably marshalled by Mr. Solly-Flood, shows him at the early age of fourteen years in active command of a force in Wales, and traces his career almost day by day from that time till his own accession to the throne, thus, by a process of exhaustion, making the popular account of his supposed unruly youth and its vagaries impossible. Oldcastle, Bardolph, Falstaff, and other of the Prince's early friends receive like vindication at Mr. Solly-Flood's hands, and are placed on the level, not only of respectability but of honour and virtue, which seems to be their just due.

---

[3] "The Story of Prince Henry of Monmouth and Chief Justice Gascoign." By F. Solly-Flood, Q.C. Reprinted from the "Transactions of the Royal Historical Society." London: Longmans. 1886.

It is an unpleasant task to destroy popular and romantic beliefs, but it is one which the new school of historical research, the enemy of all superstition, is bound to fulfil. Mr. Hubert Hall, whose able book on the Customs was to a certain extent aimed at theories put forward by other historians, has now given us a picture of society of the time of Sidney and Raleigh,[4] which will not be at all to the taste of those who consider (and there are still many) that the Reformation made the bulk of the people of England virtuous and happy. Mostly from private papers Mr. Hall describes life in the country, where tenant was set against landlord, and landlord against tenant, and only the lawyer and money-lender flourished. "Where once, on the monastery lands, garden patches of grain and pulse and potherbs filled in the landscape, tracts of bare down supported thousands of murrain-wasted sheep. The agricultural population had disappeared in these districts, many had perished from want, and more still on the scaffold." In the town, "the Reformers had pulled down the 'crows' nests,' those venerable Gothic piles, cloister, hospitium, and sanctuary, and were forced to replace them with the hideous lazar-houses of poverty and crime." "The towns were flooded with tippling-houses, bowling alleys, tabling dens, and each haunt of vicious dissipation," and the typical burgess is described as "a clever and successful knave, who has since been revered as a citizen patriarch, one of the good old times." The typical merchant relieves himself of his obligations to Government, by getting his accounts signed by a fraudulent trick. The typical bishop, though a good Protestant, is a bad magistrate, and a tyrannical landlord. "A new class of society was formed out of those who had benefited by the changes; courtiers who plundered the people, landlords who evicted their tenants, officials who cheated the Government, merchant usurers and panders, who preyed upon the vices of the great or the woes of the unfortunate. All reserve, all decorum had gone out from the life of the people. They observed no fast-day, neither did they enjoy any holiday as of old." A dark picture, but a salutary one, for those who are always lamenting past times, and despair of the present and future. The book is illustrated by a capital reproduction of a portion of an old map of London, some curious drawings of farm-houses from old maps, facsimiles, and coats of arms, all executed in a very good style.

Green's "History of the English"[5] has been so much appreciated across the Channel, that it has been found worth while to publish a French translation—not of the whole book, however, but only of the latter portion, since the Restoration of the Monarchy. It is from this period that Green dates the commencement of Modern England, and this portion has been evidently selected as containing the most useful lessons to Frenchmen. "L'Angleterre," said Mirabeau, "fleurit pour l'eternelle instruction du peuple," and Mons. Yves Guyot, in an able preface, indicates the lessons which he thinks Frenchmen can learn from their neighbours, both in the shape of example and warning. The translation, which is by a lady with an English name, is thoroughly well executed, correct, and pleasant in style.

---

[4] "Society in the Elizabethan Age." By Hubert Hall. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1886.

[5] "Histoire Moderne du Peuple Anglais." Par J. R. Green. Traduite par Mdlle. Marie Hunt. Paris: Charpentier et Cie. 1885.

Mr. Daunt's book on recent Irish history[6] is extremely pleasant reading, full of amusing detail, national in its enthusiasm, in its shrewdness and humour, nay, in its very slovenliness, but certain to repel all those who are led by argument rather than by feeling. The book has many and great merits, and in principle we are at one with the author, who is well known as a conscientious adherent of the Nationalist party. We cannot, however, conceal from ourselves that a great opportunity of advancing the cause which he has so much at heart has been foregone. What was wanted was a thoroughly impartial work, but we are sorry to observe that the present volume is likely to have but little influence upon current public opinion, from the unhappy habit of the author of disregarding all circumstances that tell against his case. The history of the anti-tithe agitation, and of O'Connell's Repeal campaigns, though marred by many faults of omission and carelessness, are on the whole well described, as well as the more modern development of the Home Rule movement under Butt and Parnell; but why so important an event as the Fenian movement is so slightly alluded to, and why the assassination of Lord F. Cavendish and Mr. Burke, the agrarian outrages, comprising murder, cattle maiming, moonlighting, &c., the career of the Land League, the imprisonment of Parnell at Kilmainham, are barely, if at all, noticed, we must leave Mr. Daunt to explain. The case of Ireland is one in which the whole truth must be told without fear or favour, and no author who departs from this canon can hope to do service to his country or to earn the favourable verdict of his fellow-countrymen.

"He who has most to say uses the fewest words" is a proverb which, at first sight, some may think the author of the "Mission de Jean de Thumery"[7] to Queen Elizabeth would have done well to take to heart before embarking on a voluminous account of a comparatively obscure embassage, which was marked by the conclusion of no treaties nor by the incidence of any remarkable events. The author has cut down as far as possible the interminable details of diplomatic *pourparlers*, all of which may be examined in their entirety by those interested in the complete correspondence of Jean de Thumery, existing in MS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. To clear the course of the narrative, he has also relegated to the second volume the correspondence of Henry IV. with Elizabeth and his ambassador. The chief interest of the work lies in the *exposé* of the part which commercial affairs played in the relations between the two countries. The main points which the Sieur de Boissise was charged with to the Court of Elizabeth were the following:—First, to procure a more favourable navigation treaty for the French, and incidentally therewith to procure redress for the piracies practised by the English on the French, "où quelques particuliers trouvent leur profit," as Henry IV. delicately expressed it, hinting at the fact that the "sérénissime dame" Elizabeth received the lion's share of the plunder; secondly, to watch over the interests of France in the treaty of peace which was under constant discussion between Spain, England, and the Netherlands; lastly, to establish a treaty of commerce fairer to France than the existing treaty of 1572, especially with regard to woollen cloths, the quality of which was a subject of great complaint. The French demand for English woollens, and his reiterated threat to exclude them, was used as a lever to accomplish Henry's desires with regard to the two other points. Elizabeth openly confessed that the loss of the French market, added to the now long-standing loss of the Spanish market, would ruin her. But though Henry could offer mate at any moment by this move, Elizabeth could checkmate him by combining with Spain, and had throughout much the best of the diplomatic game. When Elizabeth's behaviour grew outrageous, Henry instructed his resentful ambassador thus:—"Il fait dissimuler les injustices qui continuent à se faire par delà à mes subjectz;" and again: "Le plus expedient serait d'assoupir ce faict; et de n'en rien plus dire." The injured Sieur de Boissise replies: "Elle est femme, et comme telle, il en faut supporter." More than once, however, Henry gives vent to his spleen: "Son amitié serait trop chère, s'il la fallait achepter avec la ruyne des Français." At other times, when she demands the arrest of some shipwrecked Irishmen and Spaniards, he assumes a dignified moral tone. "Priez la doncques, de ma part, de se contanter de tirer preuves de mon amitié en choses qui luy soient plus utiles, et ne mi soyent si honteuses et dommageables." Nevertheless, in spite of all representations of the Sieur de Boissise, Elizabeth conceded no single point, and upon his recall reiterated her claim to visit all French ships for victuals and war material intended for Spain. Not the least interesting part of this ample correspondence is the incidental reference to the manners and characters of the principal personages—Cecil's obstinacy; Winwood's spleen ("il gronde comme un Anglois"); Elizabeth's coquetry, who, at the age of sixty-five, and after forty-two years of arduous government, is described as dancing "gaiement et avec belle disposition"—and lastly, it is interesting to note how the fiery and ingenuous disposition which the Sieur de Boissise first exhibits becomes tempered by mild hints from his master, and finally is almost quenched by the philosophy of expediency so constantly preached to him by his friends: "Les princes jugent volontiers du debvoir et mérite de leurs serviteurs par le succès de leurs affaires." It will be seen that this period, though not marked by any striking occurrences, is full of interest, and the original papers quoted are, like all original matter, most attractive. The author has kept to the originals very largely, and, if the reader is not staggered by the bulk of the volumes at first sight, a perusal will be amply repaid.

---

[6] "Eighty-Five Years of Irish History." By W. J. O'Neill Daunt. London: Ward & Downey. 1886.

[7] "Mission de Jean de Thumery (1598-1602)." Par Laffleur de Kermaingant. Two vols. Paris: Firmin-Didot. 1886.

Among the many memoirs of the time of the French Revolution, those of the Duchess de Tourzel[8] are by no means the least interesting. Not that they throw any light upon the political movements of the Court, or of the various sections of the Revolutionary party, for the authoress was merely the governess of the ill-fated Dauphin, and her adherence to the royal family sprang far more from personal love and devotion than political principles. But the personal details of the conduct of the royal family and their dependants during their imprisonment are of the deepest interest. The Dauphin must have been an interesting child, with winning ways and an intelligence beyond his years. At four years old, the Queen told him it was disgraceful not to be able to read (rather a contrast to the present day, when children sometimes do not learn till two or three years later), and in a month he learned, for the sake of giving his mother a pleasant surprise on New Year's Day. A scene, described by the Duchess, of his stamping and crying to test her firmness, will amuse those who like to know the secrets of a royal nursery; and his reception of the officers of the Flanders Regiment is a capital instance of the self-possession and courtesy of a well brought up French boy.

> "But you would not know what to say to these gentlemen," said the Queen to him. "Do not trouble yourself, mama. I shall not be embarrassed." Scarcely had the officers entered the room than the young Prince said to the foremost of them: "I am delighted to see you, gentlemen, but very sorry that I am too small to see all of you." Then, seeing a very tall officer, he said to him, "Take me up in your arms, sir, so that I can see all these gentlemen." And then he said, with charming gaiety, "I am very glad, gentlemen, to be in the midst of you."

Very simple, but just the kind of thing that would please soldiers. The sad story of his imprisonment, and death from cruelty and neglect, is not obtrusively put forward; but the Duchess mentions it in order to put on record her certain conviction that he did die in the Temple, and that she saw the details of his illness, of his last moments, and burial, in the register of the prison. The Duchess herself was set free after an examination, at which some of the National Guards, who had been moved by her behaviour to them when at the Tuileries, used their influence in her favour; and her daughter Pauline, afterwards Countess de Béarn, was taken away from prison in disguise by a stranger who pitied her—a curious story, too long to quote here, but worth reading, both her version and her mother's.

The public will receive with much pleasure the recollections of the "Comte de Castellane,"[9] of his distinguished military career in Algeria. Enlisting at the age of seventeen as a private in the Zouaves, he won his way steadily upwards, purchasing each step in rank by some daring deed. Nine years' experience under such leaders as Changarnier, Cavaignac, Bedeau, Bugeaud, and Lamoricière, from the year 1843 to 1867, were not likely to be of the most peaceful nature. The details of the daily and hourly warfare maintained by the Arabs and Kabyles, with a gallantry not inferior to their better appointed foes, are narrated with much spirit. Our readers will probably differ with him in opinion on the ultimate results of the warfare, which, in its demoralizing effect upon the military spirit of the army, prepared the way for the terrible catastrophe of 1870. Be that as it may, we can confidently introduce the Count to the favourable notice of our readers.

---

[8] "Memoirs of the Duchess de Tourzel." Published by the Duke des Cars. Two vols. Remington & Co. 1886.

[9] "Souvenirs of Military Life in Algeria." By the Comte de Castellane. Translated by Mary J. Lovett. London: Remington & Co. 1886.

A series of vôlumes, entitled "American Commonwealth," narrating the history of each of the principal States of the Union, is being issued under the editorship of Mr. Horace E. Scudder. If we may take "California,"[10] by Mr. Josiah Royce, of Harvard, as a representative specimen, the series will receive a cordial welcome. The author, though a Californian and the son of pioneers of 1848, places little reliance upon the recollections of a stormy time, and bases his narrative upon the written evidence contained in contemporary journals and newspapers. The history of California as an American commonwealth is as complete and well-defined in its beginning and development as that of Athens or Sparta, and to the Californians of to-day seems now almost as far back in antiquity. Beginning with what the author does not hesitate to describe as the filibustering expedition of Captain Frémont, and receiving a sudden and altogether unexampled development upon the discovery of the gold-field in 1848, it passed through all the paroxysms and struggles of a new State in a few brief years, so that in 1856 it had fallen into the lines upon which its futnre history was to be formed. If it is considered what elements went to form the new State in the great rush for the gold, consisting, perhaps, in the main of men who had recklessly cast aside their social obligations in the anticipation of unfettered freedom and lawless liberty, it is, indeed, one of the greatest triumphs ever achieved by any race of men. The conditions under which life was lived in this short period were so full of trial and strain, the shirking of social duties was followed by such ruthless self-punishment, that a nation may well be proud to have survived so severe a moral test of its intrinsic strength and worthiness. The manly wickedness and reckless joviality of the rowdy element has found rather too appreciative an exponent in the "romantic" writer, Bret Harte, the author thinks. The wild side of Californian history is a splendid field for the imagination of the novelist to revel in, but Mr. Royce is of opinion that no society could ever have held together if it had been composed only of those elements presented in Bret Harte's stories. But no doubt no man was better aware of the existence of sober, steady, and earnest people, forming the backbone of the State, than Bret Harte himself. Such elements are not the chosen favourites of imaginative writers, and it is well for the sober historian to give them their due weight. After the first wild rush was over, the pioneers were followed by the prosaic engines of steady progress—the school, the church, the law-courts. The lesson for humanity to be deduced from the whole history is summed up by the author admirably thus: "The Californian has come too often to love mere fulness of life, and to lack reverence for his social duties; and yet the whole lesson of his early history, rightly read, is a lesson in reverence for the relations of life. It was by despising, or at least by forgetting, them that the early community entered into the valley of the shadow of death: and there was salvation for the community, in those days, only by virtue of its final and hard-earned submission to what it had despised and forgotten. . . . . In our early history are shown our national faults writ large, with their penalties, and the only possible salvation from them." It will be seen that this work is valuable, not only for its special interest, but much more so for its universal application to the philosophy of all history. In style it is written with a glowing appreciation of the continuous historical significance of what, to many minds, has hitherto appeared too much in the light of a series of disconnected episodes.

---

[10] "California." By Josiah Royce. London: Trübner. 1886.

A sketch of the American Civil Service, under the title of "A History of the Appointing Power of the President,"[11] may be read with some interest at the present time when a Commission is sitting for the reform of our own service. What reform means with us, however, is something very different from what it means with America, which is still far from what it should be. Three clearly defined periods are to be noticed in the history of the subject—the first, one of forty years from 1789 to 1829; second, from 1829 to 1861; third, from the outbreak of the war to the present time. They may be called the merit period, the spoils period, and the reform period. The history of these periods is full of humorous incidents, only possible to a corrupt service like that of America. There still remains much to bring it to a level with that of England, which all through has been taken as a model.

Two very solid and weighty volumes, in the sense, it is meant now, of the number of pounds and ounces which it would be necessary to put in one side of a pair of scales to balance them in the other, are those in which, taking for title "The Letters and Times of the Tylers,"[12] a member of this distinguished Virginian family relates much of the history of this State and of the American Republic generally, from the earliest period down to the War of Secession. The family record is somewhat fancifully traced back to Wat Tyler, of English renown, but the two chief figures of the narrative are John Tyler, who was a young man when the War of Independence broke out, Governor of Virginia from 1808 to 1811, and finally Judge of the United States District Court for Virginia from 1812 to the time of his death in the year following; and this Judge's second son, of the same name, who was President of the United States from 1841 to 1845, living to take part with the

---

[11] "Papers of the American Historical Association." By Lucy M. Salmon. London: Putnam's Sons.

[12] "Letters and Times of the Tylers." By Lyon G. Tyler. Two vols. Richmond Va.: Whittet & Shepperson.

South in the War of Secession, but *not* to see the end of it. The devout gratitude of the biographer at this escape of his ancestor expresses itself thus:

> He died "in hope," and was never forced to see the "gaunt and horrible form" of that despotism of sectionalism which preyed for twenty years on the constitution, rights, laws, and liberties of the Southern States. He never saw his dear Virginia reduced to "Military District No. 1," governed with refined cruelty by the worst adventurers of the North and men but recently slaves, under the suggestion of a military dictator. . . . . Thank God, he was saved this spectacle. He died when the ancient Dominion stood proudly erect as she saw the hosts of the invader driven across the Potomac in disgrace and rout from her sacred soil—Virginia Victrix.

At least this may be said of the work that in the later chapters it presents the case of the seceding States in a forcible manner from their point of view. It is interesting to read how the men of the South regarded the election of President Lincoln.

> Unwilling as I am to say anything derogatory to the praise of Mr. Lincoln, I could not be faithful to my duties as a historian if I should fail to say that the personal qualities of the man was an element figuring not a little in driving the Southern States into Secession. They saw the Northern people deliberately discarding their best educated statesmen, like Winthrop and Everett, and adopting one who, as compared with all the other presidents who had preceded him (all of them more or less household names), was absolutely unknown to the people of the Union. But when they heard of his origin as of the humblest, of his lack of the commonest social and educational advantages, of his ignorance of law, of his wild "Western jests," and associated this with the reckless tendencies of the party which acknowledged him as a leader, never had the constitution, which depended on enlightened interpretation, appeared more like a "rope of sand" to every interest of the Southern people."

Portraits of three generations, grandsire, sire, and son, with which the volumes are enriched, each showing the characteristic family features, and especially the family nose, but with marked differences, afford matter for reflection to any one interested in comparative physiognomy. The last face is, to an English eye at least, of a thoroughly American type.

One of the latest additions to the Carlyle bibliography, now assuming large proportions, we owe to Mr. Henry Larkin, who, in his "Carlyle and the Open Secret of his Life,"[13] sets himself the task of discovering and disclosing "the hidden hopes, aspirations, and efforts which gave to his character its essential significance;" and of answering the question—"What, then, was it, throughout his life that he was really trying to do?" For this task the author puts forward, or rather suggests, two qualifications—namely, first, that he has been a diligent student of his master's works for five-and-thirty years; and, secondly, that when Carlyle was engaged on his "Life of Frederick," and in need of help, he offered him his services, an offer which led to "ten years of constant and intimate intercourse." But it is not from personal intercourse so much as from a study of Carlyle's writings, that Mr. Larkin seeks to maintain the thesis that the Sage of Chelsea was moved by "far other than literary aims," and endeavours to vindicate him from the suspicion, "very generally" entertained, that he had "no real aim beyond that of startling, astonishing, and disconcerting all who listened to him." Taking Carlyle's own statement that his life was in his works for the clue to the "open secret," in this book he analyses and discusses them in chronological order, but though always from the position of an enthusiastic admirer, yet with some degree of freedom and independence, and also from the Christian standpoint. He avows:

---

[13] "Carlyle and the Open Secret of his Life." By Henry Larkin. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1886.

> I never was entirely at one with Carlyle in spiritual sympathy or in my deepest hopes for the final triumph of good over evil in this checkered world. I have always sorrowfully felt that his insight stopped short where the highest spiritual life really begins, even as Goethe ethically stopped short where Carlyle's ethical work began. But why do we quarrel with these ethical preparers of the ground? They both strove by veracity of thought and effort, each according to his gifts and commission from the Almighty Providence, to make straight for themselves and for us, through all the illusions and self-deceptions of the age, a path to the Highest. If "we Christians" had been faithfully living a Christ-like life one with another, instead of so generally making Christianity a lubricant to our consciences, and a socially presentable varnish for our selfishness and sins, there would have been no need for either a Goethe or a Carlyle in the nineteenth century, to call us back into the straight path of veracity, any more than there would have been for a Luther in the fifteenth.

In his later pages Mr. Larkin touches upon the private life already so largely discussed. With Mr. Froude he evidently has little patience. Referring to Mr. Froude's remark in the latter's first instalment of Carlyle's biography, that "it is in the nature of man to dwell on the faults of those who stand above them. They are comforted by perceiving that the person whom they have heard so much admired was but of common clay after all," he says: "Such a sentiment is a libel on human nature. Only what Carlyle calls a 'valet soul' could feel comforted by such a discovery, or could deliberately pander to such a feeling;" which last member of the sentence is pretty straight hitting out from the shoulder. He adds:

> I have known Carlyle in the maturity of his manhood almost as intimately as any one now living; I have seen him in his moral and intellectual strength, and in his manifold irritable infirmities; and have reverenced the one while I sorely grieved over the other; and I unhesitatingly declare there was no such despicable inconsistency between the man and his teaching as, for our puny comfort, we have been given to suppose.

The Historical MSS. Commission not only induces the possessors of old documents and correspondence to preserve them more carefully, but also stimulates the desire to study and use them instead of leaving them to decay, of no service but to the rats and mice, who have a partiality for old paper as a lining for their nests. At Levens, in Westmoreland there is a quantity of correspondence of Colonel James Grahme,[14] Keeper of the Privy Purse to James II., and this has been very pleasantly worked up into a short biography of the Colonel, and an account of the Jacobite intrigues after the King's flight to France. But more interesting, perhaps, than the Jacobite intrigues, are the pictures of the old house, with its stone mullioned windows and square tower, and the most charming old-fashioned garden, with geometrical beds edged with box, and thick yew hedges cut into all manner of shapes.

---

[14] "Colonel James Grahme, of Levens. A Biographical Sketch." By Josceline Bagot. London: Kent & Co. 1886.

Since General Gordon's death at Khartoum,[15] nearly two years ago, there have been so many books published about his life, that most of the facts of his career are well known to every one, and there is not much that is new left for his brother to say. Some of the opinions, however, referred to in the extracts from his letters are worth noticing even now. Ireland is no quieter than when he proposed the purchase of the land by the Government and the endowment of the Catholics. His advice about the conduct of a campaign in uncivilized countries is that of a master of the art, and the result of long experience. There is reason, too, in his apprehension that the Suez Canal would be an element of danger in the event of war, on account of the ease with which it could be blocked, though whether the Palestine Canal, which he advocated, would be less dangerous is a question, though he appears to have considered that it should only be used for traffic, and the route by the Cape remain the principal military communication with India. A facsimile of Gordon's last letter, saying that Khartoum is all right, and he could hold out for years, will interest every one, and also the engraving of his siege decoration, which will become one of the prizes of the collectors of military medals.

The new volume of the Round Table Series[16] is an extremely pleasant and well-written pamphlet, describing in clear and succinct language the leading points of the theory of evolution elaborated by the great Charles Darwin. Prefixed are two stanzas of great merit, which so happily illustrate the subject, that we trust our readers will excuse us if we give them entire:

O rugged sage, strange confidant wert thou
  Of Nature's choice to learn long secret lore,
  Age baffling riddles answerless before!
Ah, woman-like, she in the end must bow
To patience of pursuit, to constant vow,
  To cunning study, yielding more and more
  To thy long siege, until the very core
Of her thought showed, invisible till now.

And thou art crowned with measureless acclaim
  The greatest son of Science' brightest day,
To Newton's self at least co-equal fame:
  Nay more, thou art a rock above the seas
Of superstition, and by thee the way
  To a new church is given, and the keys!

---

[15] Events in the Life of Chas. Geo. Gordon. By H. W. Gordon. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1886.

[16] "The Round Table Series. Charles Darwin, Naturalist." Edinburgh: W. Brown. 1886.

Man's thought is like Antæus, and must be
Touched to the ground of Nature to regain
Fresh force, new impulse, else it would remain
Dead in the grip of strong authority;
But once thereon reset, 'tis like a tree
Sap swollen in spring time, bonds may not restrain
Nor weight repress; its rootlets rend in twain
Dead stones and walls and rocks resistlessly.

Thine then it was to touch dead thoughts to earth,
Till of old dreams sprang new philosophies,
From visions, systems, and beneath thy spell
Swiftly uprose, like magic palaces—
Thyself half conscious only of thy worth,
Calm priest of a tremendous oracle.

The history of the Life of W. S. Jevons is to be sought almost entirely in his published writings; it was a life of thought. The present volume,[17] consisting as it does chiefly of Jevons' own letters and journal, adds singularly little to our knowledge of him. He was born in 1835, of a Unitarian Welsh family, it appears, settled in Liverpool. He received his education at University College, London, and devoted the chief part of his attention to science. At the age of nineteen, under the advice of his cousin, Sir Henry Roscoe, he took a post of assayer in Australia, where he remained five years. On the way home he visited America, and a few years afterwards took his degree of M.A. at London. At the age of thirty began his connection with Owens College, Manchester, where he remained lecturer eleven years, a post which he resigned in 1876 for the Chair of Political Economy at University College, London. He was drowned while bathing near Hastings on August 12, 1882, aged forty-six. Such are the bare facts elicited from his journals. Like every specialist, he invented a vocabulary and language of his own, and was a master in it, but his ordinary correspondence, consisting chiefly of a bare chronicle of events and bald descriptions of scenery, especially of Norway, might as well have never been written. By birth, education, and religion Jevons was an "esprit positif," and was never surprised out of the even tenor of his way into any kind of enthusiasm. Referring to his engagement to his future wife, he says, in a letter to his brother: "You have more than once advised me to take a step of this kind, and the fact is, that for some years past, ever since I had a fair prospect of an income, I have felt myself impelled towards it by every motive that ought to influence me." Yet there were fewer average happier households. His devotion to music was not much more than that of a dilettante, "a distraction from too exclusive a devotion to logic," but in the end he attained to exquisite appreciation of great masters. As a lecturer, those who sat under him, and there are many hundreds, have the most lively recollections of him. He struck the happy mean between purely extempore speaking and mere reading aloud. He spoke from notes, and his lectures were, as all lectures should be, rather a severe exercise to the lecturer, and communicated their fire to the listener. His memory lives with the greatest affection in the heart of every student who sat under him. There remain his numerous writings, of which a complete list is appended to this volume. They are now of European fame, and their influence will be felt for generations. He had began a work of general interest, to be entitled "A Tenth Bridgewater Treatise," which, to judge from the fragment presented, would have solved the problem every specialist has great difficulty in settling—of expressing his special knowledge in common terms. This biography was worth publishing, if only to show how little is forthcoming except the history of his writings in the life of W. S. Jevons. The happiest lives are those which have no history.

---

[17] "Letters and Journal of W. S. Jevons." Edited by his Wife. Macmillan & Co. 1886.

The "Autobiography of Froebel"[18] is mostly taken up with an unfinished letter to the Duke of Meiningen, dated 1827, twenty-five years before Froebel's death. This only gives his autobiography to 1815, and is followed by a short outline, in a letter to the philosopher Krause, written in 1828, of his life to that date, and a sketch by Barop, Froebel's successor at Keilhau, on "Critical Moments in the Froebel Community." The book closes with a list of the chief dates in the life of Froebel and the Kindergarten movement. Friedrich Froebel, born in 1782, was fifth son of the pastor of Oberweissbach, a village in the Thuringian Forest. His mother died when he was nine months old, and "it came to pass that on the first years of my boyhood I was perforce led to live to myself and in myself, and, indeed, to study my own being and inner consciousness, as opposed to external circumstances. My inward and my outward life were at that time, even during play and other occupations, my principal subjects for reflection and thought." A little further on he says: "Unceasing self-contemplation, self-analysis, and self-education have been the fundamental characteristics of my life from the very first, and have remained so until these later days. To stir up, to animate, to awaken, and to strengthen the pleasure and power of the human being to labour uninterruptedly at his own education, has become, and always remained, the fundamental principle and aim of my educational work." In 1805, when he was just twenty-three, Froebel was persuaded by Gruner, head-master of the Frankfurt model school, to become a teacher instead of an architect, and in 1816 he founded his "Universal German Educational Institute." Writing in 1828, he can say: "Amongst all the specially associated members of our little band, not one breach has occurred since the beginning of our work." Barop's sketch, written later, tells how the new system, like all things new, had a hard struggle, in this case against the bigotry of the priests. The first institution for little children was at Blankenburg. Barop says:

> Long did he rack his brains for a suitable name for his new scheme. Middendorff and I were one day walking to Blankenburg with him over the Steiger

---

[18] "Autobiography of Friedrich Froebel." Translated and annotated by Emilie Michaelis and H. Keatley Moore. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1886.

Pass. He kept on repeating, "Oh, if could only think of a suitable name for my youngest born!" Blankenburg lay at our feet, and he walked moodily towards it. Suddenly he stood still, as if fettered fast to the spot, and his eyes assumed a wonderful, almost refulgent, brilliancy. Then he shouted to the mountains, so that it echoed to the four winds of heaven, "Eureka! I have it! Kindergarten shall be the name of the new institution!"

The system was introduced into England in 1854, and the last notice of it in the chronological abstract tells us that in the Health Exhibition, 1884, a conference was held of Kindergarten teachers from all parts of England.

"The Society of Psychical Research" at Oxford have recently published, in about 2,000 pages, a collection of stupendous stories, which may possibly outlive the ephemeral literature of the nineteenth century, and go down to generations 1,000 years hence as evidences of a sacred period when the children of light walked with the children of men, and performed antics with them which will be unimaginable even to the future dull prosaic ages of the world. The literature of demonology, sorcery, and witchcraft handed down to us from centuries ago remains at the present day one of the most fertile branches of study, and is, extrinsically perhaps, more interesting and instructive than the chronicles of sober history or science. But the quantity and quality of this literature will be as nothing compared with what we shall hand down to our successors, whose stupor and amazement we can only envy without appreciating. It has become a commonplace to quote Coleridge's writing of Kubla Khan as one of the most wonderful instances of hypnotism; but the renown of that achievement will henceforth pale in the presence of a work immeasurably deeper and vastier from the pen of Mr. John Frederick Rowbotham.[19] Imagine a mind which has saturated itself with Homer and the earliest poets, and then plunged into the abyss of Pythagorean philosophy, with a dash at Aristotle, and taken deep draughts from Stobæus, Nicomachus, Macrobius, Athenæus, Aristoxenus, and which has not trembled to mix with this seething mass the fiery alcohol of German criticism upon these writers, and it may be possible to dimly conceive how a hypnotic history of music was the result. It is not a case of a writer being "intoxicated with his own verbosity," so much as a case of divine possession by means of a soma unknown to moderns—a kind of mania, sub-induced by over-reading, a sort of trance prolonged unduly, wherein by the exhibition of some stroke of art, which it were well to know, all the conceits that entered the over-wrought brain are poured forth without rhyme or reason, and entirely independently of the will of the writer, and are so commingled in delightful confusion, making a clear house of the mind as it were too suddenly, that it is impossible to distinguish when he is reproducing the multiform vagaries of the ancients or prattling fantastically in his own person. As for instance: "For the Monads, which are the atoms, seethed and tossed in the ancient sea of chaos, and all was blinding hail and dirty weather, pitch blackness and crashing thunder throughout the universe, nor any streak of grey or speck of morning light in that wild night, where no lull ever came, and midnight was never past. Each separate atom of that horrid brew struggled and tore each other, or great black things, that were misformed worlds, fell to pieces in collision. . . . . For there could be no union and no form, while still the matter of the Universal Octave lay void and empty of the Principle that should attune it. But the time came at last when the Divine and Primal Monad, out of his boundless compassion for his suffering emanations that still struggled and tossed without hope of deliverance, being the body without the soul, or the shapeless embryo without the spirit that should form it, lifted up his energy to impregnate the awful deep, and, descending from his station of celestial repose and beauty, swept right through Chaos. What heavenly harmony would then arise, when the Great Octave was made incarnate! . . . . And next the Divine and Primal Monad crept to a closer embrace with his bewildered bride, and on each separate atom that composed her he stamped the image of himself. And henceforth shall each atom be a little octave," &c. The improprieties are too numerous to bear quotation. And this is the harmony of the spheres, and hence arises the "Dance of Kosmos!" And again:

---

[19] "A History of Music." By J. F. Rowbotham. London: Trübner. Thre vols. 1886.

> It should seem that language, like other things of man's creation, is smitten with its maker's instability, and is in constant flux of strength and weakness even in a short history. And the strength of a language is when it is blurted and mouthed well; and its weakness is when it is clipped and minced. . . . . And when a period of weakness lasts for a very long time indeed, and seems as if it were about to become chronic, it has been customary for writers of recent years to treat it as an outbreak of Phonetic Decay!

A pamphlet entitled "A Historical Sketch of Music," by H. Brown can be described only as a rhapsody of nonsense.

There is something in the nature of music, something more akin to the instability of the aerial than to the stability of the concrete, which affects the style of musical criticism in a strange manner. This is observable in the writings even of the great masters, such as Wagner and Schumann, and the incoherency of some of their writing is explicable on the supposition that, having a language of their own, they find some difficulty in expressing themselves in common parlance. But ordinary persons cannot plead the incoherency of musical genius as an excuse; the utmost that they can urge is that the mightiness of their subject "requires a thunderous speech," and they feel themselves "insufficient for the same." They should remember, however, that the mightiest wind of words will never give their shallow wits the aspect of a huge sea of thought. Herr Reissmann's "Life and Works of Schumann"[20] aspires to be a technical criticism of his genius, but is as devoid of lucidity, though as well-meant, as the illustrative programmes recently supplied at the Monday Popular Concerts. The cant of "objective organization" of melodies, "subjective elaboration," &c., must be accepted with customary indulgence. Schumann, we are informed, was mistaken as to the intrinsic nature of dramatic music. "Like lyric poetry it (dramatic music) unveils the sacred mysteries of the soul, not in single lyric outbursts which isolate and divide the emotion from humanity at large, but so massed in concrete form as to show us the desired sentiment in its relations to the outside world as a factor in various incidents and events." Schumann died mad, it will be remembered. "The images with which he had once played at last exerted a gloomy constraint upon his imagination. He lost the spell with which to exorcise them, and so fell an irretrievable prey to their mad measures. Soon forgetting his finite limits, he felt himself in communion with the spirits of the departed." It must not be thought, however, that Herr Reissmann is one of those persons "who never deviates into sense." There are many valuable criticisms, and a perusal of his book will assist those who have strong nerves in a better comprehension of the growth of Schumann's intermittent genius. He shows, for instance, true appreciation of the relation of Schumann to Heine. "Schumann was the first to comprehend the whole of Heine's nature. Heine expresses not only the culmination, but also the solution of romanticism . . . . . The romantic school, with subjective arbitrariness, constructed a world of its own, which was, in its direct opposition to the actual world, a mere fabric of dissolving cloud-images. The men of this school declared the whole external world to be idle and vain, and turned it into sport for the sovereign 'I.' Heine drew the final conclusion when he asserted the 'I' itself to be utterly futile."

---

[20] "Life and Works of Robert Schumann." By August Reissman. Translated by A. L. Alger. London: Bell & Sons. 1886.

An American writer shows us the history of England,[21] as exemplified in the relics of its buildings of twenty centuries scattered through our island, thus constructing a complete chronicle in stone, commencing with Stonehenge and the Roman remains, and passing through the great mediæval castles, monasteries, and cathedrals, down to still existing residences such as Haddon or Hatfield. Where every part of this book bears the impress of careful and conscientious labour, it may be difficult to single out any portion for special praise; if any, however, the portion relating to Roman Britain is most noticeable. Not the least title to our regard is that this volume comes to us from the hands of an American Englishman, and adds another to the many ties of brotherhood between the two branches of the great English nation.

Another book which comes from across the Atlantic is a careful and scholarlike rescension of all the evidence relating to the landfall of John Cabot, in 1497.[22] The names and distinctive features of Cabot's sketch in Lok's map are traced through a long series of maps, the successive appearance and disappearance of the names being carefully noted, so as to dovetail the series together. The results, when compared with the modern surveys, fix almost beyond doubt the landing place of the earliest English discoverers of the continent of America.

---

[21] "The Imperial Island: England's Chronicle in Stone." By J. F. Hunnewell. Boston: Ticknor & Co. 1886.

[22] "John Cabot's Landfall in 1497." Cambridge: J. Wilson & Son, University Press. 1886.

Mrs. Van Gelder, in a pretty and attractive volume, has undertaken to establish two theories—First, that the Pyramids of Egypt were built by Joseph as storehouses for the overflowing harvests of the seven good years; and secondly, that the civilization of the Ancient World, including America, was due to Moses alone—and they are easily and convincingly proved to her entire satisfaction. In support of her theses the expression of an opinion is necessarily incontrovertible proof of its truth, and if facts, such as time, place, results of modern research, and other minor details do not happen to fall into their proper places in the argument, so much the worse for the facts. Remains of cereals in the form of grey dust have been found in many pyramids—therefore, it is quite clear that they are Joseph's granaries, and the irrelevance of any evidence that they were built at another epoch for another purpose, or were not adapted to contain such a vast amount of grain, becomes at once manifest. We are less disposed to urge objections in view of the accurate acquaintance displayed by our authoress with the details of good society in Egypt. The marriage of Joseph, referred to on pp. 3 and 5, was evidently a form of compromise of a celebrated *cause célèbre*, and the additional information, in the well-worn case of Eve *v.* the Serpent, testify to her high talent as an observer. The full powers of our authoress are, however, reserved for the career of Moses, upon which is lavished a perfect wealth of research. After recapitulating the received accounts of his birth and parentage, she places him at the head of an Egyptian expedition against Ethiopia. He next changes sides and appears as King of Ethiopia, after which, finding royalty to be oppressive, he obtains a situation as shepherd under Jethro, and then takes the Hebrews under his charge up to the time of his supposed death and burial. We are told in Scripture that he was 120 years old, and that his natural force was not abated; so little indeed does he feel the ravages of time, that, after a feigned demise, he, accompanied by a select band of disciples, passes through Persia and Afghanistan, having previously adopted the Aryan language and manners, together with the *alias* of Menu, conquering and civilizing the whole of Hindostan, Ceylon, and Siam, and founding cities and temples by the hundred at a time. His next little contract is the adoption of a totally new language, literature, and code of law, which he proceeds to communicate to the barbarous inhabitants of China and Corea, finishing off by performing the same kind office for Japan. By way of a change, he now takes a long sea voyage, landing in precisely the places where we should expect to find him—viz., first in Mexico and then in Peru, under the respective titles of Quetzalcoatl and Manco Capac—his fertile brain having secreted two more new systems of laws and customs. This process is again repeated in the congenial neighbour-

---

[23] "The Storehouses of the King." By Jane Van Gelder. London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1885.

hood of Nootka Sound, with entirely new accessories—viz., a boat, dress, and utensils of copper, but not with the same success. The native Indians, being passionately fond of this metal, killed the inspired missionary, but, repenting of the wicked deed when too late, gave him such compensation as lay in their power by elevating him to the rank of a deity. His feelings were, no doubt, those of deep thankfulness in thus reaching the term of a life, perhaps abnormally prolonged, but at least well-spent. In conclusion, we have only to remark that if we have succeeded in the course of a hasty and imperfect description in rousing the interest of our readers in one of the most wonderful books of the age, we shall feel that we have not lived in vain.

Of the making of Christmas books there is no end—especially, perhaps, of Christmas books for young people. In "Historic Boys"[24] we have "stories of adventure and daring" which will delight the most ardent lover of such seasonable cheer. Let no one think the book is "dry," or that it resembles the "histories" of the schoolroom. Truth is stranger than fiction, and in Mr. Brooks's skilful hands no less entertaining; indeed, that these boy heroes really lived in this world of ours gives them, it seems to us, an added interest. To all who know that delightful magazine, *St. Nicholas*, the fact that nine of these twelve stories have appeared therein, with the same illustrations, will be sufficient recommendation. We find, from this book, that many posts of honour and responsibility have been filled by a boy—we have the Boy King, Cardinal, Magistrate, Conqueror, &c. That they are not all suited to serve as examples to boys of to-day the following passage will show:—

> He [Charles of Sweden] and his brother-in-law the wild young Duke of Holstein, turned the town upside down. They snapped cherry-pips at the king's grey-bearded councillors, and smashed in the windows of the staid and scandalized burghers of Stockholm. They played ball with the table dishes, and broke all the benches in the palace chapel. They coursed hares through the council-chambers of the Parliament House, and ran furious races until they had ruined several fine horses. They beheaded sheep in the palace till the floors ran with blood, and then pelted the passers-by with sheep's heads. They spent the money in the royal treasury like water, and played so many heedless and ruthless boy-tricks that the period of these months of folly was known, long after, as the "Gottorp Fury," because the harum-scarum young brother-in-law, who was the ringleader in all these scrapes, was Duke of Holstein-Gottorp.

The descriptions are very pretty, and the details of the manners and dress of the different nations by no means hinder the story—*the* thing with holiday readers. The "Boy Magistrate" (Marcus, of Rome) is one of the prettiest, and is without the horrors of war, and the "Boy Knight" (William of Normandy) will be interesting to those who only know him as William the Conqueror.

---

[24] "Historic Boys." By E. S. Brooks. Illustrated by R. B. Birch and John Schönberg. London and Edinburgh: Blackie & Sons.

BELLES LETTRES.

HARDLY ever does the successful writer of lyrical or narrative verse—the poet, as we are fain to call him—withstand the *amabilis insania* of dramatic composition. Mr. Lewis Morris is no exception to the rule, and, disdainful of the mere sham and shadow of a dramatic form, makes at once for the substance, and boldly tells us that his drama is written with a view to stage representation. The scene of "Gycia"[1] is laid at first in Bosphorus and afterwards in the republic of Cherson, and the time is the close of the tenth century. The plot, which is based on incidents derived from a story related by Constantine Porphyrogenitus in his work "De Administratione Imperii," turns on the struggle between love and patriotism, and on the questionable validity of conflicting oaths. In order to save his country Bosphorus, Asander, the king's son, consents, though unwillingly, to wed with Gycia, the daughter of Lamachus Archon, of the republic of Cherson. Before he has seen Gycia he binds himself with an oath to make her country his and never to return to Bosphorus, but at the same time he swears on the cross hilt of his sword never to forget his native land, but to count her dearer than wife and child. Having seen Gycia he loves for the first time, gladly weds her, and gladly remains for two happy years in his adopted country, republic though it be, without a thought of his aged father, the King of Bosphorus, or of his home. Then comes the trial. He hears that his father is sick, and is desirous of seeing him before he dies. Thereupon he is anxious to break his oath to his wife's country, but is held to it by Gycia, who, much as she loves her husband, "loves honour more," and urges him, in despite of filial piety, to regard his oath to the State as inviolable. To emphasize this divergence of interests between husband and wife, jealousy and mutual suspicion with regard to former loves supervene, and finally, when Gycia is the unwilling witness of her husband's (unwilling) adherence to a plot formed by the people of Bosphorus to seize the republic of Cherson, she denounces him to the State. The reconciliation, which is complete, comes too late, and the scene closes with the self-inflicted death of Gycia. The play, on the whole, is pleasant reading, and if lucidity of diction and classic moderation of style were the sole elements in dramatic composition, Mr. Lewis Morris might be said to have achieved success. But of plays it is required that they should be found to have life and movement, that the *dramatis personæ* should be living beings with marked characteristics, that their course of action should be remarkable, and their discourse weighty and memorable. Now, with the exception of Megacles, the pompous courtier, the characters in this play are inconspicuous, unrememberable. Gycia is a mere impersonation of feminine virtue, and Asander the poorest of poor creatures, and not always consistent with himself. We have, in short, a fairly interesting chapter of ancient history narrated in the form of conversation, which are given in refined and scholarly blank verse; but of action or of passion there is from first to last a conspicuous absence. It is not every audience that will suffer the deprivation of folly and vulgarity that follows on the representation of the plays of Shakespeare. Lord Tennyson's "Cup," in spite of its great artistic merits, barely succeeded as an acting play, and we can hardly imagine that the gentle periods and somewhat intricate plot of Gycia would be gladly suffered by the playgoing public.

---

[1] "Gycia." A Tragedy in Five Acts. By Lewis Morris. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1886.

"Nivalis,"[2] a tragedy by J. M. W. Schwartz, is an ambitious and, on the whole, successful attempt to depict the struggle between passion and obedience to law in the person of a widowed queen. After some hesitation, Nivalis, left as queen regnant, determines to wed with the next heir, Prince Giulio, of whom she is enamoured. On the very day of the wedding, a former boon companion of the Prince, now a novice in a monastery, declares to the Queen that her first husband, the late king, died from poison at the hands of Giulio, and at the altar steps she forbids her own banns and denounces the Prince. The interview between the informer Antonio and Nivalis, and the scene in the cathedral, where the Queen reveals her knowledge of Giulio's crime, are full of passion and dramatic vigour. For stage representation, or even from a literary point of view, the speeches are too long and the action is too slow. Mr. Schwartz should remember the old saying as to the relative merits of the half and the whole. On the other hand, we gladly admit that, in respect of style and diction, a high standard is reached throughout, and that here and there the language of poetry is attained. We select for quotation the Queen's address to the sun on her wedding morn:—

Mantled with beauty, stands the crownèd sun,
Upon the summit of yon hill enthroned,
And with his golden sceptre hath awakened
All living things in earth and tide and sky
That by their life declare his sovereignty.
The distant booming of the solemn sea
Salutes the monarch, to the world proclaiming
His reign begun. Welcome, O king of day!
Welcome, O king! who royal gladness bringest
To royal hearts. Thou, who with one small cloud
Dost share the early glories of thy heaven—
Thou art as he that, o'er the spreading vault
Of my young happiness ascending, draweth
My wandering soul into his heart of light.
Sail on, pure cloud! It is a glorious death
To pass from self into another's life
And be the nobler for his nobleness.
Oh, happy day! oh, happy, happy day!

As a contrast to the above, we give the following lines from a speech of Nivalis in which she repels the suggestion of the informer:

---

[2] "Nivalis. A Tragedy in Five Acts." By J. M. W. Schwartz. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1886.

No human soul is thine!
From what lone depths of desolate despair
Art thou borne upwards by the love of hate?
Lost misery, that seekest misery
To feed thy cravings, art thou come to me
Because the fragrance of my happiness
Stank in thy nostrils with its too much sweet,
As hideous moths that fly at night are drawn
By treacherous odours to the tranquil flowers,
Whose hearts they stab in darkness?

"The Lyrics of Ind,"[3] by Dejm L. Roy, M.A., are evidently the work of an ardent and appreciative student of English poetry. In his preface, Mr. Roy informs us that his object has been to harmonize English and Indian poetry. We confess that we prefer those of his verses in which he does not attempt to bring about a fusion of ideas and similes. The "Universal Prayer," which is a profession of undogmatic faith in a God apart from creeds, is the last poem in the volume, and, to our thinking, the best. We quote the first and last stanzas.

Bless them, O Lord!
Who doubt, and in unravelling mysteries
By Reason, light are taught—
Who preach by arguments, not dogmatize;
Who teach, but threaten not.

* * * * * *

Bless them, O Lord!
Who love, are happy with their "weans and wives,"
Through joys and miseries;
Who with religious hate stain not their lives;
Who love, and live in peace.

To those who delight in magic and "dabble in Babylonian numbers," "Israfel,"[4] by Arthur Edward Waite, will afford much comfort and consolation. To the uninitiated it is likely to prove caviare with a vengeance. For ourselves, after patient study, we cannot be sure as to who or what Israfel may be. By way of a guess, we hazard the suggestion that Israfel is the ideal soul of man, distinct from individual souls, and personified in order at once to mirror and to magnify the aspirations of individual souls not yet at one with the Universal. We do not set much store by such a conception; but if that be the author's meaning, he might have said so. The verse is harmonious, and not without a peculiar and original beauty; but what shall we say of such lines as these?—

The thrones descend from their unheard-of heights
To circle thee; they hear the "four-square" stone—
The corner-stone, the rock which Moses smote,
The Schemhamphoras, graved with secret words
And names divine—the synthesis of God.

---

[3] "The Lyrics of Ind." By Dejm L. Roy, M.A., M.R.A.S. London: Trübner & Co. 1886.

[4] "Israfel: Letters, Visions, and Poems." By Arthur Edward Waite. London: E. W. Allen. 1886.

The "Higher Life," in the miscellaneous poems, is perhaps the most rational and purposeful product of the author's vague and eccentric muse.

"Mountain Monarchs,"[5] by Cornelia Wallace, is a *jeu d'esprit* in the metre of Pope's "Iliad." The subject is the dethronement of Mont Blanc from his former "eminence" as king of European mountains in favour of Mount Elbraz. Once Dhawalgiri reigned supreme over the world; then for a brief space Kunchinjinga held the sceptre, but was soon deposed to make way for Mount Everest; and hereafter it may be that Everest may be compelled to admit the claims of a loftier rival. As with these dethroned monarchs of the East, so it is with Mont Blanc; but he and his queen, Monte Rosa, may still hold undisputed sway over the Alpine peaks, and

> May even learn from hence
> Content is better than pre-eminence.

The verses run smoothly, and may be read with pleasure by those who in these unleisured days are still susceptible to the old world charm of playful elegance.

We beg to acknowledge a second edition of "Plays and Poems"[6] by Albert E. Drinkwater.

Lovers of Dante will welcome Dr. Plumptre's long-promised translation of "The Divina Commedia."[7] It may be remembered that in 1883 the Dean issued a small pamphlet of specimen translations of various episodes, which was noticed in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW. He has now published the first volume of his completed work, containing the "Inferno" and the "Purgatorio," and in a second volume, shortly to appear, the "Paradiso" and "Canzoniere." In the preface a justification is offered for the approximate reproduction in English of the tirza rima of the original in preference to the blank verse of Cary and the earlier translators, and reference is made to recent translations, such as those of Mr. Sibbald and Mr. Minchin, both of which were noticed in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, who have anticipated the use of the triple rhyme. In the admirable Life of Dante prefixed to this volume the Dean claims "to bring before his readers the man Dante Alighieri, as one of like passions with themselves, as he lived and moved, as he thought and acted. I shall distinguish," he goes on to say, "as I proceed, between the certain, the doubtful, and the conjectural elements of his life; but I do not despair of taking students, as it were, within the brain and heart of the great poet of mediæval Christendom." We hold that this modest boast is made good, and we venture to affirm that the biography is in itself, for clearness, for common sense, for fairness, for ease of style, and for intense though temperate enthusiasm for the subject, an "ideal biography," and a work of art of a very high order indeed. On two points, "the ultimate devotion and earnestness of Dante's faith, and the historical personality of Beatrice de' Portinari," Dr. Plumptre says, that in spite of all arguments to the contrary, "Manet immota fides." Of the translation itself it would be vain within our limits to attempt a detailed criticism. If, however, it is possible to give to English readers a conception of the great Florentine by means of a translation, and if a thorough and systematic study of such a translation is ever likely to be attempted by any who shrink from the labour of learning the Italian language, we may safely prophesy that this noble work will hold the field. We quote from the third canto of the "Inferno" the famous inscription on the gates of Hell:—

---

[5] "Mountain Monarchs." By Cornelia Wallace. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1887.

[6] "Plays and Poems." By Albert E. Drinkwater. Second Edition. London: Griffith & Farran. 1886.

[7] "The Commedia and Canzoniere of Dante Alighieri." A new Translation, with Notes, Essays, and Biographical Introduction. By E. H. Plumptre, D.D., Dean of Wells. In two volumes. Vol. I. London: William Isbister, Limited. 1886.

> Through me men pass to city of great woe;
>   Through me men pass to endless misery;
> Through me men pass where all the lost ones go.
>   Justice it was that moved my Maker high.
> The power of God it was that fashioned me,
>   Wisdom supreme and primal charity.
> Before me nothing was of things that be,
>   Save the Eterne, and I eterne endure:
> Ye that pass in, all hope abandon ye.

A facsimile of Giotto's portrait in the Bargello, reduced from the Arundel Society's chromo-lithograph, is given as a frontispiece.

A new translation of "Faust"[8] comes to us from across the Atlantic. The translator, Mr. F. Claudy, an American of German birth, has sought to reproduce the original metres, and with a view to literal rendering—we do not like his own word "rendition"—the first part of Goethe's masterpiece. The work, we are told, is the result of fifteen years' labour. The merit of this translation is its faithfulness to the original, and if the problem of converting German into English idiom without any loss of the full meaning and force of the original were not insoluble, we should be inclined to rate the work at a very high value. But the language is German-English—readable German-English, pleasant German-English, metrical German-English—but it is the language of a translation. That it will succeed in bringing Goethe home to English readers as few translations have hitherto done, we can readily believe; and that it may be read with pleasure we have already admitted; but it stands to reason that language is something more than a pigment which gives to thought its peculiar hue. Rather is it a chemical process which out of differently combined equivalents creates distinct substances. Goethe cannot be translated into English or Shakespeare into German, because the ideas which give birth to words differ in themselves, and possess no medium of exchange.

---

[8] "Faust: a Tragedy." By Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. The First Part. Translated in the Original Metres by Frank Claudy. Washington, D.C.: Wm. I. Morrison. 1886.

A translation of the first twelve books of the "Odyssey,"[9] by Lord Carnarvon is remarkable for the manner in which it combines an easy and idiomatic style with faithfulness to the original. As a poetical equivalent Mr. Philip Worsley's version will hold its own, and, as an exact reproduction in poetical language, the prose translation of Messrs. Butcher and Lang remains unrivalled; but for the average English reader who desires to hear the story of the "Odyssey," and at the same time to feel that he is reading a poem, this latest version may be safely recommended. We quote from the Fifth Book the description of Calypso's cave:—

> Within she sat;
> On the broad hearth the goodly flame burnt bright,
> And through the isle was wafted far and wide
> The scent of frankincense and cedar log.
> Within she sat; and, bending o'er the loom,
> Wrought with her golden shuttle on the web,
> And, even as she wrought, sang with clear voice.
> Around that grotto grew a goodly grove,
> Alder and poplar and the cypress sweet;
> And there the deep-winged sea-birds found their haunt,
> And owls and hawks and long-tongued cormorants,
> Who joy to live upon the briny flood;
> And o'er the face of that deep cave a vine
> Wove its wild tangles and its clustering grapes.
> Four fountains, too, each from the other turned,
> Poured their white waters, whilst the grassy meads
> Bloomed with the parsley and the violet's flower.
> It was a sight, in sooth, at which a god
> Might wonder and rejoice.

"Famous Plays,"[10] by Mr. Fitzgerald Molloy, is a pleasant, gossiping volume on matters connected with the representation of such masterpieces as Congreve's "Love for Love," Addison's "Cato," "The School for Scandal," and even, to come to modern times, of Lord Lytton's "Not so Bad as We Seem," which was privately performed at Devonshire House before the Queen and Prince Albert in 1851. It will be remembered that on this occasion parts were played by Charles Dickens, Douglas Jerrold, John Forster, John Tenniel, and other well-known artists and men of letters. By way of introduction Mr. Molloy discourses pleasantly on the playhouses of the Restoration, and of those famous actors Thomas Betterton, Mrs. Bracegirdle, Thomas Kynaston, and Shakespeare's grand-nephew, Charles Hart, who were the worthy predecessors of the Garricks, Kembles, and Irvings of later times.

Mr. W. M. Rossetti,[11] in a new preface to his well-known Memoir of Shelley, offers some amendments and corrections to errors of the text, due to the scantiness of the materials which were formerly at his disposal. *De minimis non curat lex;* but the modern biographer cares a very great deal indeed.

---

[9] "The Odyssey of Homer." Books I.—XII. Translated into English Verse by the Earl of Carnarvon. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

[10] "Famous Plays." By J. Fitzgerald Molloy. London: Ward & Downey. 1886.

[11] "Memoir of Percy Bysshe Shelley (with a New Preface)." By William Michael Rossetti. London: John Stark. 1886.

The Clarendon Press issues an edition of the "Adelphi of Terence,"[12] with Notes and Introduction, by the Rev. A. Sloman; and a "Second Middle English Primer, with Grammar and Glossary,"[13] by Henry Sweet, M.A.

We have also to acknowledge "Prose Extracts, Arranged for Translation into English and Latin,"[14] by S. E. Nixon, M.A. Parallel passages from Latin and English authors, as Cicero and Burke, Tacitus and Creasy, are printed on opposite pages. The volume contains, by way of introduction, a series of well-arranged hints on such knotty points as Negation, Pleonasm, Connection of Clauses, &c. For advanced students, and for tutors desirous to learn in order to teach, Mr. Nixon's work will be invaluable.

"The New English,"[15] by Mr. T. L. Kington Oliphant, is a continuation, down to the present year, of his former work on "Old and Middle English." His method is to select for each period such authors as he judges best adapted to exemplify the current language of the time, to pass them in review in order of date, noticing in each any changes of form, whether of orthography, diction, or construction. The first chapter deals with the first half of the fourteenth century (1300–1362), and is not headed by any great or well-known name; indeed the books and authors cited in it are, for the most part, entirely unknown to modern readers who have not made a special study of philology. The second chapter is headed: "Chaucerian English." Its range is from 1362 to 1474, and in it Chaucer, Piers Ploughman, Gower, Occleve, Wickliffe, Lydgate, and a host of less known authors are cited, and their linguistic peculiarities carefully noted. "Caxton's English" is the title of the third chapter, which takes in the period between 1474 and 1586. Among the numerous authorities examined, Tyndale and Coverdale are perhaps, next to Caxton, the most important in their influence on the language. The second volume opens with "Shakespeare's English" (Chapter IV. 1586-1660). After short notices of some of the contemporaries of the first half of Shakespeare's public life, Mr. Oliphant takes the plays of Shakespeare one by one, and sifts out of them all the verbal novelties, innovations (such as new compounds) or peculiarities of any kind, that he can lay hold of. Shakespeare used, we learn, fifteen thousand words. That he used them as no one else could is evidenced even by such a purely verbal examination of his work as the present. Coming to Shakespeare's words and turns of speech from the rugged and often barely intelligible diction which we have been examining under Mr. Oliphant's guidance, is like running into smooth water after a tempestuous voyage. One finds oneself in a familiar atmosphere of modernness. No doubt this effect is partly due to intimate knowledge of the plays, but it is none the less true that Shakespeare is strangely modern as compared with his contemporaries, and with many even of his successors. Chapter V. is entitled "Dryden's English" (1660–1750) and examines the works of Butler ("Hudibras") Wycherley, Congreve, Collier, Bentley, Vanbrugh, Farquhar, Cibber, Gay, Swift, Pope, Addison, Steele, Smollett, &c. Chapter VI. "Dr. Johnson's English" (1750–1880). No examination of Dr. Johnson's English follows, however. After a few phrases, deploring his Latinizing tendencies, we leave him, and turn to Foote's plays; next follows Miss Burney's "Cecilia," then Grose's "Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue," and Miss Hawkins' novel, "The Countess and Gertrude," published 1811, closes the list. The latter half of the volume is taken up by a most complete and copious index, absolutely essential to the primary purpose of the work, which is beyond all else a book of reference. The examination of authors closes at 1811, and the rest of the text (from 208 to 244) is devoted to remarks on modern English writing, strictures on newspaper style and diction, advice to young authors, &c., followed by a few short specimens from English writers beginning with Wickliffe (A.D. 1380) and ending with Morris (A.D. 1872). With many of the remarks we entirely agree. We dislike as much as does Mr. Oliphant the roundabout bombastic style of many newspaper articles, exactly described by the French word *ampoulé*, which reminds us of another vice of style which he severely censures, the interlarding of English sentences with French terms. Again we agree with him, though it is a temptation, when the exact word comes to mind in French, and a true synonym in English is sought in vain. For it is not so easy, as Mr. Oliphant seems to think it, at all times to find English counterparts for French words. He himself is not always successful. "Stamp" is by no means an adequate or satisfactory rendering of "cachet;" "all the same" fails to convey the force, or to hit the exact meaning of "quand même." "Ineptitude" is not a French word at all, but an English coinage from "ineptie," whose primary meaning is unfitness. In our unnecessary employment of French words we too frequently aggravate our fault by slightly misapplying them—that is to say, using them in a sense slightly different from that which they bear at home. But while concurring in many of the dicta of the author of "The New English," we entirely dissent with the fundamental idea which underlies them all. That idea may be summed up as *Teutonism*. Mr. Oliphant fairly dins us with his reiterated praises of sound Teutonic words. The young author is recommended a severe course of linguistic study, to begin with "The Gothic and Anglo-Saxon Gospels," followed by "Thorpe's Analecta Anglo-Saxonica." He is to keep his eye fixed on Dr. March's Anglo-Saxon Grammar" (the last phrase irresistibly recalls Toole's "Keep your eye on your Father," in the "Princess of Trebizonde").

---

[12] "P. Terenti Adelphi. With Notes and Introduction." By the Rev. A. Sloman, M.A. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1886.

[13] "Second Middle English Primer. With Grammar and Glossary." By Henry Sweet, M.A. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1886.

[14] "Prose Extracts. Arranged for Translation into English and Latin." By J. E. Nixon, M.A. Cambridge: Macmillan & Bowes.

[15] "The New English." By T. L. Kington Oliphant, of Balliol College. 2 vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

Now, far be it from us to undervalue the course of study suggested by Mr. Oliphant. All philological knowledge is to be prized, especially that which bears on the origin of our mother tongue. But, after all, Anglo-Saxon is but one root of our complex modern speech. Modern English is emphatically a blend. A recent American writer ("History of the English Language," by H. E. Shepherd) asserts that it is formed by the blending of "a greater diversity of languages than has ever entered into the formation of any other speech." He also tells us, and appends lists to prove his words, that in modern English the Romance words far outnumber those of Anglo-Saxon origin, and that among the monosyllabic words which constitute a striking feature in our speech, a large proportion come, not from the Anglo-Saxon, but from Latin, either directly, or through the French. In a language so highly composite as ours, common sense condemns, as irrational and absurd, the elimination of any one element in favour of another, whether it be the rejection of Teutonic words by Latinists like Dr. Johnson and Gibbon, or the distaste for Romance terms, that now obtains among the Teutonic school of purists, shared in a slightly modified degree by Mr. Oliphant himself. The rational use of language is surely to seize upon the exact word (*le mot propre*, on which French writers lay so much stress) which best conveys our meaning, without reference to its origin or derivation. To cramp our vocabulary by self-made restrictions is not more reasonable than it would be to run a foot race with one leg tied up. Besides it must never be lost sight of that language is not a manufacture but a growth. Itself an attribute of the living organism, man, it follows the laws of organic life. Now the universal law of organic life is change. When an organism ceases to change it is dead. So it is with language; it is in a continual state of flux. In following throughout Mr. Oliphant's pages the gradual shaping of our modern speech during a period of 600 years, we see all the well known processes of evolution going on under our eyes. It is idle to talk of arresting its flow. All such schemes as resisting the spread of French words introduced after a certain date, or restricting our vocabulary to the words used by Swift or Addison, are hopelessly impracticable. For better or for worse, the evolution of speech sweeps on, and overflows the feeble bounds that we oppose to its tide. What better proof of this can be found than the helpless attitude of the French Académie, always halting after the current speech, publishing supplement after supplement to sanction the introduction of words already in vogue, and legalizing changes of accent and pronunciation established and rooted regardless of its authority.

"Sources of the Etruscan and Basque Languages"[16] by the late Mr. Robert Ellis, is a book which few men could adequately review. It is impossible to gauge the value of an author's work when all your knowledge of the subject he treats is derived from his own pages. All we can say with any approach to certainty is, that Mr. Ellis seems to reach his results by a series of cautious and well-grounded inductions; that he indulges in no wild guesses, nor hasty generalizations. Beyond this, our entire ignorance of the subject forbids any expression of opinion on our part as to the value of his work. The results at which he arrives are, that the ancient Etruscan was, like our own, a composite language; that the three elements of which it was made up were Thracian, Iberian, and African, amongst which the Thracian element predominated; the Iberian held the second place, with an African substratum below both. The relationship of the Etruscan with the Basque seems to lie in the affinity of both with the Caucasian group, which geographically divided them. Mr. Ellis's general inference from all the linguistic evidence is, that "two races preceded the Aryans in Etruria, and probably in Italy also—the African and Iberians. Both appear to have been subdued by some Aryans of the great Thracian family, who retained them in subjection till the time of the Roman conquest of Etruria."

---

[16] "Sources of the Etruscan and Basque Languages." By Robert Ellis, B.D. London: Trübner & Co. 1886.

"The Student's French Notes,"[17] by Monsieur Marius Deshumbert, are admirable. Experience in teaching French in England has enabled the author to put his finger on the precise difficulties which beset English people struggling to express themselves in French. Probably no one but an Englishman, who has lived among a French-speaking population, can adequately estimate the value of M. Deshumbert's notes. They are danger-signals warning us beforehand of the pitfalls into which, without some help, such as his little book affords, we are sure to stumble.

The third volume of Mr. H. H. Vaughan's "New Readings and Renderings of Shakespeare's Tragedies,"[18] deals with "King Richard III.," "King Henry VIII.," and "Cymbeline." Mr. Vaughan's is a learned and thoughtful work; but we confess we should be sorry to see his "New Readings" substituted for the old, for many of them seem to us to lack insight and fineness of appreciation. We will give but two examples, both taken from King Richard III. In that magnificent speech of Glo'ster's, with which the play opens, beginning with "Now is the winter of our discontent," &c., the closing lines are:—

> Grim visag'd war hath smoothed his wrinkled front;
> And now, instead of mounting barbèd steeds,
> To fright the souls of fearful adversaries,
> He capers nimbly in a lady's chamber,
> To the lascivious pleasing of a lute.

In the last line Mr. Vaughan proposes to replace "lute" by "love." One is half inclined there and then to close the book, and vex one's soul with no more "new readings." The first objection to the change is, that in a passage so justly celebrated, any change is to be deprecated. Nothing but an obvious change for the better could be tolerated. The change proposed by Mr. Vaughan is distinctly for the worse; it is fatal to the melody of the verse, and obscures and blurs the sense. What is the meaning of capering nimbly "to the lascivious pleasing of a *love*"? It conveys no clear picture to the mind's eye. Whereas every one can understand capering "to the lascivious pleasing of a lute," especially "in a lady's chamber." As to the epithet "lascivious" being applied to the music of a lute, it is surely most apt. In our own day, Zola—a keen observer—talks of "*les polissonneries des petites flûtes.*" Our second example is from act i. scene 4, where Clarence is pleading for his life with his murderers. Mr. Vaughan wishes to transpose some of the lines. We have not space to quote the passage, but Mr. Vaughan's reasons for his proposed amendment we *must* quote, for they are typical of the tone and spirit of his whole work. "As I dispose the lines," he writes, "Clarence first despatches the subject of relenting. Then he addresses himself to the softer nature of one in whom he sees signs of remorse; having concluded this, he turns to both with reasons capable of affecting the common nature of both." Shakespeare's knowledge of the human heart was too profound, and his dramatic tact too infallible, to allow him to put into the mouth of a man on the point of being murdered, in place of a wild, disjointed pleading, a neatly turned discourse in three heads.

---

[17] "The Student's French Notes." By Marius Deshumbert, French Examiner, &c. London: D. Nutt. 1886.

[18] "New Readings and New Renderings of Shakespeare's Tragedies." By Henry Halford Vaughan, sometime Fellow of Oriel, &c. Vol. 3. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1886.

We gladly welcome a second edition of Sir Philip Perring's "Hard Knots in Shakespeare."[19] He is, as we said a year ago, a thoroughly conservative commentator, and approaches Shakespeare in a right spirit. His constant teaching is that we should, by patient study of Shakespeare's diction and idioms, strive to understand the existing text before we rush into emendations. In the present edition, besides the plays previously dealt with, the "hard knots" in "The Merry Wives of Windsor," "Much Ado about Nothing," "Love's Labours Lost," "Troilus and Cressida," "Romeo and Juliet," and "Othello," are considered. We will not take upon us to say that many of them are unravelled, though some undoubtedly are. But even when the attempt at solution cannot be pronounced conclusively successful, it gives occasion to pleasant Shakespeare talk which forms delightful reading. One "hard knot" which has exercised Sir Philip Perring we can explain, by the help of Mr. F. G. Fleay ("The Life and Works of Shakespeare"):—The reason the name of Brook, assumed by Ford in "The Merry Wives of Windsor," was changed in the folios and later quartos to Broome, seems to have been that "Brooke" was the family name of Lord Cobham, Lord Chamberlain from July 23, 1596, to March 5, 1597. Another very "hard knot" from the same play is the inexplicable word, "Anheires," used by the Host (act ii. 1. 228). After long pondering, it struck us that it might be a corrupt reading of the Dutch or Flemish myn heeres (pronounced *min airèz* and equivalent to Messieurs), and on looking into "The Handy Volume Shakespeare,"

---

[19] "Hard Knots in Shakespeare." By Sir Philip Perring, Bart. Second Edition. London: Longmans. 1886.

M. Belletête, contains a dedication to Sultan Murad, whose reign extended from 1421 to 1451. Several MS. copies of the Forty Vezirs are known to exist. Two in the British Museum, one in the Royal Library of Dresden, and two (slightly imperfect) bought by the author from Mr. Quaritch, are mentioned in the preface. It appears that in these several versions, though the framework is identical, the selection of stories varies considerably. Indeed Mr. Gibb tells us that the "Forty Vezirs" may be called, like the Arabian Nights, rather a vehicle for stories than a fixed collection of them. A hundred and ten stories are contained in the present volume. As stories they are by no means so striking or so entertaining as those in the Arabian Nights, but their main interest for Western readers is, of course, not intrinsic, but lies in treating the several legends as what may be called documents of folk lore, and, as such, tracing their origin and descent, transformations, collateral connections, &c. Thus, the main story—the string upon which all the others are hung—can be traced back to a remote Indian origin, "whence in the sixth century it passed into Persia, and thence spread over all the West." It here appears as the story of a king who, worked upon by a wicked wife, each morning condemns his son to be executed, and as regularly remits his sentence till the morrow, at the intercession, backed by a story, of one of his Forty Vezirs. Each night the wicked queen tells a story which once more inflames the vacillating monarch's wrath, till at length, on the fortieth day, the truth comes to light, the virtuous youth is reinstated, and the wicked step-mother torn to pieces, by being tied to the heels of a wild ass.

"Jack and Three Jills"[27] is pure comedy, without being the least farcical. It is lively, light-hearted reading. "Jack" is a fortunate fellow, whose lines are cast in pleasant places, and his three "Jills," though of widely divergent types, are all equally well drawn and natural. There are no "cracked crowns" as in the nursery rhyme, but there is no lack of incident of a more agreeable and less tragic kind. We can promise the reader some hours of wholesome enjoyment from these amusing pages. If there is a flaw, it is in the final choice of a "Jill." To our mind the first "Jill" is out-and-out the most interesting and sympathetic of them all; but tastes differ.

We welcome with great pleasure another historical romance by Miss Yonge. "A Modern Telemachus,"[28] deserves to rank among her best efforts. It is the touching narrative of the adventures which, about the year 1719–20, befel a noble family of Irish Jacobites naturalized in France. The materials, as we learn from the preface, have been mainly derived from the *Mariner's Chronicle*, compiled early in the last century, while for exact details of the dealings of the Algerines and other piratical Barbary Powers with Christian captives at the date of her story, Miss Yonge has consulted the "Old Universal History," and other authorities. The Countess de Bourke, with her family and servants, on her way to join her husband, at that time French ambassador at the Court of Spain, is shipwrecked. She herself is drowned, and her children and servants, spared by the sea, are taken captive by Barbary corsairs. Their sufferings, terrors, and privations, as likewise their final rescue, are powerfully and vividly described.

---

[27] "Jack and Three Jills: a Novel." Two vols. By F. C. Philips. London: Ward & Downey. 1886.

[28] "A Modern Telemachus." By Charlotte M. Yonge. Two vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

"The Syren,"[29] by Cecil Medlicott, is a clever, well-written one-volume novel. The characters and conversations are life-like, the incidents and situations naturally brought about. The one thing that is, to our thinking, unnatural, is the *dénouement;* and to explain our objection to it, we must, contrary to our wont, shortly resume the story. A young man of attractive manners and appearance, but possessing an inadequate income, meets with a beautiful and charming girl, the owner of a large landed estate entirely at her own disposal. In his eyes her wealth is her principal, perhaps her only charm. He woos and wins her, feigning a love he does not feel. Not until a few days before their marriage does he reveal to her that he is in embarrassed circumstances—pressed by debts that must, if paid at all, be paid with her money. She behaves generously and delicately; he shows littleness, false pride, and an invidious sense of the disparity of their fortunes. During the honeymoon all goes fairly well—*l'un baise et l'autre tend la joue.* But after the first three months the husband has no longer the complaisance even to *tendre la joue.* He becomes short, sarcastic, cold, and often rude. She ministers to his pleasures in every way—finds him hunters, shooting, and every amusement her estate can afford. But in vain. He is bored, and shows it in a manner that proves him to be not even a gentleman. Very soon he makes an excuse to go by himself to London for a day or two; stays for weeks, gambles, and loses large sums of his wife's money. Next he forces on her a visit from the sister of a "friend"—an unscrupulous blackleg, to whom he has lost more money than he can pay. When the sister comes, he falls in love with her, and she, more or less, with him. After this his whole life is taken up with the pursuit of his unlawful love. But she, syren-like, alternately attracts and repels him. His extravagance is now redoubled, and he contracts debts which can only be met by the sale of shares and the strictest retrenchment. In the midst of this, still in pursuit of his syren, he again leaves home, on pretences more or less false, and finally embarks on board his "friend's" yacht for a year's voyage round the world. The "syren," however, at length determined to break with him, surreptitiously leaves the yacht at Malta, and, long before the conclusion of the voyage, the husband, sobered and brought to a better mind by the friendship and subsequent death of a consumptive youth, who was a fellow-passenger on board the yacht, sneaks home repentant, and after a probation of some three months, is pardoned, and reinstated in the affection of his adoring wife. Now this *dénouement* is, we take leave to say, absurd. A homely proverb tells us that "it is impossible to make a silken purse out of a sow's ear." Arthur Dalrymple, the husband, is base metal, and no alchemy can turn him into gold.

---

[29] "The Syren: a Story in One Volume." By Cecil Medlicott. London: Griffith, Farran & Co. 1886.

"In One Town,"[30] by the author of "Anchor-Watch Yarns," is quite out of the ordinary run of novels. The scene is laid in a little Irish seaport. The *dramatis personæ* are merchant skippers, captains of coasters, or their families. The nearest approach to a landsman is a shipbroker. The whole atmosphere of the book is redolent of the sea. When one feels how fresh and congenial the atmosphere is, what quaintness, and at the same time what pathos, it imparts to commonplace details, one wonders that, in a maritime country like England, there are, at the present day, so few sea stories. No doubt the reason is that few people can write a good sea story. Sailors, with some illustrious exceptions, do not shine in imaginative literature; and it is rare indeed to find a landsman, however gifted, who can describe seafaring matters with that intimate knowledge which is needed to make the subject attractive. The writer of "In One Town" has two qualifications seldom found in combination—he is evidently "a waterside character," if not a sailor, and he has in no small measure the gifts that go to make a successful novelist. The result is a sea story of unusual merit, by turns romantic, pathetic and humorous.

"Legends and Popular Tales of the Basque People,"[31] by Mariana Monteiro, are interesting from more than one point of view. The traditions of a race distinct and separate from all others in language, history, and manners, and whose ancient customs and ideas are, as we are sorry to learn from the preface, rapidly disappearing, must be regarded as a valuable contribution to European folk-lore. Many of the legends are also interesting in themselves, at once poetic and wildly fantastic. The language in which the legends are presented to English readers seems to be either a translation or the work of a foreigner imperfectly acqainted with English idioms.

The graphic descriptions, both of scenes and people, in which the novel of "Rurick"[32] abounds, prove that the author is well acquainted with Russia. But we cannot say that she makes it attractive. Neither its brilliant starlit skies, its dazzling plains of stainless snow, nor yet the barbaric splendour and despotic power of its great nobles, can make Russia a pleasant place to read about. There is a constant sense of unrest, distress, and insecurity. The ground, morally speaking, is not solid under one's feet. It is mined in all directions. In "Rurick," plots and treachery are rife, eating into the very heart of domestic life; and thus the book gives less pleasure than if it treated of a happier subject.

There is a little fault to find with Mrs. Needell's manner of telling

---

[30] "In One Town: a Novel." By the Author of "Anchor-Watch Yarns," &c. Two vols. London: Ward & Downey. 1886.

[31] "Legends and Popular Tales of the Basque People." By Mariana Monteiro. London. T. Fisher Unwin. 1887.

[32] "Rurick: a Novel." By Annie Grant. One vol. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

"The Story of Philip Methuen,"[33] but there is really nothing to praise in the story itself. It is lugubrious, ghastly, and, in some of its incidents, revolting. It seems to be written on a totally false ethical theory. The notion that self-sacrifice is good in itself peeps out from many a modern novel, and is a favourite object of tearful admiration among certain lady novelists. But it is seldom that asceticism is so boldly and so crudely put forward as the highest—nay, as the only—good, as in "The Story of Philip Methuen." The hero absolutely prefers to do wrong, if it is but painful enough, to doing right if it jumps with his inclination. This is the key to all his actions, and this perverse and unnatural spirit of self-sacrifice produces all the dreary misery to himself and others of which his "Story" is the painful record.

Mrs. Alfred Hunt's novel, "That Other Person,"[34] is lively and entertaining reading. Many of the characters are well drawn. Both the laborious and absorbed antiquary and genealogist, Mr. Treherne, and his devoted wife are especially lifelike, though perhaps their peculiarities are slightly exaggerated. The machinery of the story may be rather *banal*. It can hardly be denied that an old-fashioned, commonplace ghost, who indicates a secret chamber, &c., is a somewhat worn-out method of bringing about a *dénouement*. The moral of the book seems to be that a woman who gives herself for love without marriage is more to be respected than one who sells herself in marrying for wealth and position. The proposition is undoubtedly true in the abstract; but in order to work it out in action Mrs. Hunt is obliged to paint the forsaken mistress all but impossibly pure, innocent, and noble—a *véritable merle blanc*, in fact.

"The Haven under the Hill,"[35] by Mary Linskill, is like a strain of sweet, sad music in a minor key—a strain "most musical, most melancholy." Her descriptions of land and sea, of character, of incident, harmonious though they be, all give forth a mournful cadence, so that the reader is saddened while he reads. The character of the heroine is a singularly interesting study. Her solitary childhood, passed amidst squalid surroundings, affects her whole life. She imagines that "all that is best in life makes for sacrifice," that "peace only comes by pain—that without sacrifice there is no true living." This seems to be the keynote of the book. It is, as it were, the exaltation—nay, the deification—of adversity. The "Haven" is the scene of appalling disasters and accidents both by land and sea, so that even the happier chapters are overshadowed by past or coming woe. But for this all-pervading sadness, we should wish for many a succeeding story from the gifted author.

"A House Divided against Itself"[36] is a very sensational title, but the sensation is lacking. It is more than ever Mrs. Oliphant's own unmistakable style of "linked sweetness long drawn out," so lengthy and tedious in the development of the story that it seems as though the writer purposely lingered on the way, lest she should spoil the *dénouement* by rushing on too quickly. Mrs. Oliphant is somewhat hard upon Society and its votaries. She often ascribes to them motives too glaringly odious, and indulges in unnecessary sneers at what is undeniably good—the mercy and loving-kindness shown by many among the greatest in the land. With these reservations, the work is entitled to favourable criticism, for it is in the main artistic, and occasionally rises to dramatic force.

---

[33] "The Story of Philip Methuen." By Mrs. J. H. Needell. Three vols. Edinburgh & London: W. Blackwood & Sons. 1886.

[34] "That Other Person: a Novel." Three vols. By Mrs. Alfred Hunt. London: Chatto & Windus.

[35] "The Haven under the Hill: a Novel." Three vols. By Mary Linskill. London: Bentley & Son. 1886.

[36] "A House Divided against Itself." By Mrs. Oliphant. Three vols. London: Blackwood & Sons. 1386.

"L'Esterre Durant,"[37] by the author of "Miss Molly," &c., is a very faulty novel; it has the unpardonable fault of being tedious. There is what is called, in theatrical slang, a want of "business." The whole of the first volume—over 300 pages—passes without a single incident. The space is filled with wearisome talk, and still more wearisome analysis of emotions, ill-defined thoughts, and dim, vague yearnings, regrets, and aspirations. The heroine, L'Esterre Durant, is doubtless a good, kind woman; but she is so "earnest" as to be quite unfit "for human nature's daily food." Audrey, the second heroine, is brighter, and promises at first to be amusing; but her little jests are always set in the same key; one knows precisely the sort of things she will say. There is no variety—*rien d'imprévu* about her. The second volume does contain one incident. The lover of Audrey is shot from behind a hedge, in mistake for his cousin. He is not killed, and, during his long convalescence, the dim, cloudy talk, and the minute cataloguing of L'Esterre's noble and virtuous musings are resumed and continued *ad infinitum*. His accident, however, leads to his being accepted by Audrey. Finally his cousin reappears, and marries L'Esterre. And so, at the end of two closely printed volumes, the story is happily concluded. It might have been told in half a dozen chapters, more pleasantly for the reader, and more creditably to the literary skill of the author, or rather the authoress.

The story of "Britta"[38] is not without interest, but there is, especially for a one-volume novel, an undue amount of "padding." And the padding is not of a high order. Whole chapters are taken up with trite, commonplace moralizings, which are too freely interspersed throughout. The best that can be said for the little book is that it gives a true and vivid picture of Shetland, its scenery, its customs, and its inhabitants.

Mr. Dudley H. Thomas's "Tale of the Indian Mutiny," entitled "The Touchstone of Peril,"[39] is an admirable novel. The style is terse, vigorous, and direct. The presentment of character, of incident, and of environment is more than realistic; it is absolute, living reality. The book forms a complete gallery of pictures of life, thirty years ago, in North India. The whole thing is made present to our eyes: the variations of climate throughout the revolving seasons, the sights, the sounds, the notes of the song-birds, the screaming of the parrots, the weird cry of the jackalls at night. With the same sure and rapid touch, the contrasting lives of the handful of dominant English, and of the surrounding crowd of subject natives are set before us—lives that touch at certain given points, but never mingle. Amidst the careless, self-confident gaiety of the English station, we hear, in ominous undertone, the threatening crackings and heavings of the coming convulsion. Not till the middle of the second volume does the storm break. The story of that fearful time is simply and powerfully told, and "The Touchstone of Peril" is applied with some subversive results, not, perhaps, altogether unforeseen by the reader.

---

[37] "L'Esterre Durant." Two vols. London: Blackwood & Sons. 1886.

[38] "Britta: a Shetland Romance." By George Temple. London: Wm. Isbister. 1886.

[39] "The Touchstone of Peril: a Tale of the Indian Mutiny." By Dudley Hardress Thomas. Two vols. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

"A Shadowed Life,"[40] by Richard Ashe King (Basil), has a good plot, and is both cleverly and entertainingly written. It is a vast improvement upon the "Wearing of the Green." The author has, we are glad to see, completely dropped the pedantry and affectation which then disfigured his writing.

"Zorah: a Love Tale of Modern Egypt,"[41] is a painful story, and would be more painful if it were not so glaringly improbable as to give no illusion of reality, even at the moment of perusal. The one redeeming feature is that, in the details and accessories of the drama, the authoress gives proof of considerable familiarity with Egyptian manners, language, and scenery. But her knowledge is not artistically utilized; otherwise, the hapless "love tale" would be more poignant than it is, because more real.

Dear to the heart of the genuine novel-reader will be the thrilling melodrama of "Lady Branksmere."[42] There are all the materials which go to make up a good old-fashioned romance. The loveless marriage, the perpetual misunderstandings, the dangerous temptations, the concealment of a mad woman in the castle for years, the baffled vengeance of the disappointed rival, the reconciliation—but there is more than this. Inimitable descriptions of a family of young brothers and sisters, and most lively and witty conversations. The colloquial portions of this author's books are always excellent, and she has the merit of never being dull.

"Kidnapped,"[43] by Mr. Louis Stephenson, is a delightful story. The scene is laid in the Highlands of Scotland and the adjacent seas. The time of the action is the middle of the last century, a few years after the rising of '45. Two principal characters divide the interest of the reader—the "kidnapped" hero, David Balfour, and his faithful friend, Alan Stewart. Both are admirably depicted, with touches so natural and life-like that one forgets from time to time that they are fictive creations. There is no affectation of archaic phraseology; yet the tale has a homely old-world air about it which adds to its reality, and is eminently suitable to the period treated of. This effect is, no doubt, in great part due to the fact that the dialogue is almost entirely written in Scottish dialect—Highland or Lowland—and that the narrative part has throughout a Scottish turn of expression—more, however, in idiom than in wording. The public will, we are sure, share the author's "great kindness both for Alan and David," and we trust he will soon redeem his half-promise to disclose their further adventures.

---

[40] "A Shadowed Life." By Richard Ashe King (Basil). Three vols. London: Ward & Downey. 1886.

[41] "Zorah: a Love Tale of Modern Egypt." One vol. By Elizabeth Balch. (D.T.S.) London: Blackwoods. 1886.

[42] "Lady Branksmere." By the Author of "Molly Bawn," &c. Three vols. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1886.

[43] "Kidnapped: being the Adventures of David Balfour in the year 1751." By Robert Louis Stephenson. London: Cassell & Co. 1886.

"The Cruise of the Black Prince,"[44] by Commander V. Lovett Cameron, is a good rattling sea story of a type once very popular, but now seldom met with, except occasionally in books for boys. Perhaps "The Cruise of the Black Prince" is meant for a boys' book? It is in no sense either puerile or didactic; but, then, neither is Robinson Crusoe—that best of boys' books. We should think Captain Cameron's lively unpretentious style, the abundance of exciting incidents which he narrates, and the prowess and good luck of his heroes, would make his book very successful with boys. Yet it is quite possible that boys, nowadays, may prefer more introspective and subjective literature. For ourselves, we confess that we are old-fashioned enough to like tales of daring and adventure such as Captain Cameron tells so pleasantly in the present volume.

"A Northern Lily"[45] is just an escape from being an extremely good novel. Its weak point is sufficiently indicated by the sub-title, "Five Years of an Uneventful Life." Now an entirely uneventful life does not contain the elements of a story, and the fault of this book is that it really has no story. It possesses nearly every other essential of a good novel. It is well written, the delineation of character is exceptionally good, and on that one quality the merit and interest of the book almost wholly depend; for not only is there a dearth of incident, but what little there is is mournful, and the end is needlessly lugubrious.

"Neæra: a Tale of Ancient Rome,"[46] by Mr. John Graham, is an exceedingly favourable specimen of its class. Tales of ancient Greece and Rome are apt to be lifeless, antiquarian reproductions—necessarily halting and imperfect—of minute particularities of manners, dress, architecture, &c., long since passed away; while of human nature, which in all ages is, more or less, a constant quantity, they make but small account. But in "Neæra" the personages really live, and the story is full of human interest. The Emperor Tiberius is a fine study. The Centurion, Julius Martialis, is a very real and sympathetic character; and the scene in which he braves the wrath of the dread and inscrutable Emperor evinces great dramatic power.

---

[44] "The Cruise of the 'Black Prince' Privateer." By Commander V. Lovett Cameron, R.N., C.B., D.C.L. London: Chatto & Windus. 1886.

[45] "A Northern Lily: Five Years of an Uneventful Life." By Joanna Harrison. Three vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

[46] "Neæra: a Tale of Ancient Rome." By John W. Graham. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

In "The Queen's Land"[47] Captain Cameron appears in a new character. In "The Cruise of the Black Prince" he was the British sailor of a hundred years ago. Now he is the African explorer of the present time. The romance of exploration is hardly a satisfactory class of fiction. It is too like the thing it simulates, of which, however, it lacks the one great charm—authenticity. The traveller's wonders cease to be wonderful when they are known to be inventions. Perhaps Captain Cameron instinctively felt this, and therefore magnified his wonders tenfold; so that, when all deductions and allowances for fiction are made, a residuum of marvellousness might still remain. Be that as it may, after beginning his book in a sober, business-like way, as though it were the record of a real journey of exploration, he very soon launches us into an atmosphere of magic and pseudo-miracle, compared with which the "Arabian Nights," "Baron Munchausen," and "Gulliver's Travels" seem tame and commonplace! He turns men into rats before our eyes, brings people into his presence through solid stone walls, and doubtless, before the end of the volume, works many greater wonders still. But we confess that, when the men were turned into rats by the use of mystic numbers, our patience was exhausted, and we closed the book.

Miss Mary C. Rowsell's little "Stage Story" of "Miss Vanbrugh"[48] is evidently a *roman à clé*. It is easy to pierce the veil which thinly covers the personality of two great popular favourites, though the incidents of the story are, of course, entirely fanciful. It is a sprightly little tale, offering an hour's amusement with complete success.

In "A Strange Inheritance,"[49] the author, Mr. F. M. F. Skene, takes what seems to us a strangely twisted view of the events he narrates. In the story, wretchedness and misery result from secresy and mystery. But the author lays the blame on his (or perhaps her) hero, who refuses to accept blindfold a mystery which could easily have been explained to him, and which it was his right, and even his duty, to have cleared up. As it is, mystery dogs his steps, and brings him into every sort of misfortune, and is more than once on the verge of wrecking his life. All is explained at last, but not till the very end of a most lengthy, though not altogether uninteresting, story.

"Margaret Jermine,"[50] by Fayr Madoc, is a delightful novel, striking in its originality, and attractive from its unusualness. The characters are one and all excellent, and if there are some exaggerations of eccentricity, the people are always themselves. Margaret Jermine, who is the victim of her father's crazy theory that the world would be happy if love were eliminated from it, is a splendid creature, whose career the reader follows with mingled fear and hope. After obeying her dead father through the days of her youth, she finds, too late, that he had left a letter, written on his deathbed, removing his terrible prohibition, and permitting her to marry, if the case arose. The end, as may be inferred, is tragic, but not wholly so for Margaret, who finds consolation in works of charity and loving-kindness, employing her imagination and great natural gifts in the service of her fellow-creatures. We have not seen any other book by Fayr Madoc, but, if "Margaret Jermine" is the first, we trust it will not be the last.

---

[47] "The Queen's Land; or, Ard al Malakat." By Verney Lovett Cameron, C.B. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1886.

[48] "Miss Vanbrugh: a Stage Story." London: Simpkin & Marshall. Bristol: Arrowsmith. 1886.

[49] "A Strange Inheritance." By F. M. F. Skene. Three vols. London: Blackwood & Sons. 1886.

[50] "Margaret Jermine." By Fayr Madoc. Three vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

We have received "Under the Mendips,"[51] one of Mrs. Marshall's charming stories, told with all the wonted freshness and grace which characterize her books. This one gives the details of the Bristol riots in the autumn of 1831. It closes with the dawning of the New Year, so that the trial of the prisoners does not come within its limits. Mrs. Marshall has no taste for violent political events, but she uses them to give vigour to her delightful stories, and to show forth the blessedness of domestic peace—of meek endurance, and of faith, hope, and charity, held pure and unspotted during troublous times. There are, as usual, a few pretty etchings of Bristol and its neighbourhood, and one of Wells Cathedral.

The "English Illustrated Magazine"[52] fully maintains its high standard of excellence. It is a library in itself, full of varied interest and entertainment. Biographies, travels, excellent stories, both long and short, charming descriptive articles on English and foreign towns, enter into its pleasantly diversified repertory. Then there is an article on modern falconry, another—short but really good—on dogs of the chase; one on fox-hunting—spirited and pleasant. One on London commons opens the volume. The recent disaster at Southport will give added importance to the full and interesting article on lifeboats. An article, at once instructive and delightful, entitled "Cheese-farming at Chester," gives valuable statistics on this most important subject. Its teaching is that, if English farmers will but march with the times, their prospects are by no means so hopeless as we, and they, have thought them to be. A fact not generally known is that the best Gorgonzola cheeses are made in Leicestershire! And all this store of charming and widely varied reading is enriched with a profusion of first-rate illustrations, such as, a few years back, could have been got together only for the most costly *éditions de luxe*. We must still regret, as we did last year, the one drawback to the yearly volume of the "English Illustrated Magazine"—its unwieldy size and cumbrous weight. In consulting a dictionary, one is content to stoop over a table, but half the pleasure of light literature consists in reading it at one's ease, seated by the fire in an armchair. With the "English Illustrated" this is impossible without the help of a "literary machine." Why should not the year's numbers be bound in two volumes instead of one?

---

[51] "Under the Mendips: a Tale." By Emma Marshall. London: Seeley & Co. 1886.

[52] "The English Illustrated Magazine." London: Macmillan & Co. 1885–1886.

Mr. Harry Quilter's "Sententiæ Artis"[53] sets forth "The First Principles of Art for Painters and Picture Lovers," in a series of short, detached bits of writing, far too short to be styled essays, yet too long, and not sufficiently pithy, to be regarded as aphorisms. We neither like the form nor the title of the book. The title seems somewhat didactic and pretentious, and the broken up form gives a patchiness and want of cohesion to the body of opinion expressed. It is too like reading a whole volume full of the paragraphs divided by stars which form a prominent feature in weekly papers. There is, too, or there seems to be, in the preface, a trace of affectation. There is much talk of "the spiritual consciousness" as distinguished from the mind; the author talks of "finding in every line or hue of a great picture a subtle witness to the 'something which makes for righteousness.'" All this taken together is discouraging; but, as we read on, things improve. Mr. Quilter is evidently in earnest about art, and in many respects takes a worthy and rational view of it. Once launched in his "Sententiæ," his little affectations drop from him, and he expresses himself in a manly, straightforward way. With some of his sententiæ we entirely agree, as, for instance, that one which begins: "Perhaps no purely artistic production—be it poem, statue, picture or piece of music—is capable of giving us the greatest pleasure if we can trace throughout a definite intention in its production." We have always held that a novel, or a play, "with a purpose," is a mistake—a solecism in art. His attack on the ever-increasing number of "Academic babies"—"bigger, chubbier, and better dressed" than those exhibited by outside artists—is both witty and true. But we cannot understand how any one making pretence to artistic vision can disparage Bruges as does Mr. Quilter at pages 20, 21. We say "Bruges" advisedly, for Bruges is evidently the "Gothic town" he rails at. "The tall belfry" identifies it. In Bruges, "the Venice of the North," at every turning scenic effects present themselves, with which no painting can vie in beauty and picturesqueness. But perhaps beauty must be translated into "lines and hues" on canvas, before it can subtly witness to the "something which makes for righteousness." It is ill-advised of Mr. Quilter to quote Alfred de Musset from memory. The result is a false concord: "Le *seule*," &c.

From Mr. Morley's "English Men of Letters Series" we have "Sir Philip Sidney,"[54] by Mr. J. A. Symonds. The biography is a skilfully executed piece of literary work. Mr. Symonds' own view of Sidney, which will be shared by most of his readers, is pithily summed up in the following words:—"The truth is that Sidney, as we now know him from his deeds and words, is not an eminently engaging or profoundly interesting personage. But, in the mirror of contemporary minds, he shines with a pure lustre, which the students of his brief biography must always feel to be surrounding him." When we find all the best and greatest of his countrymen extolling and almost adoring him, and the whole English nation putting on public mourning for his untimely death, we feel that, as his biographer has said elsewhere, "the man, in fact, was greater than his words and actions."

---

[53] "Sententiæ Artis. First Principles of Art." By Harry Quilter, M.A. London: Wm. Isbister. 1886.

[54] "Sir Philip Sidney." By J. A. Symonds. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

We have to acknowledge Vol. V. (Part II.)—Parc-Quod—of Messrs. Cassell's excellent "Encyclopædic Dictionary." [55] The present volume is in all ways equal to the former ones, of which we have, from time to time, expressed our hearty approval.

From the "Clarendon Press Series" we have received "Théophile Gautier: Scenes of Travel," [56] selected and edited by George Saintsbury. The "Scenes of Travel" are admirably chosen, and are introduced by a charming little essay on "Théophile Gautier," occupying only four pages, yet saying everything that need or should be said.

Racine's "Esther," [57] from the same series, is also edited by Mr. G. Saintsbury. The prolegomena, both that on the "Life and Writings of Racine," and the second on the "Progress of French Tragedy," are highly interesting and instructive. Mr. Saintsbury teaches well, for he speaks of French literature out of the fulness of knowledge.

Messrs. Vizetelly have added to their list of English versions Flaubert's "Madame Bovary." [58] It is a painful and in some respects a revolting book, sad beyond measure. But it is without a doubt the masterpiece of its author, and has inspired most of the realistic fiction of our day.

Of new editions we have Messrs. Macmillan's "Jubilee Edition" of "Pickwick." [59] It is "edited by Charles Dickens the Younger." We have not seen a more delightful book than this plain, handsome, two-volume "Pickwick." It is perfect inside and out, and reflects the greatest credit on Messrs. Macmillan's skill and taste.

Another very beautiful new edition is from Messrs. Blackie, "Rip Van Winkle," [60] illustrated by Gordon Browne. Paper, type, margins—everything is *de luxe.*

Another new edition, which will be a welcome gift book to boys, is

---

[55] "The Encyclopædic Dictionary." Vol. V. (Part II). London: Cassell & Co. 1886.

[56] "Théophile Gautier: Scenes of Travel." Clarendon Press Series.

[57] Racine's "Esther." Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by George Saintsbury. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1886.

[58] "Madame Bovary: Provincial Manners." By Gustave Flaubert. Translated by Eleanor Marx-Aveling. London: Vizetelly & Co. 1886.

[59] "Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club." By Charles Dickens. Two vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

[60] "Rip Van Winkle: a Legend of the Hudson." By Washington Irving. London and Edinburgh: Blackie & Sons. 1887.

"The Settlers in Canada,"[61] by the late Captain Marryat. The volume is profusely illustrated, and the illustrations are original.

A new and smaller edition of "Palermo"[62] is without the illustrations which constituted one great charm of the first edition.

We have also received a second edition of Mr. Fleet's "Analysis of Wit and Humour,"[63] and of "German Evenings," by D. L. Lowdell.

Our space, already exceeded, forces us merely to acknowledge the following works: "One of the People,"[64] by J. Robertson; "A Comtist Lover, and other Studies;"[65] by E. R. Chapman; "Bartholomew Legate, the Last Smithfield Martyr"[66] by Florence Gregg; "Kintail Place: a Tale of Revolution"[67] by the author of "Dorothy: an Autobiography"; "Athlos; or, The Story of a Life,"[68] by M. A. Curtois.

The second volume of the "History of Painting," translated from the German by Miss Clara Bell, and the volume of "The Fine Art Library," containing a translation of M. H. Delaborde's "La Gravure," by R. A. M. Stevenson, will be carefully noticed in our next issue.

The Subject-Index,[69] just published, of works added between 1880 and 1885 to the Library of the British Museum, well repays a careful analysis. The ordinary catalogue contains the titles of about two and a half millions of books and pamphlets. The catalogue itself fills 6,000 volumes. But it refers to titles only—not to subjects—a cause of inconvenience and loss of time to readers who come unprovided with the exact titles of the works they seek. The present is the first attempt to remedy this great drawback to the usefulness of the Library.

To readers at the British Museum Library the work will be primarily useful; but it appeals to the general public in a much wider sense, for it shows unmistakeably into what channels human thought, in this and other countries, has been running these last five years.

From this point of view we find many curious and striking facts brought out in the index before us.

The great space—no fewer than nine pages, or 600 entries—occupied by the heading "Jews" is in itself a noticeable feature. Most of the books are in German, being published by the Anti-Semitic League, or by its opponents. We have, therefore, in the latter part of the nineteenth century, an enormous literature devoted to the question whether the Jews may or may not be allowed to enjoy civil rights. Perhaps the most extraordinary part of these entries is the part relating to the Tiszra-Eszlar Trial. It will be in the minds of our readers that that trial turned upon the disappearance of a girl, who is supposed in reality to have run away with her lover, but who was said at the time to have been sacrificed with all pomp and ritual at a Jewish festival. No fewer than twelve books discuss the question whether the Jews do or do not sacrifice young ladies at their religious festivals.

---

[61] "The Settlers in Canada." By Captain Marryat, R.N. New Edition. London: Frederick Warne & Co. 1886.

[62] "Palermo—Christmas to Whitsuntide." By Alice Durand Field. London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1886.

[63] "An Analysis of Wit and Humour." By F. R. Fleet. Second Edition. London: Allen & Co. 1886.

[64] "One of the People." By John Robertson. Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1886.

[65] "A Comtist Lover, and other Studies." By Elizabeth R. Chapman. T. Fisher Unwin 1886.

[66] "Bartholomew Legate, the Last Smithfield Martyr." By Florence Gregg. Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1886.

[67] "Kintail Place: a Tale of Revolution. By the Author of "Dorothy: an Autobiography" Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1886.

[68] "Athlos: or, The Story of a Life." By M. A. Curtois. Two vols. Remington & Co. 1886.

[69] "A Subject-Index of the Modern Works added to the Library of the British Museum in the years 1880-85." Compiled by G. K. Fortescue, Superintendent of the Reading Room, British Museum. Printed by order of the Trustees. London: 1886.

We turn with pleasure from such a record of folly and superstition to the heading "Education." It is longer than that of the "Jews," and is almost equally divided amongst the different European countries. In England and France the larger number of works treat of elementary, technical, and industrial schools; whilst in Germany, the subjects are those of intermediate, higher, and university education. Does this show, we wonder, that the Germans have now no curiosity respecting primary education, having carried it to perfection; or that the professional class feels itself rather above the subject?

Close to "Education" comes "Egypt," no small portion of the entries being taken up with the war of 1882. Many of the works are in French, and, judging by the titles, some do not take a very friendly view of our proceedings there. Curiously enough, no works are chronicled relating to the final catastrophe at Khartoum!

The nations of the earth have evidently not yet forsaken the arts and practices of war. Under "Military Science and Army" there is a very large number of entries. Some refer to the German-French War of 1870, both German and French writers appearing still to be interested in the "Siege of Strassburg" and "The Battle of Sedan." In the "United States" section 200 titles refer to the great Civil War. The case of General Porter, and the campaigns of Chancellorsville and Jettisburgh are evidently of attraction to Americans even after this lapse of years, as also the actions of General Meade during the short time in which he held the balance of the Republic in his hands.

Few people, we think, would imagine that 100 books of Proverbs have issued from the press during the last five years; but this will be as nothing compared with the respectful astonishment with which most persons will realize the fact that some sixty works have been written proving that the present English nation are directly descended from the tribe of Judah; that five "Wiseacres" are still endeavouring to persuade us that "Bacon" wrote "Shakespeare," and that over 100 books have been published on "Spiritualism" and "Theosophy." Of books on religion the Roman Catholic Church occupies the largest space in the catalogue. The Church of England comes next, and the Swedenborgians third.

The attention given of late years to the study of social questions is evidenced by the number of works under such headings as "Political Economy," "Socialism," "Sociology," "Working Classes," "Capital and Labour," "Wages," "Strikes," "Social Position of Women," "Free and Fair Trade," "Bi-metallism," &c.

Again, works on the History of the French Revolution occupy eleven pages, or nearly 500 distinct entries, the most interesting feature of which is the number of monographs written on the Revolution in the Provinces.

Of books referring to cities, London occupies the first place, then Paris and Vienna, and the rest nowhere by comparison. London has 400 entries and Paris 200.

We have not the space to refer to many other highly interesting and curious facts which the catalogue strikingly indicates.

INDEX.

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

ANDERSON, J. W., M.A., "Prospector's Handbook," 231

ANIMALS OF BRITAIN, THE ANCIENT WILD, 36–44; Britain half covered with continuous forests up to twelfth century, 37; bears taken to Rome from England in fifth century, 38; prevalence of wolves until reign of Henry VII., 39; last wolf killed in 1743 in Scotland, 40; identity of British and Continental fauna, 41, the remains of hippopotamus, elephant, and deer found near Leeds; of lion, mammoth, rhinoceros, fossil horse, bison, &c., at Ilford, in abundance, 42; the "pothole" at Raygill, near Skipton, and its fossil contents, 43; change in the climate of England, 44

Anson, Sir W. R., Bart., D.C.L., "The Law and Custom of the Constitution. Part I. Parliament," 235

BAGOT, J., "Colonel James Grahme, of Levens," 244

Balch, E., "Zorah: a Love Tale of Modern Egypt," 271

Baylor, F. C., "On Both Sides," 264

Brabazon, Lord, "Social Arrows," 216

Brickdale, C. F., "Registration of Title to Land, and how to Establish it Without Cost or Compulsion," 222

Brooks, E. S., "Historic Boys," 252

Brown, J. C., LL.D., "School of Forest Engineers in Spain," 233

Burn, R. S., "Systematic Small Farming," 233

"CABOT'S (John) Landfall in 1497," 250

Cameron, Commander V. L., R.N., "The Cruise of the 'Black Prince' Privateer," 272

———, ————, "The Queen's Land," 273

Carnarvon, the Earl of, translated by, "The Odyssey of Homer." Books I.–XII., 258

Carnegie, A., "Triumphant Democracy," 227

Chapman, E. R., "A Comtist Lover, and other Studies," 277

Clarke, Percy, "The 'New Chum' in Australia," 225

Claudy, F., "Faust: a Tragedy. By J. W. von Goethe. The First Part." Translated in the Original Metres, 257

"Cruise (The) of the Alabama." By One of the Crew, 228

Cunningham, W., B.D., "S. Austin and his Place in the History of Christian Thought," 196

Curtois, M. A., "Athlos; or, the Story of a Life," 277

Curzon, G., "Delamere: a Novel," 261

DAUNT, W. J. O'N., "Eighty-five Years of Irish History," 238

De Castellane, Comte, "Souvenirs of Military Life in Algeria," 240

De Kermaingant, Laffleur, "Mission de Jean de Thumery (1598–1602)," 238

D'Ercole, Pasquale, "Notizia degli Scritti e del Pensiere Filosofico di Pietro Ceretti," 203

Deshumbert, Marius, "The Student's French Notes," 262

Dickens, Charles, "Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club," 276

DIDEROT AND THE ART OF ACTING, 44–64

Douglas, J C., "The Hive Bees and the Introduction of the Italian Bee," 232

Drinkwater, A. E., "Plays and Poems," second edition, 256

EDUCATION (STATE) IN AMERICA, 1–36

Ellis, R., B.D., "Sources of the Etruscan and Basque Languages," 261

"Encyclopædic (The) Dictionary," vol. v. part ii., 276

"English (The) Illustrated Magazine," 274

Escott, T. H. S., "Politics and Letters," 208

FAWKES, F. A., "Horticultural Buildings," 232

Fayr Madoc, "Margaret Jermine," 273

Fenn, G. M., "The Master of the Ceremonies," 265
Field, A. D., "Palermo—Christmas to Whitsuntide," 277
Flaubert, G., "Madame Bovary," 276
Fleet, F. R., "An Analysis of Wit and Humour,"277
Fortescue, *see* Subject
Freund, Dr. L., "Treue und Untreue in deutschen Sprüchen und Sprichwortern," 203

Gibb, E. J. W., done into English by, "The History of the Forty Vezirs, written in Turkish by Sheykh-Zāda," 265
Gordon, H. W., "Events in the Life of Charles George Gordon," 245
Government and Commerce, 171–191
Government, The Art of, 75–93
Government, *see* London
Graham, J. W., "Neæra: a Tale of Ancient Rome," 272
Grant, A., "Rurick: a Novel," 268
Greaves, J., M.A., "A Treatise on Elementary Statics" and "A Treatise on Spherical Trigonometry," part i., 234
Green, J. R., "Histoire Moderne du Peuple Anglais," traduite par Mdlle. M. Hunt, 237
Gregg, F., "Bartholomew Legate, the last Smithfield Martyr," 277
Guthrie, E., "The Political Problem: Proposed Solution," 214

Hall, Hubert, "Society in the Elizabethan Age," 223, 237
Harrison, Joanna, "A Northern Lily: Five Years of an Uneventful Life," 272
Hodgkin, T., "The Letters of Cassiodorus," 234
Hodgson, S. H., "The Reorganization of Philosophy," 205
"House (A) of Tears," 265
Huhn, A. von, "Aus Bulgarischer Sturnzeit. Eine authentische Darstellung des Handstreichs von Sofia und seiner Folgen," 210
Hunnewell, J. F., "The Imperial Island: England's Chronicle in Stone," 250
Hunt, Mrs. A., "That Other Person," 269
Hyndman, H. M., "The Bankruptcy of India," 208

"In One Town," 268
Irving, Washington, "Rip Van Winkle," 276

James, Henry, "The Princess Casamassima," 264
"Jevons (W. S.) Letters and Journals of," edited by his Wife, 246
Jukes-Browne, A. J., B.A., "The Student's Handbook of Historical Geology," 230

King, R. A. (Basil), "A Shadowed Life," 271
"Kintail Place: a Tale of Revolution," 277
Knight, W., LL.D., "Hume," 204

Ladd, Prof. G. T., translated and edited by, "Outlines of Æsthetics," 206
"Lady Branksmere," 271
Langley, S. P., "United States of America, War Department. Professional Papers of the Signal Service," 229
Larkin, H., "Carlyle and the Open Secret of his Life," 243
Legge, J., LL.D., translated and annotated by, "A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms," 195
"L'Esterre Durant," 270
Linskill, M., "The Haven under the Hill," 269
Loftie, W. J., "London" ("Historic Towns" Series. Edited by E. A. Freeman and W. Hunt), 225
London Government, 151–171; previous parliamentary reports, 152–54; existing government, 155; the Corporation, 156; Metropolitan Board of Works, 157; Vestries and District Boards, 158; Gas and Water Companies, 159; three alternative forms of future government, 160; localization *versus* centralization, 161–64; how are local vigilance and central authority to be combined? 165; suggestions as to future government, 167–69

Marryat, Captain, "The Settlers in Canada," new edition, 277
———, Florence, "Tom Tiddler's Ground," 227
Marshall, Emma, "Under the Mendips: a Tale," 274
Marvin, W., "Authorship of the Four Gospels," 198
McAlpine, Prof. D., "Life Histories of Plants," 232
Medlicott, C., "The Syren: a Story in One Volume," 267.
Melmonti, W. G., "The Dogaressa," translated by Clare Brune, 224
"Memoirs of the Duchess de Tourzel," published by the Duke des Cars, 240
Menger, Dr. Anton, "Das Recht auf den

Vollen Arbeitsertrag in geschichtlicher Darstellung," 218

Michaelis, Emilie, and H. Keatley Moore, translated and annotated by, "Autobiography of Friedrich Froebel," 247

Molloy, J. F., "Famous Plays," 258

Momerie, Rev. A. W., M.A., "Belief in God," 196

———, ———, "Preaching and Hearing, and other Sermons," 197

Monteiro, M., "Legends and Popular Tales of the Basque People," 268

Morris, Lewis, "Gycia," 253

NABER, *see* Pierson

Needell, Mrs. J. H., "The Story of Philip Methuen," 269

Newman, F. W., "Life after Death: Palinodia," 194

Nietzsche, F., "Jenseits von Gut und Bose," 202

Nixon, J. E., M.A., "Prose Extracts, Arranged for Translation into English and Latin," 259

O'GRADY, S., "Toryism and the Tory Democracy," 211

Oliphant, T. L. K., "The New English," 259

———, Mrs., "A House Divided Against Itself," 269

OXFORD LECTURES, THE BISHOP OF CHESTER'S, 93–109; an estimate of Arnold, 95; Macaulay, and Hallam, 96; Ranke, 97; Carlyle's "Frederick II.," 98; "The Unity of History," 99; Freeman, 100; the science of history, 101; ecclesiastical history, 102; characteristic differences, between mediæval and modern history, 103; Henry VIII., 104; the preamble to Mary I. and II., cap. 3, 105, 106; J. R. Green, 107, 108

PARTRIDGE, J. A., "The Making of the Irish Nation, and the First Fruits of Federation," 213

Perring, Sir P., Bart., "Hard Knots in Shakespeare," second edition, 263

Philips, F. C., "Jack and Three Jills," 266

"Philochristus," by the Author of, "The Kernel and the Husk," 191

Pierson, A., and S. A. Naber, "Verisimilia," 192

PLATO'S MORAL MISSION, 109–141

Plumptre, E. D., D.D., "The Commedia and Canzoniere of Dante Alighieri." vol. i., 256

Pope, Rev. G. U., "The Sacred Kurral of Tiru-valluva-Nâyanâr," 194

"Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada for the Year 1884," vol. ii., 229

QUILTER, HARRY, M.A., "Sententiæ Artis: First Principles of Art," 275

RALEIGH, T., "Elementary Politics," 207

Reissman, August, "Life and Works of Robert Schumann," translated by A. L. Alger, 249

RENT (THE) QUESTION IN IRELAND, 141–150

Roberts, Rev. W. Page, "Liberalism in Religion," 200

Robertson, J., "One of the People," 277

Romundt, Dr. H., "Ein neuer Paulus. Kant's Grundlegung zu einer sicheren Lehre von der Religion," 199

Rossetti, W. M., "Memoirs of Percy Bysshe Shelley (with a New Preface)," 258

Rothe, R., "Still Hours," translated by Jane T. Stoddart, 201

"Round (The) Table Series. Charles Darwin, Naturalist," 245

Rowbotham, J. F., "A History of Music," 248

Rowsell, M. C., "Miss Vanbrugh: a Stage Story," 273

Roy, D. L., M.A., "The Lyrics of Ind," 255

Royce, J., "California," 241

SAINTSBURY, G., edited by, "Racine's 'Esther,'" and "Théophile Gautier," with Notes and Introduction, 276

Salmon, Lucy M., "Papers of the American Historical Association," 242

Salt, H. S., "A Plea for Vegetarianism, and other Essays," 222

Saltus, E., "The Anatomy of Negation," 202

Say, M. Léon, "Municipal and State Socialism," 216

Schwartz, J. M. W., "Nivalis: a Tragedy in Five Acts," 254

Shorthouse, J. H., "Sir Percival: a Story of the Past and of the Present," 265

Skene, F. M. F., "A Strange Inheritance," 273

Sloman, Rev. A., M.A., "P. Terenti Adelphi. With Notes and Introduction," 259

Smith, Rev. R. T., D.D., "Man's Knowledge of Man and of God," 199

Smith, Samuel, M.P., "India Revisited: its Social and Political Problems," 210

Solly-Flood, F., Q.C., "The Story of Prince Henry of Monmouth and Chief Justice Gascoign," 236

Stables, Gordon, "The Cruise of the Land-Yacht 'Wanderer,'" 226
Stephenson, R. L., "Kidnapped," 271
Stokes, G. T., D.D., "Ireland and the Celtic Church," 214
"Subject-Index (A) of the Modern Works added to the Library of the British Museum in the Years 1880–85," compiled by G. K. Fortescue, 277
Swann, J., M.A., "An Investor's Notes on American Railroads," 220
Sweet, H., M.A., "Second Middle-English Primer. With Grammar and Glossary," 259

Temple, G., "Britta: a Shetland Romance," 270
Thomas, D. H., "The Touchstone of Peril: a Tale of the Indian Mutiny," 270
Tolstoi, Graf Leo, "Bekenntnisse. Was sollen wir denn thun?" 203
"Treatise (A) on Spherical Trigonometry," parts i. and ii., 239
Tyler, Lyon G., "Letters and Times of the Tylers," 242

Van Gelder, J., "The Storehouses of the King," 251
Vaughan, H. H., "New Readings and New Renderings of Shakespeare's Tragedies," vol. iii., 262

Waite, A. E., "Israfel: Letters, Visions, and Poems," 255
Wallace, C., "Mountain Monarchs," 257
Watt, A., "Electro-Deposition," 231
Welldon, J. E. C., M.A., "The Rhetoric of Aristotle," 205
Westcott, B. F., D.D., "Christus Consummator," 200
What Woman is Fitted For, 65–74

Yonge, C. M., "A Modern Telemachus," 26

END OF VOL. LXXI.

PRINTED BY BALLANTYNE, HANSON AND CO.
LONDON AND EDINBURGH